

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council Inaugural Agenda – March 2005

The inaugural meeting of the new community council session will be at 7pm Monday 7th March in the Burgh Chambers of the Town Hall, Queen's Gardens. The start of this meeting will be chaired by one of the Fife Councillors for St Andrews.

1. Appointment of Chair

2. Appointment of Vice-Chair(s)

It will be necessary to decide upon the number of vice-chairs to be appointed. The last session operated with two, previously there had often been three.

3. Appointment of Secretary

4. Appointment of Treasurer

On completion of election of office-bearers the newly-appointed Chair will take over the chair for the remainder of the meeting.

The meeting may wish to defer the following items until after the monthly agenda's item 3. Presentations.

5. Any Other Competent Business

5.1. Co-options etc

5.1.1. Vacancy

Members will be well aware that no election was necessary because community council is one member short of complement. Community council may wish to decide whether and how to fill this last place for a full voting member.

5.1.2. Other co-options

Community Council may choose, or not, at any time to co-opt or ask an external body to nominate, members in an advisory, *non-voting* capacity for technical expertise in some field or merely to represent some specific group's interests.

- Merchants' Association

This has been vacant since the previous incumbent, Bill Sangster, was elevated to Fife Councillor and Ewen Sparks (an unsuccessful candidate in the previous election) was co-opted, in accordance with Fife Council's guidelines, as a full community councillor. As Ewen Sparks also happens to be Chair of the Merchants' Association a further representative seemed unnecessary.

- 5.1.2. Madras College Whole School Board

Following discussions with the Rector last year, two students of Madras College have been nominated by the Whole School Board. The current incumbents first took their places in February 2005.

5.2. Committees

Sheets will be passed around during the meeting for members to express an interest in the existing working committees of community council. Not signing up now does not exclude anyone; committees are not exclusive and will welcome anyone.

5.3. Delegated Powers

Some committees have been granted delegated powers to act on behalf of community council in particular areas to meet external deadlines or conduct minor administrivia, without detail permission from full community council, providing they report back to community council each month.

For the smooth continuation of work in progress, community council may wish to renew the mandate of:

- Planning Committee
- Recreation Committee
- Common Good Fund representatives

5.4 Representatives

A number of representatives to external bodies are appointed to speak on behalf of, and report back when necessary, to community council:

- 200 Club Convenor – Richard Douglas
- Arms Convenor – Murdo Macdonald
- Common Good Fund – 2 vacancies
- Community Safety Panel – Joe Peterson?
- Cosmos Management Committee – George Davidson
- East Sands Leisure Centre Advisory Group – vacant
- Fairtrade Town Campaign – Bruce Ryan

- Golfing Liaison – Murdo Macdonald, Dennis Macdonald, Joe Peterson?
- Greenbelt Forum – vacant
- Harbour Trust – Chair (ex Officio)
- Ohtawara Trust – vacant?
- RAF Leuchars Liaison group – Dennis Macdonald, Chris Lesurf
- St Andrews in Bloom committee – Joe Peterson
- St Andrews Week committee – Ken Crichton
- St Andrews World Class (observer) – Joe Peterson
- *Any others, particularly vacancies?*

5.5. Any More AOCB?

Agenda – March 2005

There will be a meeting of the community council immediately following the inaugural meeting, 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 late 1997 on are at <http://www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/>)

1. Apologies

Also apply to the inaugural meeting

George Davidson.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting

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. The Open Golf Championship 2005

Fife Constabulary's Open Golf Planning Team:

The purpose of the visit is to seek local views on what effect the Open coming to St Andrews has on local communities and what, if any, measures can be introduced by the Police to assist where possible.

Once we have taken on board the views of all our partners, we will make another visit to you in June/July to discuss our plans.

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

5.1. Minutes

And major letters..

1. Appendix A: 31 Jan 05 meeting.
2. Appendix F: 14 Feb 05 meeting.
3. Appendix G: 19 Feb 05 meeting.
4. Appendix H: Roundabout & Road works – objection.
5. Appendix I: David Russell Hall – objection.
6. Appendix R: Bus Stop Shelters – comments.
7. Appendix T: 28 Feb 05 meeting.
8. Appendix U: Grange Road phone mast – objection.
9. Appendix V: Change of use of open space, Fraser Av – objection.

5.2. Plans, various: Town Drop

Proposal by Penny Uprichard

6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

6.1. Fair Shares Fair

[February Appendix K] Update from Chris Lesurf

So that stores who can't come can still be represented, I'm asking them to give raffle prizes. 30p will be charged at the door and the winners drawn at 11.30am and allowed to choose their prizes.

In view of this, I would appreciate some help.

Cosmos Community Centre, 10am–12noon, Saturday 19 March.

6.2. Fife Coast and Countryside Trust

[January Appendix I] The trust is a registered charity set up by Fife Council, Scottish National Heritage, Scottish Enterprise Fife, and the Kingdom of Fife Tourist Board. Its aim is to co-ordinate, develop and market the coastal path and Lomond Hills. Copies of the slide presentation to local community councils and other interested bodies (ramblers etc) at the recent meeting in St Andrews will be circulated.

Appendix P: Pete Lindsay's notes

Volunteer representative?

6.3. St Andrews Walks Project

Archie Strachan has passed on papers concerning David Galloway's idea to publicise local walks. [December 7.2.2].

Who will take over co-ordinating this?

6.4. World Heritage Site

[January 7.1.] Appendix C: Information from Ted Brocklebank MSP.

6.5. Special Community Council Meeting

[February 4.1.1.] 7pm Monday 28th March, Town Hall Supper Room. Economic Development & the Local Plan: briefing by Robin Presswood, Development Manager (Business & Strategy), Fife Council Development Services.

6.6. Water Services Consultation

[October 2004] Following the response by Joe Peterson and the Health, Education & Welfare committee to last years' consultations, *Investing in Water Services 2006-2014* and *Paying for Water Services 2006-2010*, we have received copies of the consultation summaries. More copies and the full report can be downloaded from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Environment/Water/>.

(See also Appendix E)

6.7. Growth of HMOs

[February 3.1] Michael Buchanan has now received responses to his Freedom of Information Act queries to Glasgow and Edinburgh city councils.

6.8. Community Council Good Practice & Complaints Procedure

Mike Melville, Team Leader (Administration), Law & Administration (East) informs us that the combined responses to these consultations are available in the meeting papers for the Community Councils Support Working Group online at:

<http://www.fifedirect.org.uk/newsevents/index.cfm?fuseaction=displayevent&MenuId=80810809-9EDF-11D6-BF4D0002A5349AC9&objectid=EC678A1F-E7FE-C7EA-0CDAA8F5E14B4948&cfid=1126035&cftoken=19144905>

(A prime illustration of how the Web makes accessing documents so much easier...)

6.9. Joint Community Care plan

John Alexander, Senior Manager (Adult Services), acknowledges the problems with the web links given last month; these are now corrected and checked. Greater care will be taken in future.

6.10. Fife Fire & Rescue Management Plan

[February 7.6.] Appendix S: Bruce Ryan's answers, which had to be submitted by 28/2.

6.11. Any other Matters Arising?

7. New Business

7.1. Phone Boxes

Appendix N: The Association of Scottish Community Councils draws attention to a review of the rules for removal of phone boxes.

Response to OfCom by 25 March

7.2. Constitution

The constitution of the community council needs to be revised to bring it into line with the current requirements of the Fife Council scheme for community councils.

7.3. Picture

Should community council have a group picture taken, both as a recognition aid for the benefit of the public we represent, and a historical record?

7.4. Bandstand Concerts

Community council has organised Sunday afternoon concerts at the Bow Butts Bandstand for over 10 years (recently in conjunction with one of the rotary clubs). Does community council wish to continue this year?

If so, who will act as co-ordinator?

