

# Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

## Agenda – June 2004

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

(Copies of Agendas and Minutes of the Community Council are held at Fife Council's Local Office, St Mary's Place and the Town Library, Church Square. Those from mid-1998 on are online at <http://www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/>)

### 0. Co-option of Community Councillors

Two vacancies exist; the original due to Gordon Pay's move out of the area, to which is added one arising from Frank Riddell's resignation due to illness [see 8.3.1.]. There are three confirmed candidates, short statements from whom are included in [Appendix A](#). There will be a secret ballot.

### 1. Apologies

Donald Macgregor, Laurel Aguilar, Ian Goudie.

### 2. Minutes of May 2004

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

### 3. Presentations

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

#### 3.1. Police report

#### 3.2. The Coastal Path

Chris Broome, Service Manager, Fife Council Community Services.

#### 3.3. St Andrews World Class – South Street

Derek Crowe, Fife Council Area Transportation Manager.

#### 3.4. Parking Pressure

Sheila Watson of Greenside Place to raise some points about the effects of increasing parking demand and limited town centre parking.

### **3.5. Any other presentations...**

## **4. Fife Councillors**

### **4.1. Frances Melville (West)**

### **4.2. Sheila Black (South)**

### **4.3. Bill Sangster (Central)**

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

## **5. Planning Committee**

Appendix G: Report 10/5/04

Appendix K: Final version of local plan submission. A bullet point summary was distributed at the local plan consultation session on 20th May.

In view of the clash with June's community council meeting and the public launch of the University's 20 year vision a briefing by Principal Brian Lang and Director of Estates David Loudon was arranged for the Fife Councillors. Thanks are due to Cllrs Frances Melville and Jane Ann Liston for arranging for Penny Uprichard and Richard Douglas to attend on behalf community council.

## **6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings**

### **6.1. Bandstand Concerts**

Murdo Macdonald: update on arrangements.

### **6.2. St Andrews in Focus**

An effect of Frank Riddell's illness that we overlooked last month was the lack of a writer for the Community Council column in StAiF. We've missed the deadline for this issue, but we need someone for the next deadline (probably August).

### **6.3. Fairtrade**

Alice Curteis is delighted with our decision last month to support Fairtrade, emailing from "deepest Nicaragua where Fairtrade is needed in a big way" to say she'll get back to us about the formalities in July.

### **6.4+. Any other matters arising.**

## **7. New Business**

## **7.1. Youth Problem**

Appendix J: letter drawing attention to a problem. It has been passed to the Police, Local Office and Community Safety Panel for comment. PC Lister has given a response.

## **7.2. Nominations for Holyrood Opening**

Iain Smith MSP asks us for suggestions for his nomination of a member of the public to attend the formal opening on Sat 9 October. Response needed by 11 June.

## **7.3. Fife Environment Network**

This is the combined Take Pride in Fife and Fife Environment Trust. They ask for feedback on our likely attendance at a conference either 23 Oct or 12 Nov. Location not stated.

## **7.4. Planning Aid for Scotland**

This group of planning professionals provides advice to individuals and community groups on planning issues.

### **7.4.1. Friends Subscription**

Annual subscription to Friends scheme: £10.

### **7.4.2. Newsletter**

May 2004: Planning for People outreach training; Members Day and AGM; Whose is the right to develop?; Volunteer recruitment and training events; Rights of appeal in planning; Planning Aid concordat (south of the border); Casework report; National planning framework; Scottish Executive consultations.

### **7.4.3. AGM and Members Day**

10am Sat 12 June, Stirling. Formal business followed by a talk by Prof. Alice Brown, Scottish Public Services Ombudsman.

## **7.5. Friends of Holy Trinity**

Appendix B: Appeal for our support.

*Pass to 200 Club?*

## **7.6. David Russell Hall Redevelopment**

### **7.6.1. Facilities Building**

DRH project general progress meeting and information on the Facilities Building work which commences soon: Monday 14th June 2004 at 6pm, Function Room, New Hall, North Haugh. Confirm your attendance by telephoning Sarah Latto on 01334-462515 or by emailing sl16@st-andrews.ac.uk.

### **7.6.2. Traffic Calming**

David Loudon, Director of Estates at the University, writes that

the traffic calming work on Buchanan Gardens will take 8 weeks from 31 May and the path from DRH to the Sports Centre will close for four weeks for improvements. These 'planning gain' works are costing the University £160,000. He hopes that we agree that they have made a significant contribution to local road safety.

## **7.7. Residents Association**

Julie Poole writes that the Queens Gardens & Queens Terrace Residents Association has its short AGM at 6.30pm in the Town Hall Court Room on Thursday 24 June. Agenda includes parking, multiple occupancy, vandalism.

Owner occupiers from central St Andrews are invited to attend to discuss forming a central St Andrews residents association "so that those who live in the auld grey town have their voices heard". Community council are also specifically invited. Contact Julie Poole on tel/fax 01334 474887 email juliepoole@aol.com.

## **7.8. Community Council Training**

i) Writing press releases 7-9pm Thu 17 June, County Buildings Cupar.

ii) Training on Planning, and consultation on Good Practice Agreement and Complaints Procedure – (time?) Thu 24 June, Madras College, Kilrymont Rd.

*Names to the Secretary please.*

## **7.9. Scottish Language Dictionaries**

Agenda papers for the SLD AGM have been received. Meeting is 3.30pm Friday 25 June in Edinburgh. It appears to be a formal business occasion.

*Does anyone wish to attend?*

## **7.10. Friends of the Earth**

### **7.10.1. AGM**

Sat 12 June, 12.30-5pm, Edinburgh. Speaker Joan Martinez Alier on "Environmentalism and the Poor" and workshops on Local Activism / Corporate Activism / Membership and recruitment. Attendance form available from the Secretary.

### **7.10.2. What on Earth**

FoE magazine: Campaign news; End of the Harris Superquarry campaign; Third party rights of appeal in planning – the Irish experience; Membership survey results; FoE future strategy; World social forum in Mum-bai; Switching to renewable electricity suppliers.

