

# Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

## Provisional Minutes – 5<sup>th</sup> March 2018

### 0. Members

#### 1. Attendance

Mr McLeod introduced Mss Emma Shay Mr Niall's Scott's Deputy Director of Communications. She will stand in for Mr Scott when he's not able to attend.

#### Community Councillors

Callum MacLeod, Ian Goudie, Gordon Shepherd, Izzy Corbin, Judith Harding, John Jardine, Penny Uprichard, Kyffin Roberts, Iain Munn, Greg Newman, Iain Munn, Neil Cunningham-Dobson, Patrick Marks, Jamie McLeod

#### Students' Association Representatives

#### Co-Opted

Emma Shay

Lindsey Adam

#### Fife Councillors

Jane Ann Liston, Brian Thomson

**Apologies** – Penelope Fraser, Dita Stanis-Traken, Izzy Corbin, Lewis Wood, Ann Verner, Dominic Nolan, Alistair Newton, Niall Scott

### 2. Minutes of Meeting – February 2018

Minutes agreed as a correct record.

### 3. Presentations

#### 3.1. Changing Places – Mr Andrew White.

Mr White introduced himself as the father of a severely disabled son who is terminally ill. He had been making approaches to Willie Rennie MSP and Cllr Liston on the subject of the lack of accessible changing facilities for the severely disabled in St. Andrews. He was hopeful of getting some guidance, suggestions and advice from the Community Council.

He described the type of facilities required, which included a hoist, a bench and toilet with privacy screen as well as space for a large wheelchair and the carers. He informed the meeting that there were seven such facilities in Kirkcaldy, two in Leven and Methil, three in Cupar, one in Anstruther and ten in Dundee. He said that this lack of such a facility had a major effect upon the ability of disabled persons and their carers to visit St Andrews. He had heard from various sources that the issue was being addressed but was not clear what exactly that meant in terms of such a facility becoming available in the foreseeable future. He felt that the funding of such a facility was top priority and a necessity above any concerns about deficits in ordinary public conveniences. He added that the average person faced with trying to access toilets could if necessary go into a hotel, café etc but this was not possible for severely disabled persons like his son.

He wondered how he could drive the issue forward and was seeking the thoughts of the CC on this important issue. He suggested that there was a prime location in St Andrews next to the Bruce Embankment toilets. He felt that it was a disgrace that St Andrews as a major tourist attraction didn't have this type of facility. He also felt that no one wanting to visit the town

should be unable to do so because of the lack of such a facility. He also thought that if such a facility existed there would be economic benefits to the town.

Mr McLeod thanked Mr White for speaking so candidly and movingly. Mr McLeod asked Mr White about the providers of the facilities in Kirkcaldy and other towns. Mr White thought that most were attached to NHS facilities, such as Victoria Hospital. The Anstruther facility is in the new Waid Campus.

Mr Roberts commented upon his experience in researching such a facility at Craigtoun Park. He had been eventually advised by PAMIS about the nature of what would be required and it was agreed that a stand-alone unit was the most practical option but with a cost of around £30000 it was not something, which Craigtoun could currently afford to get installed. Such a unit could be set up elsewhere where there was the space and ability to connect to drainage facilities. Mr White didn't think that the cost should be such an obstacle and that where there was the will it could be quite easily achieved. He thought that funds were available and could be accessed from various organisations. He added that the cost shouldn't be used as an excuse for depriving people with severe disability of facilities to meet their basic needs.

Mr Greenwell agreed that it was shameful that the town didn't have such a facility and added that the lack of decent toilet facilities was a major issue in St Andrews. He highlighted with examples the problem locally and in general in Fife for residents and visitors. He felt that Mr White's comments added weight to the case for significant improvements but was also aware of the struggle to keep facilities open due to Council cutbacks. Mr White in his reply felt it was a separate issue raised by Mr Greenwell as non-disabled toilet users could access toilet facilities in cafes and other places if the public ones were shut or not useable whereas the likes of his son did not have that choice.

In response to a query from Mr McLeod, Mr White acknowledged that such facilities would have to have regular staff oversight to ensure that were useable and operable and that unmanned stand alone units might have problems.