7.5. Environmental Marketplace

Appendix K: Proposal from Kate Hughes, Locality Manager

7.6. Voting systems

Appendix J Review by Ken Fraser, with draft answers. Response by mid-April

7.7. NE Water Customer Panel Meeting

Appendix L: We are invited to send a representative: Wednesday 30 March 2005, 2pm, Scores Hotel, 76 The Scores, St Andrews.

7.8. Web Space

From Pete Lindsay: Currently community council's web presence is limited to one page at www.saint-andrews.co.uk/CC/index.htm, kindly hosted by Ken Cochrane (a little out of date it gives Frank Riddell as Chair) and the administration and events pages at www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrews/events and www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/ both on my own space.

The cost of commercially available web space, with professional facilities and a domain name, has dropped to around £30 a year.

Would now be a good time for community council to take on its own web space? This would allow for a controlled transition, and future operations which are simply not possible with the present free, but very limited, facilities dependent upon the good will of others.

7.9. The Local Channel

In conjunction with the Association of Scottish Community Councils, The Local Channel is offering free (with advertising) web pages and a relatively easy to use, non-technical, but limited way of creating them. The company also offers a commission on advertising revenue (from local businesses buying advertising on a community council's pages); is selling refurbished PCs; and selling discount festive lighting products.

7.10. Community Councils Seminar

Appendix Q: 25 June, Glenrothes. Have we any suggestions for topics?

7.11. Postwatch Scotland

Independent watchdog for postal services, spring newsletter: Business compensation for delayed mail; Return of Post Office Savings Stamps; Compensation case study – lost medical alert bracelet; What do Scottish islanders think of their postal services; Returned to delivery office – unable to deliver; How to complain; Moving house – redirection service; **Questionnaire on postal services**; Urban post office closure programme; Competition – too early?

7.12. Funding Quest by Eco School

Robbie Sharp, the headteacher at New Gilston Primary School, writes to tell us of their Green Flag status as an Eco School 2004 award winner, and just happens to ask at the end if we know of any sources of funding to help them raise the flagpole they were given by a building company.

7.13. Water Mains Improvements

Appendix B: text of letter which will go out to affected customers. For information.

7.14. Overseas Links

Appendix O: Contact from Hungary, with response. Copied to Kingdom of Fife Tourist Board.

7.15. Vodafone Base Station

Vodafone write to inform us of plans to place a radio base station within the steeple of Hope Park Church as preferred option, and some rejected alternatives listed, with reasons.

(Passed to Planning Committee).

7.16. Temporary Path Problem

After consultation with the Chair and Secretary last month, Bruce Ryan wrote to Fife Council on behalf of members of community council to raise concerns over the temporary arrangements at the new flats on the West Port/Bridge Street corner as the new footpath is laid. This area has been the cause of similar concern during the original construction.

Appendix M: Concerns and response from Kate Hughes, Locality Manager.

7.17. Outdoor Access Code

Scottish Natural Heritage sent a full copy of the Code (*currently with Richard Douglas*) and a number of summary leaflets.

7.18. Your Right to Know

"A guide to freedom of information law in Scotland" received from the Scottish Information Commissioner and Scottish Consumer Council. More copies are available from the Commissioner's office (Kinburn Castle, Doubledykes Road) or online as a .pdf at <http://www.itspublicknowledge.info/yourrights>.

7.19. eVOLve

Volunteers Centre Fife newsletter, Jan/Feb 05: Volunteers of the Year 2004; Call for candidates for Millennium Volunteers award (ages 16-25); New Ways change of co-ordinator; Blether together; Spirals (mental health) – funding problems; 2005 – year of the volunteer; Health issues in the community; Volunteers managers network; Levenmouth volunteer recruitment drive; Volunteering opportunities (by area).

8. Reports from Office Bearers

8.1. Chair

8.2. Treasurer

Archie Strachan, the past treasurer, has updated the accounts to the end of his tenure and had them audited ready to be collected by the new incumbent.

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. Plans, various

Pete Lindsay has the community council copy of both the Draft Structure Plan and the Draft Local Plan.

8.3.2. Patras Book

Library service management has not, so far, responded though Lindsay Cordiner (community librarian) has passed on the offer. A chase-up has been sent.

8.3.3. To Do

Due to pressure of other community council business no progress has been made on the backlog.

- University observance of St Andrew's Day [Dec 10.4]
- Recycling centre [January 4.3.1]
- Information Commissioner – invite to speak [January A.2.1]

9. Reports

9.1. From Committees

If it is not done earlier in the meeting, committees should introduce themselves and their work for the benefit of new members.

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 – Planning Meeting – 31/1/05

Minutes by Penny Uprichard

Present: I Goudie, R Douglas, G Davidson, P Uprichard. Apologies: B Ryan, P Lindsay.

Previous applications

78 South Street	Internal alterations and display of signs at the former Library.	Window and door frames should be retained in white, sign should be outlined in timber and should be a pale colour. The use of black as a background colour with the extension of the logo is not hereby approved. The signboard for the infill door opening is not hereby approved.
Feddinch	Outline planning permission approved. Install private golf course etc.	Approved with 36 conditions.

Current applications

1 Murray Park	install roof lights to attic room (owners' accommodation in guest house)	NC
25 Nelson Street	rear extension and increase height of boundary wall	NC
9 Middlesshade Road	conservatory extension to dwellinghouse	NC
12 South Castle Street	install satellite dish (rear of building)	NC
191 South Street	illuminate fascia sign (exterior). Alterations to shop front including repainting	NC
R&A Clubhouse	partial re-roofing and installation of new ventilation equipment	NC
16a Greyfriars Garden	dormer extension and installation of roof light	NC
St Rule Club	internal alterations	NC
Bus Station	alter layout of bus stances and access road. Access road to car park (including demolition and reconstruction of wall)	No papers
127 Market Street	change of use of shop to Starbucks Coffee Shop and alterations to shop	Obj.

	front. Internally illuminate signage. N.B. lack of bins. Obj. re signage and lack of bins	RD
101-103 Market Street	install air conditioning and vents on roof (retrospective application). Obj. on grounds of visual and noise disruption to neighbours, also just as easy to lodge retrospective application, having done work, as to apply in advance. Ground floor building (which did have planning permission) also built on garden ground	Obj. PU

Appendix B – Water Mains Improvements

From James McMillan, Customer Care Manager, Scottish Water. For information contact Adam Scott on 0845 601 8855.

St Andrews Water Mains Improvement Ref: WMR-SL3-SWC

As part of our ongoing commitment to improving our service to customers, Scottish Water has a long term programme for the improvement of ageing water mains. As part of this improvement programme, extensive work is planned for St Andrews Water Supply Zone starting on 24 February 2005 lasting for approximately fifteen weeks.

These ageing water mains will be replaced by new plastic water mains and will provide better quality water and reduce the number of bursts. We intend to use techniques that will result in minimum disruption. These modern methods will reduce the time required to carry out the work.

There may be some disruption to your water supply, however we will give you at least 48 hours advance notification of any interruption to your water supply. Periodically during the works you may experience low pressure and discoloured water. Please do not use any water for washing clothes during this period. Instead, you should turn on your cold tap in the kitchen until the water runs clear.

There will be some local disruption to traffic movements during the construction period. We will make every effort to minimise the impact of this disruption.

Please find enclosed our customer information pack which contains, an Electrical Earthing leaflet, a copy of the guide to our Water Mains Improvement programme, a Special Needs/Business Requirements form and a reminder card to hang on your kitchen tap.

To help us to continually improve our service to our customers we may ask you for feedback on your experience prior to and during this improvement programme. For this purpose a Customer Satisfaction Survey form may be delivered to your address during the Water Mains Improvement Project. We would like to take this opportunity to thank you in advance for your participation in our survey.

We apologise for any inconvenience that this essential work may cause. If you have any questions about Scottish Water or the project, please contact our Customer Helpline on 0845 601 8855 quoting "St Andrews Mains Improvement".