## **7.11. CARF Membership Drive**

Appendix H: Letter from CARF

## **7.12. Scottish Civic Forum Council**

We are invited to make nominations for the Forum's Council. Papers are available.

## **7.13. Community Planning**

Received: Copy of revised Fife Community Plan and summary sheets (will be circulated at the meeting). Also available from <http://www.fifedirect.org.uk/communityplanning/>.

## **7.14. Cycleclips**

Millennium Cycleways Newsletter, summer 2004: Assisted cycling events; East Fife upgrades (£10,000 allocated for cycle lockers at rail stations); Bike Week 12-20 June; In Town without my Car 2003 report; Focus on travel plans; Round the Forth Trailblazing Ride.

## **7.15. Respect**

Newsletter of the Scottish Executive's Antisocial Behavior Unit: Responses to last year's consultation on anti-social behaviour; what is the Antisocial Behavior (Scotland) Bill; More money for tackling antisocial behaviour; Community wardens; Youth crime and restorative justice.

## **7.16. RSCDS Bulletin**

Royal Scottish Country Dance Society October 2003 newsletter contains a brief report of the presentation of the community council's congratulations on their 80th anniversary.

## **7.17. SEPAView**

Magazine of the Scottish Environment Protection Agency, spring 2004: Fly tipping; Day in the life of an Environmental Protection Officer; Environment in education; World environment day; Green shopping; Waste management in Ireland; Steps to protect soils underway; Habitat award for regulator.

## **7.18. Police Community Team Newsletter**

Appendix C: extracts relevant to St Andrews.

## **7.19. Cancer Care Support in Fife**

NHS Fife and Fife Council Social Work Service are undertaking a project looking at the support that is currently provided in Fife for cancer patients, their families and carers. There is an consultation session from 10am, Friday 18th June, Victory Memorial Hall. Contact [midj.falconer@fife.gov.uk](mailto:midj.falconer@fife.gov.uk) 01592-413904.

## **7.20. Fife Flood Prevention Report 2003**

This statutory document specifically covers the flooding of non-agricultural land. It is now available in local offices, main libraries, Planning and Transportation offices and on the Fife Direct website.

## **7.21. Strandline**

Newsletter of the Marine Conservation Society's Adopt-a-Beach project, summer 2004; Beachwatch 2003 report; Microscopic plastic fragments in the environment; National Aquatic Litter Group; Good Beach Guide 2004; Beachwatch 2004 clean-up and litter survey 18-19 September.

## **8. Reports from Officers**

### **8.1. Chair**

#### **8.1.1. Award Received**

Accepted on behalf of community council a grant of £200 from the Kate Kennedy Club presented, along with others, in a ceremony at the Old Course Hotel.

### **8.2. Treasurer**

#### **8.2.1. Annual Grant**

Appendix I: Grant award letter. Summary: £2920.88.

### **8.3. Secretary**

#### **8.3.1. Resignation of Frank Riddell**

Joan Riddell writes to say that while Frank is improving tremendously in limbs and speech it may take him something like a year to recover fully. He has therefore submitted his resignation from Community Council.

#### **8.3.2. Flyposting**

Appendix E: an exchange of correspondence with the International Politics Association.

#### **8.3.3. Letters written**

- i) R&A 250th anniversary congratulations [May 10.2]
- ii) 42C South Street [May 7.1.]
- iii) Fairtrade: response to University One World Society (who wrote supporting Fairtrade Status) [May 6.5.]

#### **8.3.4. ASCC Survey**

Appendix F: cover letter for information, plus there are some questions in the survey on which the Secretary needs a little guidance on how to respond.

#### **8.3.5. Trust Fund**

Annual statement gives the balance at 5 April 2004 as £3444.16.

## **9. Reports**

### **9.1. From Committees**

#### **9.1.1. Health, Education and Welfare**

Appendix D: May report.

### **9.2. From Representatives**

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

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

---

## **Appendix A – Co-options**

### **Bette Christie**

Being a wheelchair disabled resident in the town I see a lot of problems from a different point of view to able bodied people – but as I have not always been disabled I therefore can appreciate the problems from both sides.

### **Les Beech**

I have lived in St Andrews for 31 years ... I am also very concerned about the way that Fife Council seem to think that St Andrews does not count for very much in the overall plan for Fife in general.

I am also concerned about the way our town is being spoiled by the developers and the out of control commercialisation of our town centre. I feel that we really must do something about some of the horrible shop fronts in the town centre, also there are far too many direction signs around the town which spoil the look of it. On a recent visit to Pitlochry I noticed that they have very discreet direction signs in the town.

### **Bruce Ryan**

I like to think that I can represent several sides of the St Andrews community:

- I was a student here from 1985 to 1995.
- Since then I have lived and worked here for a small St Andrews-born business.

From these experiences, I know the problems that face local residents:

- (lack of) affordable housing
- traffic issues (congestion and parking)
- environmental issues
- relationships with other areas of Fife, Scotland and the rest of the UK.

Since marrying a Southern Californian, I have seen the smog and other damage caused by overuse of cars and a devil-take-the-hindmost culture. I would like to promote environmentally-sound housing and transport policies in and about St Andrews in order to promote the long-term interests of residents and visitors.

Overall, it is my wish in some way to protect and promote the interests of the town that has been my home for almost 20 years.

---

## Appendix B – Friends of Holy Trinity

*From Jean R Cardine, Secretary, Friends of Holy Trinity*

The Friends of Holy Trinity is an association recently formed for the support of the Town Church. Not only is Holy Trinity an exceptionally beautiful and historic building, but, as the church at the centre of this ancient city, with long standing associations with the University and St Andrews Golf Clubs, it has a major role within the community. It is also the venue for cultural activities, not least choral concerts and organ recitals.

Our aim as Friends is the welfare of the church and, in particular, the support of a new departure, namely, the creation of choral scholarships to enhance the beauty and significance of worship in the church.

We are therefore seeking donations from all interested parties.

We have made a most encouraging start, having already appointed five scholars, but we still need a great deal of help.

I write to you hoping that you might supply such help from your funds, and help with our publicity.