Cllr Liston made some general comments about the issue of providing such a facility. She thought that in planning terms certain types of new buildings maybe should be required to have such a facility or if there was major refurbishment of toilets a provision of such a facility as well. She talked about plans still being developed to try again for a Visitor Centre at the West Sands run by the Fife Countryside and Coastal Trust which would have such a facility as part of its premises. It was emphasised that this project was at the very early stages of development and required funding and formal approval. Cllr Liston also noted that when the Beach Wheelchair scheme was in operation in the summer there would be a temporary PAMIS Unit available but she recognised this wasn't a long-term solution. She also acknowledged that there were funds available locally which could go towards such a project and agreed it was a nonsense that St Andrews didn't have this type of facility and would do all she could to push for one to be built.

Mr Roberts commented that Fife Council had an Access Officer and understood that this would come under that remit. He wondered whether Mr White had spoken to this official? Mr White acknowledged he hadn't. Mr Roberts said he could get Mr White the appropriate contact details.

Mr McLeod asked if there was a CC member able to help progress the development of this facility? Mr Roberts volunteered to bring up the matter at the Fife Tourism Partnership Group meeting in a day's time. Mr Dobson will also attend.

Mr Newman expressed concern about being able to maintain such a facility given Fife Council cutbacks.

Mr Marks or Mr Macleod to feed back to Mr White the outcome of the meeting.

## **4. Fife Councillors.**

### **4.1. Jane Ann Liston.**

#### **4.1.1. Marriage Registration Office**

Cllr Liston reported about a discussion at the ward meeting in relation to plans for the provision of Marriage Registration in St. Andrews. An official managing the services informed councillors that there were no plans to get rid of the St Andrews Registration District.

#### **4.1.2. Leuchars Station Footbridge**

Cllr Liston had recently attended a conference in Edinburgh on rail infrastructure. While there she spoke to a Network Rail official about the decaying state of the footbridge at Leuchars. There are issues to be resolved with regard to responsibility as Fife Council has some involvement and Cllr Liston got the impression that Network Rail would be prepared to buy out the Council, but even then there would be no certainty of any work being done for several years. Fife Council will keep pressing Network Rail to do something. Cllr Liston also commented upon the difficulties still present for some less able passengers for whom the only easy way of access would be a lift.

#### **4.1.3. Leuchars Station Lounge Development**

Mr Newman commented upon the issues for passengers getting late evening trains when the current lounge is closed when staff are not there. He had made enquires and discovered that there is to be a newly built lounge on the platform. He asked Cllr Liston for her views on this development. Cllr Liston acknowledged the current problem and she had also heard about the plans to build a lounge area and had noticed work starting on the platform. She welcomed the shelter being provided but was a bit concerned that this wouldn't be used as an excuse to cut hours when staff were manning the station. She said she'd try to find something out officially.

### **4.2. Dominic Nolan**

#### **Apologies**

### **4.3. Brian Thomson**

#### **4.3.1. Proposed Taxi Rank – Bell Street**

Cllr Thomson reported that there had been a proposal to convert the whole of Bell Street to a taxi rank but the NE Fife Area Committee had rejected officials' recommendations. Officials have been asked to revise the TRO to include a loading bay for local shops, which had rightly objected to the idea of losing the current bay.

#### **4.3.2. Fife Council Budget**

Cllr Thomson reported that Fife Council's funding had been cut by about £13 million and the Council Tax increased to cover some of the deficit. There will have to be around £10 million in cuts across the services.

#### **4.3.3. Bins in Town Centre**

Cllr Thomson reported on this ongoing issue. He couldn't see any significant improvement despite the claims of officials at the January CC Meeting. In relation to bins in car parking spaces Cllr Thomson was not satisfied with the response by officials to a restaurant using a car parking space on a permanent basis without paying any parking charges. Officials had decided that there was little they could do in the circumstances despite possible loss of income. Cllr Thomson viewed this response as unacceptable. He reminded the meeting about the example set by Edinburgh City Council which in central areas doesn't allow bins out for more than a specified time or a fine could be imposed. Edinburgh businesses have to label their bins with business name and address and the company uplifting the bins. Fife Council he says have claimed they are unable to implement this policy due to a conflict of interest as Fife uplifts some commercial bins. Cllr Thomson added that councillors couldn't tell officials what to do but they could change policies of the Council. Cllr Thomson said he'd gone back to Cllrs Vettraino and Craik to ask if they can get the situation sorted.