Appendix C – World Heritage

From Ted Brocklebank MSP

St Andrews World Heritage Site status

You may have read about an initiative I have launched to secure World Heritage Site status for St Andrews. My apologies for the delay in approaching you officially seeking your support in the campaign.

The reason for the delay is that I first wanted to secure Executive approval for the idea from the Minister for Tourism, Culture and Sport, Ms Patricia Ferguson. Having now held that meeting, I am delighted to say that the Minister has offered Executive support in principle.

Consequently, I am now writing officially to you, and to as many interested groups as possible, to ascertain your thoughts on this proposal and to seek your support for it.

I attach a motion which I have tabled in the Scottish Parliament. [January Appendix F - PL] As you will see, it has already received considerable cross-party support and I hope your involvement will help promote the idea further.

I also enclose a paper which gives some background to World Heritage Site status and look forward to your comments.

St Andrews – Application for World Heritage Site status

Background

Responsibility lies with UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) to award Site status, under the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Scotland has 4 sites with "Heritage" status; Neolithic Orkney, Edinburgh Old & New Town, St Kilda (natural) and New Lanark.

In the last decade the process has changed due to a) A more rigorous selection process and b) Devolution. Due to increasing applications for "Heritage" status signatory nations have been recently restricted to one application per year. In Britain due to the high number of sites waiting to apply for Heritage status the Westminster Government (Department of Culture Media and Sport) have developed a UK Tentative List of sites waiting for nomination, when it was unveiled in 1999 it had 25 sites. Being on the Tentative List is a compulsory prerequisite for any site that wishes to apply for "Heritage" status. It is thought that a site would probably be on the list for a period of about 5-10 years before being nominated.

Another change that has recently taken place is due to devolution, although the actual function of

nominating a site for Heritage status is a reserved matter, the Scottish Executive is responsible for putting forward Scottish sites on to the UK Tentative List. In developing sites for inclusion on to the Tentative List the Executive delegates much of the ground work to Historic Scotland.

General Points on Nomination

UNESCO only designates sites that have an aspect of either Cultural or Natural heritage thought to be unique and worth preserving. There are some key criteria of which the site must conform to at least one. In St Andrews case concentrating on either its links with the University, its status as the home of Golf or both would give the best foundation for a case for nomination. In previous cases Historic Scotland has got involved early on with nomination bids, they tend give their opinion on the merits of the case and the case can be altered and strengthened accordingly. A successful bid would be helped by a prospective World Heritage Foundation already being in place. In the case of Edinburgh the presence of Edinburgh World Heritage Trust was valuable in pursuing key themes that UNESCO is keen on developing. Eventually St Andrews would have to submit a Management Plan where the case for its nomination would be made. In this document it would be useful to have St Andrews case backed up by quite a broad range of opinion.

Starting Point

The first place to start would be trying to gather together some kind of prospective St Andrews World Heritage Foundation. In Edinburgh this was done by amalgamating smaller foundations (Edinburgh New Town Conservation Committee and the Edinburgh Old Town Renewal Trust) into the World Heritage Foundation. In St Andrews there exists The Links Trust and the St Andrews Preservation Trust and possibly more. If they could be persuaded to at least work together and agree on basic principles of public access and preservation it would be looked upon favourably by UNESCO. Eventually there will have to be wider consultation with Fife Council, Scottish Enterprise Fife, Kingdom of Fife Tourist Board and Historic Scotland. The support of these groups would be a must, but it would be helpful to have the backing of the University of St Andrews, R&A and the Fife Chambers of Commerce, the wider and more broadly based opinion is the better. Their support will also be helpful when producing the final Management Plan, here the input of leading academics and public figures would also be vital. If St Andrews bid was to be successful these leading figures would need to be prepared to argue the case.

Summary

- The basis of a St Andrews World Heritage Foundation should be established.
- Fife Council, Scottish Enterprise Fife etc. would all need to be consulted and be brought round to support the idea.
- Leading figures will need to be found who can affectively argue St Andrews cultural importance to the world.

Appendix 1 – Sites in Britain that are already designated World Heritage Sites and the reason for their inception.

Durham Cathedral and Castle (1986): Chosen as represents; "...the Norman Domination of England and symbolise the spiritual and temporal powers of the Prince Bishops, who for centuries were amongst the most powerful men of northern England. It is, however, above all the relationship between the two, towering over the adjacent streets of the town, which inspires awe..."

The Tower of London (1989): The Tower was accepted for being symbolic of Royal power since the 11th Century and for exemplifying Medieval Norman architecture.

Appendix 2 – Possible criterion under which St Andrews could be considered.

Criterion ii; exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; or

First of all it could be considered whether or not St Andrew's town planning has changed in order to focus on the increasing importance of the University and education in the city. Also since St Andrews represents wide ranging use of landscape design (evident in golf courses) it also may be eligible under this clause.

Criterion iii; bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilisation which is living or which has disappeared; or

Once again St Andrews could be regarded as being an exceptional example of a city with very strong higher educational links and with unique links to Golf (it would, however, have to be argued that Golf and education was a cultural tradition in their own rights)

Appendix D – Scottish Civic Forum

From Joyce McMillan, Convener, Scottish Civic Forum.

Scottish Executive-to cut Scottish Civic Forum Funding

This is to let you know that Executive Ministers told us at a meeting this morning that they are proposing to half the Civic Forum's core funding to £100,000, with effect from the 1st April. They also made it clear that they are offering this amount for one year only, as they are not willing to core fund us any further. This decision was not entirely unexpected, since we have been receiving negative signals from the Executive throughout this year, but we had still hoped that our record of work would persuade ministers to continue our support at or beyond previous levels. Obviously, their decision not to do so creates a major crisis in the Forum's affairs, and means that we will have to take very tough decisions about whether the Forum can continue at all on these terms, and if so in what form.

The Board will be meeting within the next ten days to make initial decisions about how to proceed. In the

meantime, though, it would be most useful if you could let us have your views on how the Forum should respond to this crisis, and if you could muster as much support as possible, not least in the form of letters to MSPs. On 24th February, there will be a Member's Debate in the Scottish Parliament, on a motion put down by Linda Fabiani of the SNP, suggesting that the Parliament itself offer some funding to the Civic Forum. It's important that MSPs of all parties be encouraged to sign this motion and speak in support of it, and that the debate is well attended, both by MSPs and by members of the public who are supportive of the Forum.

I will also be convening a meeting of our major Social Partners, so as to involve them in our decision-making about how best to respond to this major challenge for the representation of active citizens in Scotland. Please stay in touch with us during this difficult period. We would be grateful for any help or support you can offer, financial, political or moral, in the coming weeks and months.

Appendix E – Water Charges

*From Kathy Auld, Business and Community Relations Regional Manager, Scottish Water.
Kathy.Auld@scottishwater.co.uk*

Scottish Water is working – charges announcement

I would like to update you about Scottish Waters recently announced charges for water and waste water services across Scotland for 2005/06.

The new charges for business and household customers will increase by an average of 2.8% which is the lowest increase of any water company in the UK. The average household bill for 2005/06 will be £280 per annum.

The new charges come at a time when Scottish Water is investing at record levels with current investment reaching £40 million per month.

Like all businesses we are constantly striving to improve our efficiency and these improvements will help keep increases in the years ahead to a minimum during a period when we are investing at record levels in the industry in Scotland.

By contrast, in England and Wales prices will rise by an average of 18% between now and 2010. Some customers there will see bills going up by 25%.

Delivering clear benefits

Scottish Water was created in April 2002 and has been rapidly transforming the water industry after decades of under investment. Between 2002 and 2006, were investing £1.8billion to deliver better quality drinking water, to clean up the environment by improving waste water treatment and to sort the miles and miles of leaking water pipes and crumbling sewers.