---

## Appendix C – Community Police Newsletter

*Extracts from the June 2004 newsletter.*

**Crime Statistics for MAY 2004. (Yearly total in brackets)**

May	Dom HB	Vandalism	Theft	BoP	Assault



	Rep	Det	Rep	Det	Rep	Det	Rep	Det	Rep	Det
St Andrews	1 (8)	1 (6)	16 (92)	0 (8)	30 (161)	2 (32)	7 (34)	4 (26)	8 (37)	2 (15)

**Boy Racers** – I have been in consultation with Transportation Services and a proposed plan to make alterations to Bonnygate car park has been drafted. It will now be a case of going through the consultation process. There are now concerns that the problem has moved to Fluthers Car Park and this is being addressed. We are also addressing this problem in St Andrews and Anstruther areas. PC Nairn has liaised with the vehicle inspectorate and carried out a joint initiative in Anstruther resulting in prohibition orders being issued to vehicles. We aim to continue this and extend it throughout the division.

**Bicycle Passport Scheme** – an evaluation of this has been completed. The number of bikes stolen over comparable periods shows a small reduction. The excellent news is that no bicycle, which has been stamped and re-recorded, has been reported stolen. PC Lister and PC Todd along with Kate Hughes, Locality Manager, and Brian Forsyth, Road Safety Officer carried out more cycle marking on Sunday 16th May. This will now be removed from the POP updates and will be evaluated after 6 months. However the scheme will still operate as it does at present.

**The Abandoned Cycles Scheme** – was established in October 2003 jointly between the Locality Manager, St Andrews University and Police, as a way of dealing with cycles left secured to railings etc, for long periods of time both in public places and at University Residences etc. Many of these cycles were in such a poor state that they were becoming a hazard.

It was agreed between the partnership that reports of such cycles would be forwarded to The Community Officers at St Andrews who would view the problem and if in agreement that the cycle did appear to be abandoned then a label was attached to it for the attention of the owner to the effect that if the cycle was not removed within a period of 14 days, it would be removed by the partnership. After the time period has elapsed and if the cycle is still in situ, details are then passed to Environmental Health and their staff attend and remove it. If the cycle is in a poor state it will be scrapped, however if in reasonable state of repair it will then be recorded as Found Property, and if not claimed the cycle will be recycled into a good cause within the community.

To date a total of 64 cycles or parts thereof have been dealt with under the scheme, and 8 lodged as Found Property. As this is the end of the University year, it is anticipated that these numbers will grow within the next few weeks.

The next meeting of the Partnership members is set for 16th June, and at this time it is anticipated that a worthy cause(s) will be identified.

---

## **Appendix D – Health, Education and Welfare Committee**

*Report by Chris Lesurf*

When I called a meeting at the beginning of April, I had put 4 items on the agenda. These were

1. Objective No. 6 in Fife Council's 'Road Safety Strategy for Fife 2003 – 2007' is 'reducing the need for single occupancy journeys by car where practical, in favour of environmentally friendly alternatives such as walking, cy-cling and public transport to help reduce traffic volumes and consequently danger on the roads'.
2. Members of the public in North East Fife seem to have little say on the Health Service they receive in Dundee.
3. In the free newspaper Health News, a Ring and Ride service for people who have difficulty in making journeys on their own has been set up in Levenmouth and Kirkcaldy was mentioned but no similar service around St Andrews,
4. Fairtrade – support was agreed at May CC meeting.

When Joe Peterson, Joe Lamb and I eventually discussed these matters near the end of May it was agreed that

1. Reducing road traffic is becoming more and more important but as the matter had been discussed wrt the Local Plan and the majority views of the Community Council had been given to Fife Council, there was no immediate action we could suggest.
2. I had sent a personal enquiry to Fife Health Board asking why, when public consultations are offered, no reference is made to the services supplied to Fife patients in Dundee. I received a phone call from one of the FHB directors asking what I thought they should be discussing and when told that it was the general principle, he said they would take it into account.

I had also sent a personal enquiry to Tayside Health Board asking why Fife residents were not invited to any public consultations they held but I received no reply.

I checked with Joe Lamb and Joe Peterson and we agreed that there was no further action we could suggest. However, I did ask both Fife Health Council and Tayside Health Council about any possible influence they might have. They both said that had no say in what was discussed at public consultations but would be willing to help with individual complaints.

3. I had contacted the 'Ring and Ride' service and asked why it

is not available to people in St Andrews as a large proportion of our residents are senior citizens. The organiser told me that the Levenmouth and Kirkcaldy service was a pilot scheme which was probably going to be stopped in 2005 because of lack of funding. He said he would welcome any efforts we made to prevent this happening.

In order to make use of the Ring and Ride service residents have to register as having some physical, mental or sensory impairment. However, being elderly and infirm may be sufficient qualification. Once they are registered, they may use the Ring and Ride buses from their own homes for such purposes as going to Bingo, visiting relations or going to church. In other words, there doesn't need to be a medical need to take the trip.

As there are no doubt many people in St Andrews who would benefit from such a service, may we suggest that the matter be taken further by St Andrews members of Fife Council?

---

## Appendix E – Flyposting

*From the International Politics Association's President Max Frohnsdorff to the "Town Council".*

I am writing on behalf of the IPA to ask for your assistance with a problem that we have. Today, 6 May 2004, I witnessed a female town councillor cutting down one of our posters. She claimed that our group was responsible for "vandalising" public property. We quite understand that public property should not be damaged but putting an advertisement on a post is not damaging the post. After all, Fife Council frequently places signs/notices on lamp-posts and other items of public furniture and we are extremely conscious not to eclipse these, or other, signs. We go to considerable expense, for a group on a very limited budget, to ensure that our advertising is professional and socially responsible. We laminate our posters, and attach them using cable ties so that the posts are not damaged in any way. After our event has taken place, we always take down our posters and remove the cable ties from the posts.

We feel justified in claiming that the work we do for St Andrews is exemplary. This year alone, we have brought the following list of speakers to St Andrews (to name but a few): Prince Turki Al Faisal (Former head of Saudi In-telligence and Saudi Ambassador to Britain), Sir David Omand (Head of Britain's Intelligence Service), Grigory Karasin (Former Deputy Foreign Minister of Russia and Russian Ambassador to Britain), Martin Lees (Former As-sistant Secretary-General of the United Nations and Rector of the University of Peace) we have also succeeded in persuading the producers of the BBC TV show "Question Time", to film an edition here in St Andrews. Our

success acting as the interface that connects our community with the centre of the political world is unparalleled in Britain. We would be only too pleased to demonstrate to any town councillor that might wish to attend, the nature of our work. Please do visit our website for more information.