#### **4.3.4. Local Area Office**

Cllr Thomson advised that the office wouldn't be closed until services within the building are moved to other premises in town. He added that to date Council officers had done no feasibility study on alternative premises for the services affected. The premises being considered include the library and the downstairs former shop premises and part of the town hall. In relation to St Mary's Place issues to be addressed include whether the car parking will be sold with the premises or kept by the Council. As things stand no date can be given for a move of staff or disposal of the offices.

#### **4.3.5. Town Hall Flag**

Cllr Thomson said he'd just heard from town hall staff that the new flagpole might be the wrong sort. He'd understood that the new pole was to have the cords internally positioned to stop the problem of snagging as had occurred with the old flag. The flag was delivered before St Andrews Day and erected despite the flag not being the type expected. The flag went up on St Andrews Day but snagged and hasn't been put up again since that date. Internal building work in the roof area to allow safe access hasn't been carried out either according to Cllr Thomson. He also reported that there was no progress in relation to the town hall bell. Mr Greenwell reminded the meeting that the money for the flagpole was to be taken from the Common Good Fund. He asked whether it had actually been paid out? Cllr Thomson wasn't certain and said he'd need to check what payment had been taken out. Part of the cost factored into the estimate was to include construction of the new pole on the roof and internal work to allow safe access. He thought that as the wrong type of pole had been sent the manufacturer would be asked to do a straight swap if it was their error. Mr Jardine was surprised that it had taken the town hall caretaker to point out the problem with the new flag pole and that it hadn't been mentioned by an officer in the department assigned to the purchase of the pole and setting up of the job. Mr Jardine also queried how the new flagpole had been erected before the health and safety work had been done internally and externally, supposedly part of the overall job specification? He felt that officials needed to be challenged about the way certain decisions were being taken.

Cllr Thomson agreed with Mr Jardine that things had not been done properly, such as a risk assessment for staff. He would be making further enquires with Council staff about the situation and the unsatisfactory state of the job.

Dr Goudie thought that there should normally be a supervisor checking that jobs were being done properly and signing off the outcome if it was satisfactory. He gave an example of the level of scrutiny, which took place in the university to check jobs were completed correctly and to a satisfactory standard. Cllr Thomson acknowledged he didn't know why there hadn't been a proper scrutiny of the job.

#### **4.3.6. Planning Application Melbourne Braes**

Cllr Thomson informed the meeting about a complication in relation to this proposed development on Melbourne Brae. He advised the meeting that he couldn't discuss the actual application as it would constitute a conflict of interest but noted that Fife Council owned part of the site. The developer has approached Fife Council with a view to obtaining the land. Council officers have been approached but haven't come back yet to Councillors to get their view. If local Councillors voted against the sale of the land it would have to go to a Property Committee for a final decision.

#### **4.3.7. Pressure on Open Space**

Mrs Harding asked Councillors to make colleagues from outwith St Andrews to be aware of the pressure in the town on open spaces from developers. She cited a couple of examples of what she considered unsuitable applications. She was also concerned about the affordability of the new properties for local people and the way this was changing the character of the town. Cllr Thomson in his replies advised that Councillors had clear guidelines about the suitability of properties being built and couldn't just make a judgement based on personal like or dislikes. Councillors had to have sound planning reasons for refusal.

#### **4.3.9. Paid Parking – How Much Used**

Mr Marks asked Cllr Thomson for an estimate of the annual level of use of the paid parking in St Andrews. Mr Marks didn't think that the parking would be 100% used all the time and take up would vary throughout the seasons. He wondered whether the argument about loss of income used by officials to defend the need to keep a certain level of paid parking spaces could stand up to scrutiny, especially if officials weren't forcing Forgans/Mitchell's to stop using the space in Market Street. Mr Marks added that such statistics might be useful in any future debate about pedestrianisation as he thought that clear figures could demonstrate whether shoppers could if necessary access space further out in Argyle Street or other paid areas. Cllr Thomson thought occupancy could be about 85% but he acknowledged he'd need to check. Cllr Thomson repeated his view that he couldn't understand the attitude about loss of income in relation to the Forgan/Mitchell's situation especially when officials had been awkward about the use of parking spaces for extra cycle parking. In relation to pedestrianisation Cllr Thomson acknowledged the need to consider alternative car parking.