One of the main reasons for creating Scottish Water was to improve the efficiency of the industry. We intend to reduce our costs by 40% in our first four years – all for the benefit of the customer. So far, we've saved nearly a million pounds for every week since we were created. Although much has been achieved already, much remains to be done. Our rapid progress so far proves Scottish Water is working for the people of Scotland.

Further details of our commitment to you can be found in our new Code of Practice and Guaranteed Standards which can be found at www.scottishwater.co.uk along with further details about the new charges.

Appendix F – Planning Meeting 14/2/05

Minutes by Penny Uprichard

Present: I Goudie, G Davidson, B Christie, R Douglas, B Ryan, P Uprichard. Apologies: P Lindsay.

Previous applications

10 Argyle Street – appeal dismissed. Reasons – over-intensive form of development. Would be harmful to the character and appearance of St Andrews Conservation Area.

Present applications

Bus shelters (16) – these applications were inspected and passed with the exception of

1. the one near the Health Centre in Pipeland Road (No. 418), which should be moved either to the lower side of the entrance to the car park, or further up closer to the Health Centre.
2. No. 473 needs to be put to the east of the entrance to David Russell Hall.
3. The shelter at the corner of Jamie Anderson Place and Scooniehill Road (No. 266) should be to the west, or a little further to the east.

If the seats are the same as those in the bus shelter in St. Mary's Place, they are too high for anyone but a six-footer.

Bruce Ryan to write.

There followed a discussion about disabled access during the forthcoming road-works.

Appendix G – Planning Meeting 19/2/05

Minutes by Penny Uprichard

Present: I Goudie, B Ryan, G Davidson, R Douglas, P Uprichard. Apologies: P Lindsay.

Pilgrim Care	Proposed complex for care of elderly. The Committee recorded that: "We will consider the complete application, but would emphasise – as was indicated at the meeting of the full Community Council, that the Community Council is generally opposed to further development on the southern hillside. We wish to see this new housing development located in the valley of the Kinnessburn."	
Bus station alterations	Committee also considered the proposed barriers on the four roads at the Hope Park roundabout, the raised roundabout, the proposed reduction of the roads to a single lane at 3 of the 4 entrances, the reduction in safety when there is a hearse and funeral cars outside Hope Park Church, the proposed 'hump' in Double Dykes Road, which is unsafe for bicycles, the larger refuges (why are they to be increased in size?). The wider pavements in Alexandra Place will mean that just one stopped car will bring the entire street to a halt. It is likely in any case that there will be tailbacks to the West Port. The reduction to single lanes will inevitably cause major tailbacks. In the case of City Road the tailbacks will be likely to cover the crossings and also the opening from the bus station. The barriers are unnecessary and unsightly.	
Golf Place Maintenance	Possible access during road-works? Dropped kerbs for wheelchairs and pushchairs? During the road-works there is the need for a clear road for wheelchairs and prams, etc. Kerb should be raised on the south side.	
2 Church Square	change of use of flatted dwelling to 4 person HMO	NC
Westoun, Wardlaw Gardens	replacement windows at Flat 3 – replace 3 white PVC with timber sash and case windows	Commend BR
17 Howard Place	internal alterations to listed building, removal of internal partitions only	
69 Younger Gardens	conservatory extension	N.C.
68 Pipeland Road	use of land for siting two portable office buildings (Fife Primary Care Trust)	N.C.
Kinaldy	erection of a single farmhouse, which will be for agricultural purposes	N.C.
6-7 Pilmour Links	retrospective ELBC for fascia signage	N.C.
Vodafone	have contacted us about Station 4 East – a mast in Hope Park Church – committee has said informally that it would prefer the mast to share the existing mast at Grange Road.	IG

Appendix H – Road Works Objection

Written by Penny Uprichard

Road Works

The Planning Committee of the Community Council wishes to OBJECT to many of the proposed roadworks and alterations.

The roadworks and alterations at the roundabout beside Hope Park Church are obviously going to cause considerable difficulties for traffic, all the more so as they are going to last for a considerable time. When the roadway between the roundabout and Hope Street is being dealt with, the consequent diversion will take cars and lorries all round the town, causing problems in other roads on the way.

Our major concern is the reduction from two lanes to one lane on three of the four roads at the Hope Park roundabout. This will undoubtedly cause more frequent severe congestion (a) on City Brae, where the tailback traffic will presumably block the pedestrian crossing and the entrance and exit to the bus station: and (b) in Alexandra Place, where the traffic is likely to back up to the West Port. Furthermore, because of the proposed widening of the pavements, if one single car stops in Alexandra Place the traffic in the street will probably come to a standstill.

It is understood the Hope Park roundabout itself will have a two-inch 'sill'. As drivers are used to a more or less flat roundabout, this may not be very safe.

If, as is frequently the case, a hearse and funeral cars are parked outside the church, there will be a considerable reduction in space on the road, and the one remaining lane will be partially obstructed. What will happen during the period when this part of the road is shut?

We consider that the barriers to be installed round the roundabout are unnecessary and very unsightly. They look authoritarian and unwelcoming.

We also understand that a 'hump' is to be installed in Double Dykes Road. This is very awkward for bicycles, and can be dangerous. Why is this necessary? Double Dykes Road is only two lanes, it is not a road for either speeding or passing other cars. I am told that traffic is supposed to use Argyle Street. How can cars know this? Drivers will only meet the hump when they have turned into Double Dykes Road. Double Dykes Road is the natural route to use from the Hepburn Gardens area, and the return route avoids the very busy roundabout at the West Port. What is Double Dykes Road for if not to release some traffic from Argyle Street? Have Kinburn Museum and the Commissioner for Information been consulted about this? Presumably they both want their presence to be known to the general public.

Why are the refuges being enlarged? Is there any advantage in bigger refuges?

Overall the proposals look as if they have been put together in haste. They will cause worse problems and congestion in the short term and the long term. Although we realise that Fife Council sees it as its duty to make life hard for the motorist, these proposals should be subject to thorough public scrutiny. Rather than the usual piecemeal approach, they should be considered as part of the Area Transportation Plan.

Appendix I – David Russell Hall Extension

Letter of objection by the planning committee

Proposed erection of three four-storey student residential blocks to the north of David Russell Hall, Buchanan Gardens, St Andrews.

We write as members of the Planning Committee of the Community Council to comment on the above application and to object to one aspect of it.

Housing context

We need no persuading of the general desirability of providing more student accommodation in St Andrews. It is true that the University performs very well compared to other UK universities in the proportion of students it houses in its own accommodation. Nevertheless, it is equally clear that the housing problems of the town would be much less acute if, over the last fifteen years, the proportion of the general housing stock of the town occupied by students had not expanded so rapidly to its current level in excess of 10%.

Impact on Green Belt and views of town

Although the proposed site falls within an area designated for university use in the 1996 Local Plan, the Community Council has a long history of opposing developments which would detract from views from the west of the town, and its medieval skyline. We do not, however, object on these grounds on this occasion since it would appear that the proposed new blocks would not interfere with views from the Strathkinness High Road as it would be screened by the houses on that road.

Objection: Lack of parking provision

Our objection to this application is to the absence of any new parking provision. It is very unfortunate that Fife Council has to determine this application before the impact of the present redevelopment can be objectively assessed. Our judgement, which the East Area Development Committee did not accept, was that under 200 parking spaces would prove to be woefully inadequate for the present redevelopment of around 750 bed-spaces. It follows, a fortiori, that we do not believe that this provision can also cater for a further three blocks, containing 198 more bed-spaces. To date, we have only seen part of a year with a partially occupied site, and have no experience yet of the summer months, so there is little hard evidence. We are, however, aware that there was the predictable parking on verges when students returned at the start of the session.