Our association exists to provide a service to all residents of St Andrews, we do not see ourselves as a purely uni-versity group. We have been working hard to engage the town's people with our work. Our problem is, how can we continue to provide our town with this service given the obstruction that we suffer at the hands of our repre-sentatives? How can we reach out to the town's people, to provide them with the valuable service that we deliver, when those who are here to assist the community sever our only channel of communication with them? The feedback we get from our members who are permanent residents of the town is extremely positive. It would be a mistake to underestimate the value they attach to our work. I dare to conjecture that its worth is held in higher regard than the function performed by those town councillors who see their role as the preservation of the stylistic purity of lampposts. As a group who has St Andrews' best interests at heart, rather than acting to constrain our activities, perhaps you could suggest alternative ways in which we could reach the town's people? I can promise that the IPA would be very receptive to good suggestions.

*Reply from Pete Lindsay as Secretary*

Your letter to the town council regarding your concerns over removal of your posters has been passed on to me as there hasn't been a town council since 1975 and community council is the local representative (though not governing) body. It may be that you'll want to make your comments to Fife Council, which is the local government authority covering St Andrews, but there were some points in your letter that I thought I could reply to, to give a community perspective.

I'm afraid that flyposting is still flyposting however good the cause or the quality of the posters. You have not sought permission from Fife Council to post on the town's lampposts (it would not have been granted) nor advice from the Students Association who assure us, through the student representatives on community council (usually the Association President) that they discourage the practice of fixing advertisements to street furniture. That Fife Council put statutory notices up (not advertisements) is due to a legal requirement to do so and the fact that they own the actual poles, lampposts, bollards etc. It has been pointed out to Fife Council that this leads to some con-fusion but, as they reply, they are using their property for their notices.

Fife Council note that:

The Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 Section 100 (b) states that "A person who without lawful authority or reasonable excuse affixes upon a tree, traffic sign, milestone, structure or works a picture, letter, sign commits an offence". Although not specified, this regulation relates to all street furniture, including lamp columns.

So it is a bit more than just a concern with "the stylistic purity of lampposts". I have it on good authority that you have made the acquaintance of Fife Councillor Jane Ann Liston who very public-spiritedly acts to remove illegal flyposting whenever she is able, rather than calling Fife Council enforcement officers from Cupar at cost to the public purse.

The problem with permitting any flyposting is that i) it's ugly, and ii) it breeds. While we might accept that yours is good quality, tasteful, carefully attached and removed promptly (though I noticed one still in Muttoes Lane on 8 May); tolerating any leads less responsible flyposters – circuses, construction companies, political parties, traders, etc – to fix'n'forget so the town ends festooned with variously bedraggled, discoloured and decaying remnants of events long past. The use of laminated posters such as yours has its down side in that they won't disintegrate in the natural course of weather and will hang around for even longer.

To turn to being positive, I hope; you ask for suggestions for ways of publicising your meetings to the town at large. I note that I have emailed the IPA on a number of occasions to suggest it might like to keep the town events web pages (address below) and its monthly listing sheet "Event: St Andrews" informed, but answer came there none... I'll keep an eye on your web site but a note that it has been updated is always helpful. There are public notice boards at St Andrews Bus Station, South Street (at the Royal Bank of Scotland), Lamond Drive (western end shops). Many of the shops, bars and other businesses will put a poster if asked. Safeway has an area for public notices by the tills – a lot of people go by there. The other major way to get attention is articles in the local press – for The Courier I'd suggest you contact local journalist Dougie Miller (mailto:) and of course there is the St Andrews Citizen in Greyfriars Garden. An informational piece on the speaker and topic will be included almost verbatim, including times and dates, if supplied in good time. If your programme is ordered well in advance the new bimonthly magazine St Andrews in Focus might take such pieces too. The editor is Flora Selwyn, (mailto:)

*and in conclusion:*

My name is Scott Tindle and on Monday I took over as IPA

President for the coming academic year. Max, the former President, has briefed me on the flyposting situation. I very much appreciate your reply and we will be sure to take advantage of some of the suggestions for publicity you make in your final paragraph when we resume our activities in September. We certainly understand the concerns of the community if flyposting were to get out of control and lead to a degeneration of the town. If we have any further concerns regarding flyposting I will be sure to direct them to the Fife Council.

---

## **Appendix F – ASCC: survey cover letter**

The attached Survey is to update and compare information gathered about Community Councils in 1999 and provide a national picture of Community Council activity, funding and resource concerns. It will allow the ASCC to reconsider its role brought about by devolution, and the increased number of consultations and initiatives being pursued by the Scottish Executive, Scottish Parliament, other agencies and the increasing influence of European legislation.

The ASCC is increasingly asked to provide views, representative of Community Councils, to the Scottish Executive, Scottish Parliament and other Agencies of Government, sometimes at short notice. To date we have attempted to identify and coordinate these views by email, and by contacting individual Community Councils who have previously made known their concerns on particular issues. Additionally we are asked to disseminate details of consultations and other material, being one of the few organisations to hold an extensive national database of Community Council contacts, continuously updated.

A main concern of Community Councils is the vast quantities of paperwork sent to them. In many cases it is not appropriate to their area, nor of interest. The ASCC is proposing an email databank for all the 1160 plus Community Councils to disseminate brief information on consultations, news, and funding opportunities. The range of material can be increased according to demand. It would reduce costs and the bulky reports that arrive through every Community Council secretary's letterbox. We would still arrange for the relevant paper copies to be sent, when these merit further and more detailed interest. We have no wish to censor material, merely to identify issues relevant to, or affecting, Community Councils.

Individuals can ask to be removed from the list at any time, and the ASCC will not pass details to any other organisation or agency, nor identify individual recipients.