#### **4.3.10. Proposed Church Street Crossings**

Ms Lindsay Adam asked for an update on the proposed Church Street crossings. Cllr Thomson informed the meeting that it had been included in the Area Works Transportation Programme for the coming financial year. The programme of work is to be considered by North East Fife Area Committee on the 28<sup>th</sup> March.

#### **4.3.11. Green Belt**

Miss Uprichard said that in relation to Green Belt she understood that once the boundaries of the Western Extension had been set, the boundaries of the Green Belt would be set. She understood that at the moment there was no Green Belt or Western Extension boundary and wondered if these matters were waiting for the approval of the boundaries of the Western Extension for that to happen? Cllr Thomson thought that the boundary of the proposed Western Extension was already set in Fifeplan. He wasn't certain why Miss Uprichard was unclear. Miss Uprichard replied that the confusion was that in her understanding neither boundary existed at this time because of the Western Extension plans to be published. She asked why there wasn't a new Green Belt map? Cllr Thomson replied that he thought that the Green Belt boundary took into account the boundary of the Western Extension. He thought that the boundary of the Western Extension was quite explicit in the Fifeplan. The proposal at the moment he added illustrated a Masterplan within that boundary. He offered to check the plans for Miss Uprichard.

Miss Uprichard added that in her understanding the boundaries of a Green Belt should follow natural features such as streams, walls etc and she felt there were no such features of that sort in the one proposed for St Andrews.

#### **4.3.12. Cycle Parking Plans**

Mr Marks asked about the progress in relation to improving cycle parking in the town. Cllr Thomson acknowledged that he wasn't happy with the state of the proposed cycle parking plans, as they hadn't been reported to committee. He added that he'd had some strange excuses from officials about the ongoing delay in the plans. He thought it might be going to the April North-East Fife Planning Committee.

### **4.4. Ann Verner – apologies**

#### **4.4.1. Dolls House Bins**

Cllr Verner reported she'd spoken to the staff at the Dolls House regarding their bins following complaints. They assured her that they will endeavour to keep the area in better condition.

#### **4.4.2. Domino's Pizza Delivery Drivers Issue**

Cllr Verner met with residents from the narrow end of Market Street following complaints regarding Domino's delivery drivers. She has written to Jo Peddie and was advised they were already looking at this matter.

#### **4.4.3. Parking Charges**

Cllr Verner reported that Fife Council have decided not to increase parking charges and are against charges elsewhere in the town.

#### **4.4.4. Lamond Drive Speeding Issue**

Cllr Verner has written to Colin Stirling following concerns expressed by residents about the speed of traffic on Lamond Drive. She was advised to contact the police regarding this matter.

#### **4.4.5. Cycle Stands Application**

Cllr Verner reported she'd received an email from Nick Lopez regarding this application .

### **5. Planning Committee**

#### **5.1. Committee Reports**

##### **5.1.1. New School**

Miss Uprichard gave her report saying that the committee were beginning to deal with two major developments, namely the new school and the Western Extension. In relation to the latter the Planning Committee had got an extension until after the April CC meeting to which they would bring back their comments. In relation to the school application she suggested that every Councillor should look at the application 18/00295/full. She encouraged members to at least take a brief look at all 55 documents attached to the plan. Personally she said she wasn't happy with more blocks in St. Andrews. She felt it was a great pity that an iconic building such as the new school was also going to be made up of blocks. She might send in a personal objection on that matter. She quoted from a letter sent by an eminent architect who thought that flat roofs were not good ideas for a variety of reasons such as potential drainage issues and new areas for gulls to inhabit.

Mr Macleod asked her about the closing dates for comments. He also reminded members that because of the major nature of the plan a decision would be made by the whole CC not just the Planning Committee. Miss Uprichard confirmed that the comments for the school application were for the end of March. Mr Macleod confirmed after some further discussion that the CC wasn't putting in any comments about the school plans but individual members could send in personal comments.