Dubious assertions and statistics

Paragraphs 3.21 to 3.25 of the "Planning Supporting Statement" for this application, prepared by Halliday Fraser Munro, are riddled with inaccuracies and imprecision on the transportation aspects of this application. A Travel Plan produced by the applicants in 2002 asserting that "car parking at David Russell Halls (sic) is underused" may indicate forethought on their part, but is scarcely independent corroboration. There is no reference to which times of the year this is thought to apply. The supposed statistic that 88% of students walk to lectures might just be plausible for those in town centre residences, but is completely unrealistic for David Russell Hall. The assertion that only 2% of students go to lectures by car will not receive much credence from anyone who has observed the roads on the North Haugh, particularly when Arts lectures are scheduled there.

Green Travel

Most cyclists within the University community will greet with a wry smile the report in paragraphs 3.22 of the "Planning Supporting Statement" that the University's Green Travel Plan has implemented a range of measures including cycle facilities i.e. paths, parking and showers. To date the proportion who enjoy such facilities is minimal. In granting consent to the redevelopment that is currently underway, Fife Council weakly accepted a University proposal for a very circuitous cycle route from David Russell Hall to town. Experience so far indicates that, as the Community Council predicted, this is doing very little to attract cyclists away from Hepburn Gardens and Buchanan Gardens. Indeed, over the winter months, it has been evident that not even the rather large proportion of student cyclists who feel unable to afford cycle-lights appear to consider it a good idea to use the off-road route. When will Fife Council insist on the more direct off-road route that is required?

A "car free" development

What should we understand by the proposal that "Phase 1(c) of the student accommodation will be car free"? In other contexts, it might be expected that occupants of a car-free development will be required to sign legally-binding agreements that they will not own cars. Will the student occupants of these blocks be required to do this? How is it anticipated that they will transport their belongings at the beginnings and ends of sessions? Will the parental cars create worse traffic problems than were seen last September? How will these blocks be used over the summer? Is the University saying it will not use them for conferences nor rent them out to tourists? If, on the other hand, such uses are intended, how will the blocks remain car free? Parking on the North Haugh might work for some well-regimented conferences, but it is hard to see tourists obeying exhortations not to bring their cars to the site. To us, the "car free" proposal looks like another ingenious device for attempting to secure planning consent. Fife Council needs to demonstrate that it can frame and enforce conditions or agreements to give the notion substance. Unthinking care-free acceptance of an ill-defined "car free" proposal would result in the public being misled, and the local residents suffering the consequences.

Appendix J – Voting Systems in Scotland

Analysis and report by Ken Fraser

The Scottish Civic Forum has sent us a summary of the aims of the Commission on Boundary Differences and Voting Systems in Scotland, including its ten questions, responses to which are invited by 15th April. The Council could choose not to respond, or not to respond to all the questions. As they are somewhat controversial, all I can do is to offer suggested responses in the hope that the Council might agree with at least the majority of them.

In an ideal world, we should have, at each level, electoral systems which were fair between parties, easy to understand, and used consistent methods and boundaries. In the real world, it is not possible to achieve all these at once. One of them has to take precedence over the others. My own preference is for a system which allows a near approach to proportionality of seats with votes cast for each party. The Commission's consultation document takes a similar view. Others may disagree.

The various voting systems

We have at present three systems in Scotland.

1. For Westminster and local elections the first-past-the-post system. This is simple, but very unproportional, heavily favouring the largest party.
2. For the Scottish Parliament we have a combination of first-past-the-post and regional lists. *If* the numbers elected on the lists are high enough (as in fact they are) this system is fair, but some voters do not understand it, and there is confusion about the two types of MSPs.
3. For the European Parliament a pure list system is used. This is the most proportional *if* the number of MEPs in a constituency is large enough, as it is in Scotland with 7. It is also simpler than the Scottish Parliament system, but it requires large constituencies. In addition:
4. The Executive now proposes the Single Transferable Vote for the local elections from 2007 on. It would be a proportional system *if* the number of councillors in a ward were large: however, the Executive proposes 3 or 4 per ward, which is not enough to achieve anything like proportionality in a country with 4 major parties and 2 or 3 significant smaller ones. But clearly it is much more proportional than the present system.

As there will in future be 59 Westminster constituencies compared with 73 Holyrood constituencies, the boundaries of both cannot be the same unless radical alterations were made to the Scottish Parliament. The Parliament has rejected a reduction in its own numbers. The Commission consultation paper describes several methods (too complex to specify here) of maintaining the number of MSPs while adopting Westminster boundaries: some would make the system much less proportional, some more so.

The Commission's questions

In the light of these alternatives, if fairness is seen as the most important factor, I should suggest replying as follows (I have abbreviated some of the longer questions):

1. How important would it be to have the same boundaries for Holyrood and Westminster elections ?

A. We believe the most important aspect is that the elections should produce a result which fairly represents the distribution of votes. The constituency boundaries are secondary to that.

2. Do you experience difficulty in deciding who to approach (councillors, MSPs, MPs, etc) on a particular issue ?

A. No.

3. If there were to be common boundaries for Westminster and Holyrood elections, how should it be done ?

A. We believe that any proposed change should make the system more rather than less proportional.

- 4 (i). How important is it to have close identification between elected representatives and specific areas ?

A. It is important, but we recognise that it poses difficulties for all proportional voting systems.

- 4 (ii) What is the maximum size and population for effective representation ?

A. This would vary with the level of election. At the local government level, we would be reluctant to consider a ward larger than St Andrews and district.

5. Would it be useful if other public bodies (e.g. health boards) fitted constituency boundaries ?

A. Yes.

6. What impact will four different voting systems have on voters ?

A. It is likely to confuse some of them.

7. What is your view on the voting systems for the elections to the Scottish and European Parliaments ?

A. These both produce approximately proportional results, and we believe this proportionality should be maintained. In the case of the European Parliament, it is unlikely that any other system than the existing one could be more proportional.

8. Will electors be confused by having to use two different systems on the same day for the Scottish Parliament and local government elections ?

A. Yes. But if the elections were held on different days, they need not be far apart.

9. Have you experienced difficulties in the representative roles of the two kinds of MSPs ?

A. Usually not, although there has been a tendency to underuse the list MSPs.

10. Are there improvements that could be made in the way MSPs are elected ?

A. No system can fully achieve all the aims set out by the Commission, but we repeat our plea that any proposed alteration should not make the system less proportional.

K.F. 3/3/05

Appendix K – Environmental Marketplace

From Kate Hughes, St Andrews Locality Manager

Fife Council and partner organisations are keen to pilot an environmental “marketplace”, in partnership with a local community group(s). The public event is intended to promote environmental awareness and action and sustainability issues and to tackle fuel poverty.

It is proposed that organisations from the statutory, voluntary and private sectors would provide stalls with information, advice, samples etc across a range of issues. This could include information on solar tiles and panels, domestic wind generators, composting bins and wormeries, insulation products, recycling issues; fair-trade products; cycling, walking and public transport; grants for home energy efficiency improvements and central heating installation; tackling fuel poverty ... And any other areas which community partner organisations consider would be of interest to local people.

The Council would approach the other agencies to enlist their participation and produce promotional posters. We are seeking a community partner to suggest an appropriate venue and to host and promote the event so that it reaches as many local people, young and old, as possible. We anticipate a one-day event, possibly from 2pm-7pm but we would take our community partner's advice on timing and on date. We do not anticipate piloting the event before late April/May.

Having piloted the event, we would then evaluate it, learn lessons, and offer it to other community partners across East Fife.

For this pilot, we would welcome the participation of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews's Community Council as a partner and host organisation. If you would like to discuss this proposal which is still at a very early stage, please contact me.

Appendix L – NE Water Customer Panel

From Ian Smith, Convenor, Water Customer Panels.

You are kindly invited to attend, or be represented at a meeting of the North East Water Customer Panel to be held on:

Wednesday 30 March 2005 @ 2.00pm, Scores Hotel, 76 The Scores, St Andrews.