The ASCC is reviewing its working practices in order to offer a more effective service to its members. We currently provide

telephone and email guidance and information facilities, based on working knowledge of the practices of Community Councils. We have access to local authorities and government sources in Scotland, to Westminster through the National Association of Local Councils, and shortly will extend this to a recently established sister organisation in Wales.

We have to increase our base knowledge of activity, ascertain more accurately views across a wider spectrum of Community Councils, and be able to deliver these views, with authority, to the bodies that matter. This can only be done with your support.

---

## **Appendix G – Planning Report**

### **Planning Meeting – 10.5.04**

The following applications were considered but no comment was made on any.

1. Rymouth Hostel, Glebe Road – restoration of burn bank.
  2. Fife Park – nursery building extension.
  3. Ashleigh House, St. Mary Street – material variation to design of five dwellinghouses, also roof lights, including balconies, window and door alterations.
  4. 14b Hope Street – internal alterations to flatted building.
  5. McIntosh Hall – erect plaque at entrance door.
  6. 6 Ruthven Place – extension to dwellinghouse.
  7. 66 Market Street – internal alterations to flatted dwellinghouse.
  8. 34 Lade Braes extension to dwellinghouse.
  9. 8 Kinnessburn Terrace – demolition.
  10. 2 Doocot Road extension to dwellinghouse.
  11. 2 Gibson Place – replacement windows.
  12. 8 St. Mary Street – conservatory extension to dwellinghouse.
  13. 20 Carron Place – extension to dwellinghouse and replacement garage.
  14. 54 Market Street – repaint exterior.
- 

## **Appendix H – CARF**

*Joe Paterson, Vice Chairman, writes:*

Citizens Advice and Rights Fife are presently holding a membership drive.

As a Councillor, there will possibly be occasions where either you, or your constituents, will have used CARF's invaluable service.

The existence and principle of CARF is to tackle inequality, discrimination and the disadvantaged, providing high quality information, advice and representation services to the citizens of Fife.

It should be pointed out that this is a free service. It is confidential, accessible, independent, impartial and non-judgemental. It provides a user centred service that is delivered across Fife by telephone and face-to-face awareness, for access to both social and legal rights. This is achieved by take-up campaigns plus providing a specialist and representation services.

Hopefully, after reading the main objectives of CARF, you will consider our membership offer.

---

## **Appendix I – Grant Award Letter**

*From Mike Melville, Administration Team Leader (East).*

### **Annual Grant 2004/2005**

I refer to your letter to the Area Finance Manager dated 6 May 2004 concerning your Community Council's annual grant for the current financial year. I have now heard from the Local Services Accounting Team Leader that your accounts do comply with the terms of the Scheme of Administration for Community Council and accordingly have today made arrangements for the payment of your grant of £2920.88.

Please note that this grant must not be used to publish any material which the Fife Council would be prohibited from publishing in terms of section 2 of the Local Government Act 1986. Section 2 of the Act states that a local authority shall not publish any material which, in whole or in part, appears to be designed to affect public support for a political party.

---

## **Appendix J – Youth Problem**

*From Mrs Willsher*

I said I would write to you on behalf of a friend. She is very worried about an incident which happened earlier this year (March?) It may be that you know about it, or even that it was mentioned in the police report at the community Council meeting. I am unable to hear what the police reporter says, but I can hear the rest. There is a post-graduate student from USA doing his second degree. His mother is here with him and does some work for this friend of mine. He is a very clever young man, but he is badly handicapped physically. He came here



bringing a wheelchair which was made especially for his needs and was a great help to him. It cost a large amount though that is not the real problem). He was at a meeting of the Rotary Club in the Town Hall; it was dark when he came out, and two youths were seen making off with the wheel chair. Two or three men chased them but lost sight of them – they had gone down a side street in the Kinnessburn area and they smashed the chair to pieces. It was beyond repair. The police knew who they were two fifteen year olds. They are members of a gang who hang around outside the shopping mall – the pub beside the Spar shop. Apparently no women dare go near there in the evening as they are afraid.

I do not know if they are connected with the boys who at various times did some damage in the Kinnesburn area. One late afternoon I came on two of that lot just above the steps in Greenside Place, being abusive and threaten-ing to Lawrence Huff. They ran away when they saw a man coming along. Lawrence said he knew them and that the police had the names of the four who went about together causing trouble, but 'could do nothing'.

The student's name is Robert McCaig. My friend was very concerned, that. such a thing could happen here at St Andrews, and worried in case nothing is done about it. She was not referring to the replacement of the wheel-chair. He is using an ordinary one.

*Response from PC Janis Lister Community Team, St Andrews.*

The incident referred to was reported to the Police at the time, the person(s) responsible were traced soon thereafter and have been reported accordingly.

---

## **Appendix K – Consultation on the Local Plan**

*Amended final version by Ian Goudie and the Planning Committee after comments arising from May's meeting.*

### **Role of this submission**

The aim of this submission from the Community Council is to highlight areas of concern which need to be ad-dressed in the Development Plan. Whilst a majority of the matters raised are pertinent to the Local Plan revision, some are issues that it is more appropriate to pursue in the context of the revision of the Structure Plan. We do not enter here into the detail of how we might wish to see the Development Plan amended, although on some issues that will be apparent. Our aim, at present, is merely to list and give a brief explanation of our concerns.

### **The Strategic Study**

We would urge that the Strategic Study of St Andrews,

published in 1998, should be taken as the starting point for the overall strategy for the town. It is an excellent document and represents the most recent genuine attempt to build a strategy based around the views of the people of this town. Its central conclusions that "St Andrews is at its landscape capacity and no major expansion should take place" and that "The quality of the town's environment is under threat from traffic congestion" remain as true today as they were then. In the intervening years there have been many, including Fife Council on some occasions, who have wished to brush this document aside, but if the Local Plan exercise is to be a partnership with the local community, then this is where to begin. In general, the various Council decisions which have ignored the conclusions of the Study have resulted in the problems that it identified growing still worse. We would anticipate that a Draft Plan which is broadly consistent with the Strategic Study would be well received. One that is not is likely to generate much greater controversy.