Dr Goudie reminded Mr Macleod about comments he'd made in an email, which contradicted the idea that the CC wasn't making any comments on the school plans. He said that the comments related to the lack of provision of a lay-by on Buchanan Gardens, which he felt was pointing out a major mistake in the plans rather than a minor comment. Dr Goudie thought this omission had huge implications in relation to road safety and traffic flow. He added that with any major application it was very hard to take on board all the potential effects it might have. He thought that an extension might have allowed a more measured assessment and he reminded the meeting how when the Pipeland application had been announced it was welcomed uncritically until the CC assessed the plans and began to make critical comments for which it was heavily criticised. He reminded the meeting of some of the eventual areas where officials began to accept potential problems and assess whether they could be resolved. He felt that if the CC had nothing to say on such a major application it wasn't a serious player. He thought that anyone who stopped and thought about such plans and what they meant in practice ought to be able to come up with at least one change, which would make significant positive changes to benefit pupils and the community. He didn't think it would be good for the reputation of the CC to say that there was nothing to say.

Mr Roberts reminded the meeting that he'd been the CC Chair at the time of the Pipeland proposals and at that time there had been a push by the CC and others to get the school on the western side of town. Now that the school would be where campaigners had hoped he didn't feel there was any argument. If the CC wanted to bring up technicalities he didn't know how that could be done without making the CC look like it was once again objecting as any submission to Fife Council would have to start with such wording. He didn't feel that it

should seem like the CC were objecting to a school in the location viewed as acceptable in general terms to the CC.

Mr Greenwell said that when he'd been at one of the planning presentations by the consultants he'd had a chat about the need for a drop off area in Buchanan Gardens. As he understood the reaction to this idea there would have to be a further agreement between Fife Council and the University because the drop-off would have to eat into some of the playing fields of the University. The impression he got was that the drop-off area would be considered at a later stage possibly in time for the school opening but not holding the plans for the school up. He felt that the CC should put in a letter of support for the school plans but he'd like an extra comment put in saying that the CC would also clearly like Fife Council and the University to come together to do a proper drop-off area on Buchanan Gardens in support of the safety of our children. He added that such comments would get picked up by officials and put in the Report of Handling. He did not want the CC to do anything to delay the school development plans at this time.

Dr Goudie thought that the role of the CC should be analogous to the House of Lords as a chamber to scrutinise issues/legislation and make changes on the basis of their expertise. He thought that no large application was without flaws and that there could be issues not foreseen even by the planners. He felt that it was still legitimate to look at the documentation and try to ensure that nothing had been omitted, which would benefit the new school. He cited the issue of traffic assumptions by the planners and how they assessed the traffic flow from parents dropping off their children in various locations and adding to traffic at certain times of day. He felt that transport officials to aid the progress of the school development should flag up and given more consideration traffic issues. He gave examples of various roads in town and how they might be used and how this would impact upon traffic flow. Dr Goudie felt that some of the matters he'd commented on had not been covered in the transport assessment.

Mr Macleod asked the meeting how the CC should progress the matter. He wondered if members would like to take up Mr Greenwell's suggestion that the CC send a letter of support with the added comment about the drop off point and possibly other issues Councillors should consider. Mr Roberts backed Mr Greenwell's proposal. It was agreed that the letter should be sent following a brief period of consideration by members as to whether there might be other issues, which the CC thought, might need to be considered which were relevant to the development. Mr Macleod reminded members that if there was any concern expressed by members there might have to be a further meeting before the end date for comments to try and resolve the concerns expressed about any aspects of the plans. The initial responses from members would be by email. Miss Uprichard agreed to clarify the final date for comments, which she believed to be the end of March.