The meeting will provide an opportunity to discuss development constraints within the Scottish water industry, and current activities. You will also be able to record any matters of concern and importance to your organisation about water and wastewater services, supplies, charges, renewals and investment planning etc.

Please let the office know if you are able to attend, or if you are nominating a representative to attend, by contacting Kath Cummins on [01786-451606] or email to info@watercustomer.org.

Appendix M – Temporary Footpath

From Bruce Ryan on behalf of members of community council, to Kate Hughes (locality Manager) and Cllr Bill Sangster

I write on behalf of members of St Andrews Community Council about the temporary pedestrian route around the ongoing work at the flats on the corner of West Port/Bridge Street. This ‘footpath’ is impossible for people in wheelchairs or battery-cars and for parents with prams or buggies, especially double-width buggies. The alternative (crossing City Road, Argyle Street and then Bridge Street) isn't practical or safe for such people.

We have seen similar problems at this site in Autumn 2003. I append an email from Pete Lindsay from that time. [October 03 Appendix E]

Can you or Fife Council please put pressure on the contractors to provide a safe pedestrian route around this building work, including installation of necessary traffic controls?

Response from Kate Hughes, Locality Manager

I contacted my colleague in Transportation Services about the above area and the CC's concerns.

He replied that the footway has given them problems from the start of the works. The current pedestrian walkway is approximately 1.1m wide. Double buggies are 0.9m wide and would be able to use the walkway. With regard the electric wheelchairs, the contractor actually spoke to the gentleman who regularly uses the footway in his electric buggy prior to setting up the temp footway and the gentleman was happy with the proposed arrangement.

The ideal solution would be for the temp footway to be 2m wide, however in order to allow two way traffic on Bridge Street this has had to be reduced to 1.1m at the West Port roundabout. The alternative would be to erect three way traffic signals. These would cause considerable traffic delays and congestion, as has previously been experienced. Richard believes the current arrangement to be sufficient, however will monitor the situation to ensure that pedestrian safety is not compromised.

Hopefully the works will be completed soon and the temporary footway removed.

I am sorry I cannot be more helpful

Appendix N – Phone Box Closures

Advisement from Douglas Murray, Secretary, Association of Scottish Community Councils.

Consultation in respect of Universal Service Obligations (USO) and Public Call Boxes (PCB) by Ofcom, the Communications Regulator.

This consultation has particular relevance to Community Councils, as they are currently deemed to have a statutory right of veto on the removal of the last PCB from a site. The use of that veto, and its continuing statutory effect, is being re-considered. Responses to the consultation must be made to Ofcom by 21 March 2005, preferably by email to alan.pridmore@ofcom.org.uk The paper runs to over 60 pages, but with a summary available – both at www.ofcom.org.uk The ASCC can provide a pdf file of both, by email if this method is more convenient.

The ASCC has undertaken to try to make community councils aware of this paper, and the following is a brief (4 page) summary of the views being sought that are likely to be of specific interest to local communities. You may wish to be selective on the questions you wish to answer. It would help the ASCC complete a detailed submission if you copy us with your response.

The introduction to the consultation sets the legal framework, and the increasing availability (99%) of people with access to fixed telephony services, compared to 77% in 1984. The principle duty placed on Ofcom is to further the interests of consumers, with specific regard to the elderly, disabled, those on low incomes and the different interests of those living in rural and urban areas. Historically, both BT and Kingston as service providers, have subsidised certain of these from higher margin services which are now subject to open competition. This is the first part, of a two stage consultation seeking views on various policy options being outlined.

There are three questions on who, and how, particular subsidised services should be funded and organised in the future, which could include direct or indirect levies, direct government funding, and increased reliance on new mobile technologies.

Questions 4 and 5 relate to special tariff scheme proposals by BT for low user, and lower income households, while Q6 relates to problems associated with the 1 million disconnections made each year by BT. While BT have a range of services available, such as pre-pay options, Ofcom believe that these are not widely, nor effectively promoted.

Section 5, Public Call Boxes (PCBs) is highly significant for community councils. Where the last PCB is being recommended for removal from a site, the community council has 'the local veto' if it objects. They MUST be consulted. This has previously not been contentious, but PCBs are becoming increasing unprofitable (60%), while 43% of BT's proposed removals are being rejected through the use of the local veto. The definition of a 'site' is given in an example of two PCBs within 100metres walking distance – one may be removed without consultation.

Ofcom has been reviewing the rules to establish an appropriate balance between adequate local provision, while enabling BT to respond to changing commercial circumstances. There are approx. 75,000 PCBs in the UK and of these BT estimates that over 45,000 are unprofitable and that the average running cost per PCB is £1,914. However it is also stated that almost 20,000 (out of the 45,000) PCBs do cover their direct operational costs. There must be a 42 day period for representations, and if a community council submits a letter of objection to the proposal, providing reasons, the local veto has effect and a PCB cannot be removed.

There are two main sources of contention – the reasonableness of objections and the difficulties of contacting all potential objectors.

With the first, BT have indicated some extreme examples of objections.

- A PCB with income of £1.40 per annum in an area of 19 households, and no calls to the emergency services, yet the objection was that it provided a 'useful landmark' and needed for emergency calls

- The light from the PCB provided a useful beacon on dark nights
- The light from the PCB illuminated a local council notice board at night.

On consultations

- BT have had difficulty in accessing contact details of, and areas covered, by bodies such as community councils (Informal discussions have been held between the ASCC and BT on the need for a digitalised mapping system for community councils in Scotland)
- The 42 day notice period is insufficient to allow time to raise objections
- Some MPs say they should be consulted
- BT has expressed concern that it has no right of appeal.

Ofcom has identified three approaches for consideration:

- Retain, but modify the current arrangements: local public bodies would keep their veto but the process would be made more transparent, accountable and consistent;
- Define a set of USO PCBs which would be protected from removal; or
- Remove the existing Direction (no local veto).

Ofcom favours the **first approach**. In order to address some of the problems identified, modifications are being proposed:

- The definition of a site
- Public Bodies that must be consulted
- The consultation process
- The reasons provided by public bodies
- An appeal process.

Site definition is subjective, with a rural/urban split in terms of expectations – e.g. 5 minutes walk in an urban area, while 20/30 minutes in rural areas appears reasonable from Ofcom research.

It is suggested that the number of public bodies be reduced. In Scotland this would mean that only the 32 Local Authorities would be directly consulted, but that they in turn would have an obligation to consult with other public bodies (community councils) and the local community. (The absolute community council veto would be lost in favour of whatever approach is decided by the local authority).

The consultation process would change with delegation to Local Authorities, to give adequate notification to communities likely to be affected, and to take account of representations made to it within a specified period. The current period of 42 days could be extended to a total of 90 days.

Objections submitted by local authorities must be justifiable, not discriminate unduly, and be proportionate to what it is intended to achieve and be transparent. Ofcom would develop a set of guidelines which could include number of households in area, distance to next nearest PCB, housing type in area, incidence of vandalism, profitability of PCB, volume of calls, including emergencies and mobile phone coverage at the site.

Objections would be subject to appeal, with the Competition Appeals Tribunal being the appropriate body.

Finally, if this approach is used, should revenue generated by a PCB be taken into account, and that BT, although required to consult, could take account of objections, but the veto might not apply. Ofcom invite comments on the above (preferred) approach, which can be summarised as under:

- Principle of delegating power for objecting to removal of PCBs to the 32 Local Authorities (in Scotland)
- Whether there are other bodies that could undertake this delegated power
- An amendment to the definition of 'site'
- The appropriate public bodies to have the power to object (e.g community councils/community associations submissions to local authorities only)
- The consultation period
- Factors to be used in guidance for objecting
- The use and level of a revenue threshold (per PCB)

The **Second Approach** is to define a Universal Service PCB.