### **Green Belt**

The Community Council wishes to see a Green Belt for the town in place as soon as possible to conserve the "green bowl" which contributes so much to the town's setting. On the southern side of the town, the inner boundary of the Belt should follow the edge of the existing built-up area. To the west it should safeguard the view as the town is approached on the Strathkinness High Road. The development guidelines for the Green Belt should seek to maintain the present natural environment of the Green Belt area. We do not wish to see the town entirely ringed by golfing developments, still less under-utilised golfing developments funded by external capital.

## **Housing**

### **Housing for Local Need**

The inner boundary of the Green Belt must be sufficiently loose in the Kinness Valley to allow limited housing development to meet local needs. We recognise that any housing development produces some environmental loss. It is therefore important that such development is restricted to the low-lying ground to the south-west of the town, where the resulting damage has least impact. Even here, environmental considerations and the danger of flooding point to the need to ensure that development does not creep too close to the banks of the Kinness Burn.

### **Affordability**

Present housing policy is failing to deliver what the town needs. St Andrews is now set to lose an important section of its southern hillside at John Knox Road to housing which appears to be affordable only in name, with prices comparing poorly

with what is available on the open market. This is environmental loss for no worthwhile gain. Indeed St Andrews cannot continue to squander land on housing which only remains affordable for 10 or 15 years at the most. This is just private development by the back door. Development plan policies should promote only those types of affordable housing (e.g. housing cooperatives) which remain affordable in perpetuity.

### **“Pressured Area” Status**

Demand for social housing in St Andrews clearly exceeds supply, and it is evident that the situation is being exacerbated by the Right to Buy legislation. We would therefore urge Fife Council to seek “pressured area” status for the town under Section 45 of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001, so that the Right to Buy can be suspended for an initial period of 5 years, which may then be extended thereafter. The relative security gained by the housing stock under pressured area status also opens the possibility of the Council borrowing to build much-needed social housing.

### **The University and the housing market**

The last fifteen years have seen a very large increase in the number of properties in the town occupied by students, with consequential adverse effects for local people seeking accommodation. The difficulty in predicting the future of the University increases the difficulty of this problem. The expansion over the last five years was not foreseen at the time of the Strategic Study in 1998. Whilst student preferences are equally unpredictable, there needs to be greater recognition that decisions of the University on residence charges impact directly on the wider community. We would not wish to see the Development Plan restrict the ability of the University, as the town’s major employer, to react to opportunities for expanding into new areas of higher education provision. Nevertheless, as the future housing provision for the town cannot rationally be planned independently of the University, guidelines on the proportion of the student community to be housed on university premises may merit consideration. It may also be appropriate in the Plan to recognise that consent for University developments may on occasion need to be conditional on provision of sufficient residential accommodation.

### **Windfall Developments**

The overall impression that the Development Plan has little effect on the inexorable expansion of the town population is also due to the large contribution from housing developments on windfall sites. Again many of these developments are targeted at either students or those retiring to St Andrews from elsewhere, rather than at local people seeking family

accommodation. We wish to see the Development Plan modified to curtail the rather un-controlled way in which windfall developments proceed.

### **Light industrial sites and brownfield sites**

In particular, the presumption in favour of development on brownfield land is not helpful in the St Andrews context. The small sites needed by local tradesmen are being rapidly lost due to regulations designed for large-scale post-industrial blight. If local trades are forced to base themselves outwith the town, the service to local residents will suffer. Existing and designated sites for light industrial use should be protected in the Local Plan.

## **Transport**

### **Broad aims**

We are pleased to note that our aims as a Community Council on transport provision for the town appear entirely consistent with the goals in the recently published National Planning Framework for Scotland. Para. 98 of that document says that one of the "key elements of the spatial strategy to 2025" is "to highlight long-term transport options and promote more sustainable patterns of transport and land use". It has become all too common in the planning for this town for the major consultation on an issue to take place only after consent has been given to a key planning application, which severely curtails the available options. The gravity of the traffic problems facing the town mean that we need a much more whole-hearted commitment to more sustainable forms of travel. It is inappropriate to berate or attempt to penalise the public financially for their use of cars unless there has been a far more serious investment in greener alternatives than we have yet seen.

### **Rail link**

The contradiction between trying to encourage ever greater numbers of tourists and trying to solve the ever-worsening traffic problems of the town is one which has never been adequately addressed. The Community Council has for many years believed that the most effective way of attempting to square the circle is the reinstatement of a rail link. The goal should be to provide ultimately a facility which can offer direct rail services to Edinburgh, and we welcome recent proposals for a station at Edinburgh Airport. Accordingly, we welcomed the statement in the Structure Plan (para. 2.2.5) that "The Local Transport Strategy identifies the need to review the requirement for new stations at Leven and St Andrews (including a new rail link)". We therefore call for a suitable route to be identified and protected from any conflicting development. Most of the one proposed by the Fife and South

Tay-side (FAST) Rail Study appears viable, but, as previously noted, the proposed alignment at the St Andrews end does not address the practical problems. More thought needs to be given to the route across the North Haugh in order to promote long-term planning which is consistent with the requirements of the Structure Plan.

### **Transport Interchange**

Reinstatement of the rail link will clearly take some years, but its eventual usefulness can be increased and its cost reduced by appropriate forward planning now. In particular, the Structure Plan requirement needs to be changed to a bus/train interchange within easy walking distance of the town centre. A rail terminus out near Strathtyrum would not be a satisfactory solution. The only viable alternatives are to plan for an embankment in front of the Gateway Building so that the rail link can reach the old station site, or for line to go behind the Gateway with a station as close to the bus station as present developments still permit. Either way the new bus station building is best sited on the western side of the present bus station site, above the old station car park. The site identified for the rail station needs to be sufficiently large to cater for car parking, taxi provision and cycle parking.