### **5.1.2. Western Extension**

Miss Uprichard continued her report informing the meeting that she'd be checking whether there was definitely an extension for comments about the Western Extension and if not she'd ask for an extension given the size of the plans. She felt that the development would have a huge impact upon the town in a range of ways. Mr Newman asked if the CC wanted the Planning Committee to come up with a letter in relation to the Western Extension? Mr Macleod asked the meeting if it wished to delegate powers to the Planning Committee in relation to comments on the Western Extension? Mr Greenwell replied that the Planning Committee already had delegated powers apart from the school development. Mr Roberts queried this saying that he felt it was important for the full Council to be able to make a decision in relation to a major development. He was concerned that leaving such a major decision to a small group of CCs could lead to criticism about a lack of transparency and lack of consultation with the local community. Mr Greenwell reminded the meeting that the Planning Committee had dealt with the major developments in Abbey Park and related developments in the ex-St Leonards property without coming back to the full CC. Mr McLeod commented that the Planning Committee would not put in a letter if it didn't think that it had the support of the full CC. He added that letters produced by the Planning Committee were circulated by email and if there was any objection that would lead to a meeting thus avoiding any issues around the letter's contents. It was agreed that the Planning Committee should

bring forward its letter about the Western Extension for formal approval or otherwise by the full CC.

### **5.1.3. HMO Report**

Dr Goudie reported that he'd circulated an email in relation to the CC's view on the recent HMO Report. He wasn't certain if planning had had a chance to discuss it at their last meeting, as he'd been absent. He wondered whether a view had been agreed by the CC on the report? Miss Uprichard said she'd circulated the report to the Planning Committee and it would be on their next agenda. Cllr Liston wondered whether the CC had had an invitation to a meeting about the report on 22<sup>nd</sup> March. Mr Macleod replied that Cllr Lothian had said the CC would be invited but assumed the invites hadn't been sent out yet. Two representatives can be sent to state their views.

## **6. Matters Arising**

### **6.1. Reports from Representatives**

#### **6.1.1. Holy Trinity Action Group**

Mr Macleod said he'd circulated a report and other documentation on the aims and objectives of this group. One area being discussed was to try and accommodate music groups needing a venue due to the closure of the Younger Hall for a year for refurbishment. That had taken up a lot of time in the meetings. A lot of ideas were being considered depending upon what could be done in a Grade A listed building. There was also discussion about what to do about the church hall on Queens Terrace and this may be sold.

#### **6.1.2. Crail to St Andrews Cycle Group**

Mr Marks had attended this group, which was looking at a safe cycling route between the two towns. He described it as being in the early stages of development with some basic consultancy work having been done on issues such as landowner agreement to access a vital factor to make the route possible. At present there may be a focus on the route from St Andrews to Boarhills, which could be less difficult to complete, but it would depend upon getting funding to complete a proper feasibility study. The group is made up of representatives from the various Community Councils and others with an interest such as Transition University Group. The group will be asking the CC for a general letter backing their idea with the request to be sent by Ali McLeod. This might make funding for a feasibility study more realistic. Dr Goudie reminded the meeting that the CC had made past comments and he felt that any letter of support should come with some riders in respect of the CC views on the proposed route. He was pleased to hear that Sustrans have become involved but wondered about the route as the CC had been a bit concerned that the route out of St Andrews was a steep climb straight out of town which he felt wasn't necessarily suitable for many members of the community. Mr Marks said he was unable to comment but thought that there might not be any alternative and he commented upon some issues causing problems for the group. These included the response of the caravan park, which is owned by a company in North Wales and hasn't been positive about a cycle route skirting their property. He said he could flag up the concerns to group members and see if he could get a definitive comment on the route from Crispin the consultant or Ali McLeod. Dr Goudie thought that Sustrans might be able to come up with other possibilities on viable routes.

#### **6.1.3. St Andrews Community Trust**

Mr Greenwell reported on the activities of the Community Trust. They'd met recently in February and had considered 21 applications for a total of about £63000 and had approved 14 applications for about £31000. The Trust received a similar sum for the coming year from the Links Trust and the CC should receive a royalty payment of about £5000. Dr Goudie reminded Mr Greenwell that there was written into the Trust guidelines the possibility of awarding grants for research up to a maximum of 10% of the annual income. He noted that the Trust had refused grants two years running towards the STAG Report last year and in relation to a Starlink application more recently. He wasn't aware of the reason for refusal but was very

disappointed. Mr Greenwell couldn't remember the reason but agreed to check his notes and let Dr Goudie know.