Ofcom would develop a set of rules to make an algorithm (or program) that would be used to determine if BT could remove any PCB, without consultation, and no local veto. Some factors that would be used are already described above – household numbers, vandalism, and profitability etc. Certain defined PCBs could be protected from removal, but others would be retained or removed at BT's commercial discretion.

A **Third Approach** is to remove the existing Direction which assumes that detailed requirements would be removed. However there would be a general requirement that BT (and Kingston) meet the reasonable needs of PCB users. There would be no local veto. Ofcom would have normal enforcement powers if it considered that BT (and Kingston) was not meeting the overall obligation.

Ofcom are not supporting Approaches Two and Three.

There are other issues that are open for discussion, including a need to reduce the costs through vandalism and theft from cash boxes. BT are suggesting a basic cashless PCB, offering at least emergency, operator and freephone services that could replace a normal PCB. Ofcom can see benefits, but have some reservations. Any such replacement would have to be with the agreement of local bodies.

Should cash payment facilities be retained in the last PCB at a site (with reasons), and comments are invited on BT's proposal for an emergency and freephone replacement.

The consultation paper also discusses issues relative to customers with disabilities.

These include:

- Requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995
- Text Relay Service
- Video Relay Service
- Web-based access to the relay service
- Alternative text formats
- Payphone accessibility – e.g wheelchair access, visually impaired and hearing aid compatibility.
- Acceptable formats for bills, payments and contracts for those with a disability.

There are also issues over Functional Internet Access, which will be of interest for those with narrowband connections, and the speed of access.

Following the end of this consultation period, Ofcom intends to publish a Statement and then to consult on any proposed amendments to the Universal Service Obligations, later in 2005.

Appendix O – Overseas Links

Email from Lajos Tamás Szalay, President, Albannach Scottish Cultural Society (Hungary), with interstitial reply from Pete Lindsay

First of all, please forgive my English, as it is not my mother language.

It is a lot better than my Hungarian!

Secondly, I know that you are a very busy person so I will try to be as brief as possible.

My name is Lajos Tamás Szalay. I am a 24-year-old political journalist working for the oldest daily newspaper in Hungary called Népszava. Last year I was awarded 'Journalist of the Year' at the paper.

When I was a teenager, I fell in love with Scotland. Last year I wrote a travel guide to Scotland – which was a charity project, as all my royalties went to a foundation that helps blind children in Hungary. I would like to develop my relationship with the Scots and Scotland even further. To this end I have been learning the Gaelic Language with the help of Sabhal Mór Ostaig.

Firstly I would like to open the world of Scottish culture to Hungary and Eastern Europe. As an important step, I would like to create a Scottish Cultural Office in Budapest, the capital of Hungary. The recent enlargement of the EU to include Hungary is a valuable opportunity for cultural interchange and tourist visits from Eastern Europe as this is largely an untapped market for Scotland at the moment. Budapest could be the centre of this new region. I think that there is a lot of similarity between the Hungarian and Scottish history, culture and mentality.

I have created the "Albannach Scottish Cultural Society" in Hungary, which would publish articles about Scottish events, help the connection between our countries and help the Hungarian get acquainted with Scottish culture. As the first step, we opened a central website (www.skocia.hu), which could be the virtual bridge across the borders. It would be a great honour for us, if we could build out a great relationship with your city council and could promote this town and region for the Hungarian tourists.

I think you should get in touch with the tourism professionals here, so I'm copying this reply to Patrick Laughlin <plaughlin@kftb.ossian.net> who is the head tourism man in these parts. He'll be able to help you with this.

Maybe we could build out also a twinning-town programme somehow in the future.

I very much regret that I have to say that twinning with St Andrews is somewhere between rather unlikely and practically impossible.

The current attitude here is that, because St Andrews is so popular with twinning requests (yours is the fourth or fifth enquiry in the last twelve months), it would be impractical to agree to all and that it would be unfair to reject some and agree to others. As a result the policy to decline all formal twinning approaches, no matter how appropriate or the commitment at the other end. There are many other fine towns and cities in Scotland that have a much more open policies.

I hope that our policy won't put you off; St Andrews is far more welcoming to individuals.

I am looking forward to hearing from you in due course and thank you in advance for your time.

Appendix P: Fife Coast and Countryside Trust Meeting Notes

Notes by Pete Lindsay

Meeting was attended by Pete Lindsay and Archie Strachan, for St Andrews, with representatives of the Ramblers and other coastal communities.

The point was strongly made, and acknowledged, that the path is unusable at Kinkell at present and must be brought up to a walkable standard.

Trust staff revealed that Fife Council have recently established that there is a legal right-of-way though the caravan site, which will allow bypassing of the infamous slip.

They are aware however that the St Andrews–Crail section of the path will never be a smooth tarmac path suitable for all classes of visitors in all weathers. It will also always require a higher level of maintenance than some other stretches.

Trust doesn't have huge funds, can't depend purely on grants from the founders as priorities change – looking for commercial sponsorship, persuade eg St Andrews Bay & Kingsbarns Golf Course to maintain at least 'their' sections of the path, preferably more.

It is not the intention that the path be uniform standard throughout its length.

Emphasised that path is run in co-operation with the landowners, who *still own the land*.

Trust is concentrating on publicity and promotion of the path due to fears that a lack of focus will be a result of the new single national tourist board.

Looking for volunteers for a Fife-wide co-ordinating committee of perhaps 12 members meeting 2-3 times a year, and perhaps local groups to both establish priorities of local communities in local area and engage businesses, communities and individuals with the running of 'their' section. This is all tentative; details to be worked out when they have some community reps.

Appendix Q – Community Councils Seminar

Linda Purdie, Team Leader (Administration), Law & Admin

Community Council Seminar – Saturday 25th June 2005

I am writing to give you advance notification that a Seminar for Community Councils is being arranged to take place on Saturday 25th June, 2005 in Fife House, Glenrothes.

Planning for the event is in the early stages, but it is anticipated the Seminar will run from around 10am till 4pm and will include lunch.

If there are any specific topics your Community Council would like to see covered at the seminar, either through a presentation or workshop discussion, I would be grateful if you would advise me as soon as possible, and not later than 25th March 2005, to enable these to be considered by the Planning Group in drawing up a Programme for the day.

Appendix R – Bus Stop Shelters

Written by Bruce Ryan

We very much favour ease of use of public transport. Hence we are very pleased with the general proposal to provide 16 bus shelters and are very pleased that money has been found for so many shelters. We would like to receive information on the style(s) of bus shelters to be installed. We note that the shelter in St Mary's place has seats that are too high for all but very tall people to comfortably use.

We are entirely happy with 12 of the 16 proposed locations for bus shelters on described in your letter and indicated on the accompanying maps. However, we would like to comment on the following four:

- No 226 (Scooniehill Road/Jamie Anderson Place) The proposed new shelter would be on the wide strip of pavement on the east side of this junction, just where the bus stop sign is now. While we understand why this wide-pavement location has been proposed, we feel that a shelter in this location could impede the views of drivers turning out of Jamie Anderson Place onto Scooniehill Road: such drivers need to see that there is a suitable break in traffic approaching this junction from the east.

We suggest that the shelter could be located to the west side of this junction. (although the pavement may not be wide enough on this side.) Alternatively, the shelter could be further to the east of the junction, on the pavement bordering the parking bay.

- No 418(Pipelands Road/Health Centre) The proposed new shelter would be on the south side of the entrance to the Health Centre car park. We feel that a shelter in this location could impede the view of drivers turning out of the car park onto Pipelands Road.

We suggest that the shelter could be located to the south of the junction, on the pavement bordering the parking bay. This would be much more convenient for people visiting the surgery.

- No 473 (Buchanan Gardens/David Russell Hall) The proposed new shelter would be on the west side of this junction, just where the bus stop sign is now. We feel that a shelter in this location could impede the view of drivers turning out of David Russell Hall onto Buchanan Gardens. We suggest that the shelter could be located to the east side of this junction.