### **Off-road cycling provision**

The Local Plan should require the identification and protection of suitable off-road cycling routes. The emphasis now should be on routes from the periphery of the town to the centre, rather than the Council's primary focus to date on the centre itself. Identifying such routes is difficult, but this is no excuse for inaction. It will probably require the expertise and imagination of appropriate consultants. We recognise that, with its current transport priorities, Fife Council does not believe it has the finance to implement such routes in the short-term. The immediate task, however, is simply to identify the routes and ensure that they are not lost through lack of forethought. The proximity to motorised traffic means that, for safety reasons, advisory cycle lanes on roads need to be maintained to a higher standard than off-road routes, yet because lanes on roads are also used by cars and lorries they also deteriorate faster. So both of these factors mean that, in the long-term, off-road provision is safer and cheaper than cycle lanes on roads.

### **Traffic Assessment**

It would be appropriate for the Development Plan to contain an appendix providing much greater guidance on what is expected from developers in terms of assessing the impact of their proposed developments. As things stand, developers are not entirely without justification in relying on the guidelines of the Institution of Highways and Transportation. Whilst these

guidelines have some points of merit, there has been increasing awareness at central government level of their weaknesses on other aspects (e.g. the use of percentage criteria for assessing traffic increases).

## **Other Site Identification Issues**

### **Hospital Site**

Despite the complications of the PPP process, the town needs a site for a new hospital/healthcare centre identified in the Local Plan. Indeed identification of such a site is a requirement of the Structure Plan. Most members of the Community Council retain the view that St Leonards Fields should be the preferred choice. Of the possible sites, most of us see St Leonards Fields as being the most convenient for those without their own private transport, and as the site which is most consistent with the overall planning strategy for the town, as embodied in the widely supported Strategic Study for the town. Despite the very substantial effort that has been put into trying to prove that St Leonards Fields is not a viable site, few of us feel we have yet heard a convincing case against it.

### **New secondary school in North Fife**

Fife Council needs to produce, as a matter of urgency, plans for updating the decaying and outmoded secondary school accommodation in this town. This is, however, a problem which can only be resolved in a wider context. The Community Council continues to support the case for a new secondary school in North Fife. The statistics show clearly that Fife's policy on the size of secondary schools is out of line with that of the rest of Scotland. We would not dispute that those who suffer most from this policy are the children who spend a disproportionate part of their day travelling to Madras College from North Fife. Residents staying close to the Kilrymont Building, however, also suffer, having to contend with their streets being used by a daily stream of buses for which these roads were never intended. The school buses are also a determining factor for the town centre one-way system.

### **Recycling Site**

Plans for a recycling site behind Safeway (or Morrisons, as it will be) were under discussion in 1996 when Fife Council was created, but still no site has been constructed. The recent decision from the Planning Appeal on the John Knox Road site flies in the face of rational planning in allowing housing alongside the proposed recycling site. Nevertheless, if a recycling site is to be well-used, it must be convenient for the residents of the town. It therefore remains the view of the Community Council that the site behind Safeway/Morrisons is the preferred site, and should be identified for this purpose in the Local Plan.

## **Environmental Concerns**

### **Unbuilt Coast**

The existing Development Plan policies on the unbuilt coast have failed. We acknowledge that planning officials are subjected to considerable pressures as a matter of routine, but the current situation – where these policies have been deemed relevant to the Hungry Horse site but not to Kingask (the St Andrews Bay hotel) or Kinkell Braes (the 7th course clubhouse) – risks bringing the Development Plan into disrepute in the eyes of the man in the street. Tighter wording is clearly needed to make the Development Plan effective, so that generally agreed goals are achieved – whenever pressures arise with any particular application. We welcome the central government interest in this matter. The National Planning Framework for Scotland says (para 97) “The Executive intends to consult on the development of a strategy for protecting and enhancing Scotland’s coast.” Perhaps more effective guidelines can be gleaned from the Development Plans of other local authorities.

### **Green Spaces**

Infill Development in the town centre is steadily eroding the amount of green space. There is a need to decide now which green areas we wish to preserve. The gardens in Queens Gardens, Greyfriars Garden and the historic ‘lang riggs’ are obvious examples. Such areas need explicit identification and protection in the Local Plan. The rate of encroachment has been even faster in areas hidden from the public eye. Consultation should be held on whether the central blocks should be allowed to become wall-to-wall concrete jungles, or whether what remains of our “green lung” is worth preserving.

### **Assessment of Impact**

The present Development Plan is lacking in guidelines on how the environmental impact of applications will be assessed. At present, we argue each case from first principles, whenever it appears, for instance, that scaffolding may be needed to assess the height and bulk of proposed new buildings.

## **Built Environment**

### **Building Styles**

Better planning guidance is needed on acceptable building styles. The years since Fife Council assumed control have seen a rapid dilution of the local building style in St Andrews. If this continues, the local vernacular will cease to be obvious and become a matter for academic investigation. There should be a requirement for detailed design briefs such as was produced for the Craigtoun sites. Unlike those sites, the brief should then be implemented. In recent times, individual planning officers’

views on what constitutes acceptable style appear to have been influenced more by national quangos than local opinion. Last year the Council's view of acceptable styles for the North Haugh bore no resemblance to the overwhelming majority of local opinion. More recently, the differences between the advice coming from officials and the views of the Development Committee have caused discontent and unnecessary delay. Better guidance in the Development Plan is required.

### **Building Heights**

Whilst appreciating the motivation for increased housing densities close to public transport nodes, too little thought has been given to the impact of this policy on the height of buildings and how this may affect the character of an area. This has led to a willingness on the part of officials to recommend approval of buildings of a height that is regarded as ridiculously out of place by the local community. Limited protection is afforded to St Andrews by the skyline policy, but this is too weak a tool. Stronger comparison with the surrounding area is needed, as are more specialist provisions (e.g. on the overshadowing of ancient monuments, listed buildings, etc.) The skyline policy should be widened to cover not only the medieval skyline, but also views of the green bowl surrounding the town. The perception of the green bowl is a key part of the Green Belt strategy. The Green Belt will become something of a Pyrrhic victory if excessive building heights within the town envelope mean that the "green bowl" cannot be seen from the town centre.

## **Technological impact**

### **Light pollution**

This is an increasing problem in both urban and rural settings. A particular concern is the increased use of security lights on domestic and non-domestic property. These can be a source of aggravation to adjoining householders, and a serious distraction to both drivers and cyclists. Stronger planning controls (e.g. on luminosity and the extent of the illuminated area) are required. Tighter conditions on lighting are also needed in rural areas, affecting as it does the perception of what is countryside and what is urban sprawl.