#### **6.1.4. St Andrews Town Group**

Mr Greenwell reported that he'd attended this new group on behalf of the CC Chair recently. The group was formed of the remnants of the Partnership, was chaired by Dorothea Morrison but Mr Greenwell wasn't certain of the origins of the other members. Mr Greenwell described it as a loose association of groups in the town, which has various projects to some extent Partnership related. The Group also has a list of about a dozen projects they'd like to put together. Three sub-groups have been set up, one to do with the promotion of the town, driven by a Links Trust representative, Laurie Watson. There was some talk about a wi-fi set up for the town by Mr Greenwell thought this might not progress as he felt confident that a 4G network would be set up much more quickly and easily. There was also some talk around the co-ordination of the St Andrews websites.

Local toilets were another project discussed with the issue of information about availability and accessibility important for visitors. There was also a general recognition of the inadequacy of public toilet facilities.

The third project relates to lighting the cathedral, which Mr Greenwell felt was making more progress. Lindsay Matheson is to front this project which hopes to have the lighting in operation by St Andrews Day this year.

Mr Greenwell said at Miss Uprichard's request that he'd forward the details including the invite list of individuals and organisations as well as a dozen possible projects.

Mr Munn questioned how someone without a data plan could get 4G? Mr Greenwell thought that data plans were commonplace but Mr Munn thought that many people might not have data plans as they were in his view expensive, so would be excluded if there weren't a wi-fi network. Mr Greenwell thought that 4G was much faster and there was a much lower limit at which wi-fi could be provided. He also thought that there wasn't the motivation to find the money for what he thought would be an expensive wi-fi project.

The next meeting is the 7<sup>th</sup> June 2018.

#### **6.2. Wired Microphones**

Dr Shepherd reported that there was a new model of microphone and he was awaiting the details from the company rep. A video demonstrating the new model might become available. A purchase of microphones could either be the new model or the old model at a discounted price. He would continue working on the microphone possibility and report back again.

#### **6.3. Town Entry Signs**

Mr Greenwell said he'd asked for this subject to be put back on the agenda. Mr Greenwell reported that the working group had been experiencing some differences of opinion particularly with one member and his ideas about the signage. He felt that the group had managed to agree on some aspects of the project. The group had agreed to disagree on anything other than a straightforward sign for the town, but did agree that they wanted to have "Royal Borough" also the town crest. There was a majority vote for a white background as opposed to the suggested alternative of a blue background. They also agreed that the need to rationalise the brown signs was not the scope of the project. Miss Uprichard agreed that a plain sign with dark colours on a light background was preferable. Mr Dobson also supported a simple sign with the minimum of information. Dr Shepherd thought that the group's views on background colour were not as clear as Mr Greenwell had claimed and he still advocated light blue as per the saltire with a St Andrews Cross and he also wanted to see a watermark of a vertical saltire in the crest.

Mr Roberts wondered if anyone had thought about the practicalities of the project and reminded the meeting that the CC couldn't just change the signs at the town entrance without speaking to the relevant department in Fife Council. He felt that issues such as the colour of

the background of the signs was not of immediate relevance until the practicalities of realising the project were known. Mr Greenwell thought there were fairly detailed signage guidelines by the UK Government and he thought that what the group was suggesting was perfectly acceptable. He wasn't certain if it was Fife Transportation who would have any say on the acceptability of changing the current signs but it might help if there were other sources of funding not from Fife Council budgets to pay for the project.

Mr Macleod asked how the project would be taken forward? Mr Greenwell replied that it would be easier for him to proceed if the CC made a decision on the most acceptable background. Dr Shepherd proposed having a blue background and Mr Greenwell proposed a white background. Mr Macleod asked for members' views on these proposals. A substantial majority favoured the white background.

#### **6.4. Community Engagement**

Dr Shepherd said he wanted to talk about community engagement. The objective he said was effective community engagement and to have the CC setting exemplary standards for community engagement with the citizens of St Andrews. He still thought that the best way to proceed was to rent premises to use for a range of purposes – drop-in centre, resource centre, surgeries for Councillors, MSPs and MPs. He also saw it as a useful place for committee meetings. He saw the short-term benefits in relation to be a place for wi-fi and pc connectivity and a resource centre and in the long term he thought it would increase the influence of the CC. He had looked at the premises below the meeting room and had met with a Fife Council official who'd said he would want a commercial rent paid which Dr Shepherd acknowledged put a bit of a dampener on the idea. However he still thought it merited looking at and thought that funding might be possible from a number of sources such as the CGF.