If any of the above locations are essential, the shelters should be as transparent as possible (i.e. no advertising hoardings). However, non-transparent waiting passengers could still impede drivers' views. Hence our suggestions for alternative locations.

- No 507 (Shoolbraids/Forgan Place) The location of the existing bus stop is incorrectly marked on the map (drawing IPT/04/051). We have no problem with a bus shelter being installed in a suitable location on the west side of Shoolbraids.

Appendix S – Fife Fire & Rescue Service

Response by Bruce Ryan on behalf of community council

Having read the Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP), would you be kind enough to spend a little more of your valuable time to answer the following questions.		
1. Are You		Member of the Public
2. Did you find the plan easy to read and structured in a logical manner		Yes
Do you agree that the Fire & Rescue Authority ...		
3. ... adopt the IRMP process?		Agree
4. ... develop a risk assessment based methodology in determining future resource provision for fire and emergency cover?		Agree
5. While the Fire & Rescue Authority will continue to take into account national and local initiatives, do you think that there are other initiatives or partnerships that the Fire Authority should take into account as part of the IRMP?		No Opinion
6. ... re-deploy resources to drive down the number of primary and secondary fires?		Agree
7. ... re-deploy resources to reduce accidental dwelling fires and subsequent injuries?		Agree
8. ... implement initiatives to improve the reduction in the number of hoax calls?		Strongly Agree
9. ... review the appliance response to Automatic Fire Alarm incidents and where appropriate reduce that response?		Agree
10. ... should consider introducing financial charges for attending incidents as a result of faulty fire alarms?		Agree
11. ... introduce a formal call challenging (management) system for emergency calls where appropriate?		No Opinion
12. ... reduce the appliance response to an incident as a result of call management procedures when deemed applicable?		Agree
13. ... implement new local performance standards for appliance attendance at incidents?		No Opinion
14. ... review the use of blue lights and sirens when responding to incidents where there is no risk to life or property?		Disagree
15. ... review the provision of aerial appliances in order to determine actual requirements and the most appropriate location?		Agree
16. ... re-deploy resources to support initiatives that target those specific section of the community most at risk from fire?		Agree
17. ... implement initiatives and allocate resources to working with young people and youth groups?		Agree
18. Please add any further comments to the Plan		

Appendix T – Planning Meeting – 28.2.05

Present: I Goudie, B Christie, G Davidson, P Lindsay, R Douglas, P Uprichard. Apologies: B Ryan

Previous application

4 Playfair Terrace appeal refused, undesirable precedent.

Present applications

33 Fraser Avenue	change of use of open space to garden ground, and front extension to dwellinghouse - send standard letter, plus 'We are concerned at the fact that the extension greatly overlaps the adjacent property, which could blight future residents' views.'	Obj PU
Duke's Course	Alterations to clubhouse	N.C.
Duke's Course	Erection of buggy shelter	N.C.
8a Park Street	5 person HMO	N.C.
7 Abbey Court	4 person HMO	N.C.
3 Kinness Place	6 person HMO	N.C.
2E Murray Park	6 person HMO	N.C.
133b South Street	3 person HMO	N.C.
7 Greenside Court	3 person HMO	N.C.
127 Market Street	externally illuminated lettering and projecting sign	N.C.
5-7 Pilmour Links (House of Bruar)	form aluminum frame round timber signboard	N.C.
29 Brewster Place	single storey side extension to dwellinghouse	N.C.
Duke's Course	remodelling of golf course, including greens, tees bunkers etc. Cosmetic changes to parts of golf course.	
Grange Road	erect 12.5 metre monopole telecom mast, including 3 antennae, control and electrical cabinets (amended proposal), site at Grange Road, St. Andrews. It is suggested that Fife Council should ask for information on the levels of microwave radiation which will be experienced by the closest residents, i.e.	Obj PU

	those in Irvine Crescent, at ground floor and at first floor level (bedrooms), so that it can be established that broadcasts from this mast are within the agreed national standards. The Planning Committee suggests that unless there are compelling technical reasons that would prevent it, that the mast should (a) share the pole with the other nearby mast and (b) be moved to the other side of the trees and (c) should be moved further away from the road. There is an umbrella effect, and the people further up the hill will not be below the umbrella	
53 Hepburn Gardens	extension to dwellinghouse (amended submission)	N.C.
Bridge Street, 3 West Port Court	change of use of flat to HMO	N.C.
Feddinch	Short course (to come). Transformer, changing rooms, toilets, greenkeepers' hut. Application for golf course and area (not including accommodation)	N.C.

N.B. Professor George Hazel said, in a study for Fife Council, that rail links could be funded by associated development, housing co-operatives, etc.

Appendix U – Grange Road Phone Mast

Objection written by Penny Uprichard

05/00409/EFULL – Erect 12.5 metre Monopole Telecom Mast, including 3 Antennae, Control and Electrical Cabinets, (amended proposal) site at Grange Road, St Andrews

The Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council wishes to OBJECT to the above application.

The Planning Committee suggests that Fife Council should ask for information on the levels of microwave radiation which will be experienced by the closest residents, i.e. those in Irvine Crescent, at ground floor and at first floor level (bedrooms), so that it can be established that broadcasts from this mast are within the agreed national standards.

The Planning Committee also suggests that unless there are compelling technical reasons that would prevent it, the mast should (a) share the pole with the other nearby mast and (b) be moved to the other side of the trees and (c) should be moved further away from the road. There is an umbrella effect, and the people further up the hill will not be below the umbrella.

Appendix V – Change of Use of Open Space, Fraser Av.

Objection written by Penny Uprichard

05/00213/EFULL – Change of Use of Open Space to Garden Ground and Front Extension to Dwelling House, 33 Fraser Avenue, St Andrews

The Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council wishes to OBJECT to the above application.

The Planning Committee considers that this loss of public land would be unacceptable, particularly at a time when so many small green spaces in the town are being lost or absorbed into developments.

We are also concerned at the fact that the extension greatly overlaps the adjacent property, which could blight future residents' views.

Correspondence

Date	from	subject
08/02/2005	Entrust	Newsletter
12/02/2005	Scottish Exec Inquiry Reporters	10 Argyle St
12/02/2005	Pilgrim Care	Care Development proposals
12/02/2005	Scottish Water	Mains Improvement
14/02/2005	Record Playground Equipment	Advert
15/02/2005	Scottish Executive Environment Group	Water Service Consultations
15/02/2005	Scottish Civic Forum	Funding Crisis
15/02/2005	New Gilston Primary School	Funding Info Request
16/02/2005	Harlequin/Vodafone	Base station : Hope Park Church
21/02/2005	Scottish Executive Inquiry Reporters Unit	Planning Appeal 4 Playfair Terrace
21/02/2005	Scottish Information Commissioner	Your Right To Know – info booklet
21/02/2005	The Local Channel	Free Webspace
21/02/2005	Postwatch Scotland	Newsletter Spring 05
21/02/2005	St Andrews in Focus	Receipt
22/02/2005	Links Trust	Committees & Working parties
23/02/2005	Volunteer Centre Fife	eVOLVe newsletter
24/02/2005	Scottish National Heritage	Outdoor Access Code
25/02/2005	Ted Brocklebank MSP	World Heritage Site
25/02/2005	East Area Services Committee	Agenda 2/3/05

25/02/2005	Scottish Water	Charges Announcement
03/03/2005	Water Customer Panels	St Andrews meeting
03/03/2005	Fife Council Local Office	Environmental Marketplace
03/03/2005	Development Service	Draft Structure Plan
04/03/2005	Scottish Executive Justice Dept	Standing Up to Anti-Social Behaviour Awards
04/03/2005	St Andrews in Focus	March/April 2005
04/03/2005	Law & Admin Service	Community Council Seminar 25/6/05
05/03/2005	Michael Buchanan	Update to last months comments
05/03/2005	Development Service	Draft Local Plan