### **Satellite dishes**

A recent governmental consultation foresees future demand for multiple satellite dishes on domestic property. Whilst we are not persuaded of the technological need for multiple dishes, it is nevertheless a worrying prospect for the future appearance of the town, and for the Conservation Area in particular. We would certainly wish to see no weakening in the provisions for the Conservation Area in this regard, and consideration should be given to the desirability of more general controls.



### **Low frequency vibrations**

Government consultation in the past year has recognised the nuisance caused to people by noisy and inconsiderate neighbours. There has been less recognition of the irritation and loss of sleep caused by low frequency vibrations, despite increasing public concern. There should be a presumption against developments liable to cause low frequency vibrations that would be audible in domestic property.

### **New technologies**

Any proposed developments which may have health implications should only receive planning consent if independent assessment shows them to be beneficial. In particular, the Community Council backs the precautionary principle with regard to TETRA. The type of safety regime that is taken for granted in the pharmaceutical industry provides a more general broad model for what is required, but we recognise that, even under that regime, errors will still occur. An absence of evidence against a technology does not constitute evidence for its safety. (X-ray machines used to be provided in shoe shops on that basis!)

## **Other housing issues**

### **Housing for the disabled**

During the debate on the John Knox Road housing application, it became clear that firmer regulation is needed on the location of housing for the disabled. It should not be acceptable to push the disabled into unsuitable elevated positions in order to maximise density or profits on lower parts of sites that would offer much easier wheel-chair access.

### **Energy Conservation and solar panels**

The Council could make a much bigger contribution on the energy conservation front by imposing tighter guide-lines on what is acceptable. More attention should be paid to materials and the orientation of buildings to maximise solar gain. Use of north facing slopes which minimise the scope for solar gain should be discouraged. The Community Council wishes to encourage environmentally friendly technology. In particular we support greater use of solar panels wherever their use is compatible with preserving the character of the Conservation Areas.

## **Other issues**

### **Shopping**

Whilst acknowledging that the out-of-town supermarket plays a useful role, the Community Council does not wish to see major developments which would further strengthen the position of the peripheral supermarket at the expense of the town centre.

Indeed we wish to see a policy framework which will promote a thriving town centre with the diverse range of small shops which forms part of the distinctive character of the town. Nevertheless, we have often noted that the traffic problems of the town centre would be somewhat reduced if many residents were not forced to enter the centre simply to make the odd "corner-shop" purchase. We would therefore wish to see in the Development Plan a presumption in favour of applications for neighbourhood shops, particularly on the western side of St Andrews.

### **Harbour**

The Community Council wishes to maintain a living, working harbour, and accordingly supports further redevelopment, provided that the principles for development embodied in Policy S15 in the current Local Plan continue to apply.

## **Procedural and administrative matters**

### **Scope of the Local Plan**

For ease of reference, it would be helpful to the public for the Local Plan to include, as appendices, the supporting regulations that determine the acceptability of planning applications. (e.g. advertisement control in the Conservation Area, rules on infill development in the town centre, etc.)

### **Reviewing the Development Plan**

The arrangements for biennial review of the current Plan do not appear to have been implemented. The new Structure and Local Plans should incorporate review arrangements which are feasible in terms of budget and workload.

## **Correspondence**

<b>Date</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>Subject</b>
06/05/04	ntl:	Largo Rd 3rd Gen transmitter
07/05/04	Police	Community Newsletter
08/05/04	Law and Administration	Media Training for Community Councils
08/05/04	Friends of the Earth	What on Earth newsletter
08/05/04	International Politics Assoc	Flyposting
08/05/04	Scottish Executive Water Services	Summer Consultations
08/05/04	NHS Fife	Fife NHS Board meeting 25/5 Glenrothes
08/05/04	K & F Mason	HMO 42C South St.

08/05/04	Andrew Gold	St Andrews Town & Gown
13/05/04	CARF	Membership Drive
13/05/04	Transportation Services	Fife Flood Prevention Report 2003 available
13/05/04	Scottish Executive	Respect AntiSocial Behaviour Unit News-letter
13/05/04	RPS Consultants	Harbour/East Sands meeting 24 May
14/05/04	RSCDS	Newsletter Oct 2003
14/05/04	SEPA	SEPAView Newsletter spring 04
14/05/04	Planning Aid	Subscription
17/05/04	Friends of Holy Trinity	Funds Appeal
26/05/04	St Andrews World Class	Public Exhibition 26/5
26/05/04	Iain Smith MSP	Nomination for Holyrood Opening
26/05/04	Crown Estate	Scottish Marine Newsletter
26/05/04	Betty Willsher	Youth problem/harrassment
26/05/04	Fife Environmental Network / Trust	Joint Conference
26/05/04	Wickstead Leisure	Advertising
26/05/04	Fife Council	Revised community plan
27/05/04	The Learning Kingdom	Market Place Event Cupar 27/5
28/05/04	Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator	CC Trust
28/05/04	East Area Services Committee	Agenda Wed 2 June
28/05/04	ASCC	CCs Survey
28/05/04	Ursula Martin	Loudens Close planning obj (copy)
01/06/04	University	DRH redev: facilities building
02/06/04	East Area Services Committee	Extra agenda item 2 june
02/06/04	University	DRH traffic calming and cycle track
02/06/04	Fife Council	Library re-opening invite 16 June
03/06/04	Social Work Service	Cancer Care Consultation
03/06/04	Police	Community Team Newsletter

03/06/04	Millennium Cycleways Project	Cycleclips Newsletter
03/06/04	Scottish Civic Forum	SCF elections
04/06/04	Law and Administration	Community Council Training
04/06/04	Mrs Willsher	Bins to Roy Stewart Env Svc (copy)
04/06/04	Scottish Dictionaries Ltd	AGM Papers - 20 June
05/06/04	Marine Conservation Society	Strandline Newsletter
05/06/04	Queens Gardens & Terrace Residents Assn	Central St Andrews Residents Assn

---

[<May Minutes\]](#)    [2004 index](#)    [\[June Minutes>](#)

---