Mr Greenwell wondered who would man the premises? Mr Greenwell then asked if Dr Shepherd was expecting the CGF to come up with £30000 pa before employee costs?

Dr Shepherd asked if he could at least get approval in principle of the idea of the CC having premises for community engagement. Ideally he thought that the downstairs premises would be a shop window for the CC and other organisations. He also wanted help to investigate sources of funding to pay for rental costs etc. Regarding manning the premises he already knew an organisation that'd be keen to occupy part of the premises rent-free if possible. He thought this organisation could man the premises and do basic tasks such as keeping it clean in lieu of rent. In conclusion he said that he believed that using the premises would be a good way to improve community engagement something, which has been an issue for the CC for a variety of reasons. Mr Greenwell was still sceptical about the outcome being as significant as Dr Shepherd believed and reminded the meeting about the poor attendance at the CC Coffee mornings which were also opportunities to interact and attempt community engagement. Dr Shepherd thought that these couldn't be compared to having a regular presence with a shop front. Mr Roberts thought the idea was a great one in principle but in practice he didn't think it would work. He would support trying the idea if Dr Shepherd could find a financial package to pay for use of the premises. Mr Dobson supported the idea in principle but thought that a feasibility study would be important which sounded out stakeholders and local groups to get an idea of how premises might be used. Miss Uprichard agreed with the idea in principle as well.

Mr Macleod asked the meeting if it might agree to ask Dr Shepherd to undertake further research on his idea and return to the CC with the conclusions to his research? Dr Shepherd was asked to try and put together a business plan.

#### **6.5. Any other matters arising**

No other matters arising

## **7. Committee Reports**

### **7.1. Recreation Committee**

Planned meeting had been cancelled due to recent wintry weather and no date yet for fresh meeting.

### **7.2. GP Meeting**

No meeting

### **7.3. 200 Club**

1<sup>st</sup> Mr K Lindsay 2<sup>nd</sup> Mr Alistair Newton 3<sup>rd</sup> Mrs Pat Anthony

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

No report

### **7.5. Rail Committee**

No report

## **8. New Business**

### **8.1. Community Engagement**

Discussed under Matters arising

### **8.2. East Fife Sports Council Award**

It was agreed by email prior to the CC meeting to fund the award trophy and some associated costs as requested by the East Fife Sports Council. The Chair and Recreation Convenor will attend the event.

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

### **9.1. Chair**

Mr Macleod reported he'd attended the East Sands Private Student Residence consultation, which related to their request to rent out the rooms in summer when students were away. He had also attended an Exhibition Launch at Kinburn Museum on 16<sup>th</sup> March. He had written the regular article for the St Andrews in Focus with a cycling theme for the next issue.

### **9.2. Treasurer**

February accounts have been emailed out and put on the website. He reminded members to cash outstanding cheques before the end of the financial year. Mr Macleod mentioned that there had been a suggestion that the financial rules for the CC and its members should be circulated. It was agreed to keep discussion about the rules until the next meeting.

### **9.3. Membership Secretary**

No report. In the absence of Mr Stanis-Traken Mr Greenwell agreed to act in this capacity should it be required.

### **9.4. Secretary**

See correspondence in agenda. Mr Marks reminded members about the email from Mike Melville of Fife Council Democratic Services who had proposed so minor changes to the election rules for CCs and welcomed a response from CCs ahead of the elections which will be held nearer the end of this year. Views to be returned to Mike Melville by 20<sup>th</sup> April.

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

### **10.1. Regis Professor**

Dr Shepherd suggested that the CC should write to Professor Falconer who had been made Regis Professor in his subject, a prestigious honour. Mr Macleod agreed to write a letter of congratulations from the CC.

### **10.2. 700<sup>TH</sup> Anniversary of St Andrews Cathedral**

Mr Macleod informed the meeting that on the 5<sup>th</sup> July 2018 the cathedral would have its 700<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its inception. He asked members to think whether the CC could do anything to help commemorate this important date.