

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council Agenda – April 2005

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm Monday 4th April 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/>)

0. Co-option

1. Apologies

Dennis Macdonald, Stuart Holdsworth, Simon Atkins.

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. Town Centre Residents' Alliance

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

Appendix A: 14 March

6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

6.1. Fair Shares Fair

Cancelled due to ill-health.

6.2. St Andrews Walks Project

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

6.3. Phone Boxes

Appendix B: response to OfCom consultation

6.4. Patras Book

6.x. Any other matters arising...

7. New Business

7.1. 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.

7.2. 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?

7.3. 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?

7.4. Voting systems

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

7.5. 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web presence is limited to one page at www.saint-andrews.co.uk/CC/index.htm, kindly hosted by Ken Cochrane (a little out of date it gives Frank Riddell as Chair) and the administration and events pages at www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrews/events and www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/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.

7.6. 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.

7.7. Honorary Citizen Proposal

Appendix D: proposals by Keith McCartney for the award of the title Honorary Citizen to Jack Nicklaus and a commemorative quach to Peter Thomson.

Appendix E: Honoured/Honorary Citizen procedure.

7.8. Be a part of Fife's Future

Posters advertising the consultation meetings on the local plan etc are available. Please take one (at least) and put them up somewhere public.

7.9. Doors Open Day

Appendix F: information and request from the Fife Co-ordinator.

7.10. Antisocial Behaviour Strategy – draft

Fife Community Safety Partnership would like comments on this paper by 15th April. Also available at http://www.fife-direct.org.uk/uploadfiles/Publications/c64_ConsultativeDraftSummaryASBStrategyver05100305.doc

7.11. Pressured Area Status Consultation

Appendix G: Housing Service would like our comments on proposals to suspend "Right to Buy". They attach tenants' questionnaires for information.

7.12. St Andrews in Focus

Flora Sewyn, the Editor/Proprietor asks if the new community council would like to continue the previous arrangement of paying for (heavily discounted) "advertorial" space in this magazine: around 400 words or pictures to about a third to a half page. If so, the deadline for the July / Aug issue of the magazine is 28 May.

The following for information:

7.13. Firth of Tay & Eden Estuary Special Area of Conservation

Scottish Natural Heritage write that the SAC designation came into force 17 March 2005. The site designations for: Estuaries; Intertidal mudflats and sandbanks; Phoc Vitulins (the common seal); and subtidal sandbanks. More information at <http://www.snh.gov.uk/>

7.14. An Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes (Fife Supplement)

This glossy, illustrated booklet from Scottish Natural Heritage covers St Andrews Links, Craigtoun Park and, slightly further afield, Cambo, amongst a 16 Fife locations.

7.15. Bell Pettigrew Museum

The museum in the Bute Building has been refurbished and will be open over the universty summer vacation (early June – mid September) from 2–5pm Tuesdays and Thursdays.

8. Reports from Office Bearers

8.1. Chair

8.2. Treasurer

8.2.1. Interim Report

Appendix H

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. Environmental Marketplace

It was suggested to Fife Council that this otherwise interesting idea was poorly timed with the current consultation load, but should be raised again later.

8.3.2. Community Councillor Declaration

I didn't quite answer Ian Goudie's query at the inaugural meeting whether you *have* to sign the declaration that you'll be a good, well-behaved community councillor. It is covered in the Scheme for community councils, which you should all have, item 5.2. which requires that the declaration is signed and returned to Fife Council within two months of the election, or your place is vacated.

You can get the full Scheme from Fife Council at
http://www.fifedirect.org.uk/uploadfiles/Publications/c64_t4z5qb.doc

9. Reports

9.1. From Committees

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 Minutes

Planning Meeting – 14.3.05

Present: I Goudie, K Fraser, J A Peterson, P Uprichard, B Christie, R Douglas, S Atkins, P Marks, P Lindsay. Apologies: G. Davidson, B. Ryan.

There was a brief discussion on affordable housing. Mr. Peterson thought that housing mainly for rent was needed.

Previous application

24 Fordyce Court – change of use of open space – permission granted

Present applications

1.	Safeways	security fencing and gate	NC
2.	Woodlands, Kennedy Gardens	extension to flat (HMO), including demolition. Demolish existing attached store, erect new dining room and internal alterations	NC
3.	Morrisons	new signage, requires planning permission? Grant Baxter is looking into this.	
4.	28c Argyle Street	change of use to dwellinghouse to Clause 2 office (therapy)	NC
5.	103 North Street	change of use of maisonette, develop to 3 person HMO	NC
6.	55 Windsor Gardens	extension to dwellinghouse	NC
7.	12a Queens Gardens	change of use of house and flatted dwelling to form guesthouse – 11 letting rooms	NC
8.	11 Queens Gardens	internal alterations, two listed buildings to form one guesthouse	NC
9.	College Gate	instal swipe card unit at entrance	NC
10.	45 Lade Braes	replacement windows and doors	NC

Appendix B – Response to OfCom

By Pete Lindsay

The Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council comes to this consultation from the position of agreeing that not all current PCBs are needed.

However our experience of BT's cavalier attitude to consultation, whereby the company repeatedly ignored current guidelines and made then broke agreements with our local authority (Fife Council) over PCBs, significantly hardened our position to a blanket policy of objection to any further removals. We appreciate that this is not sustainable. We would like real consultation between BT and the community over which PCBs can be removed.

Comments on:

Section 5 – Public Call Boxes ('PCB')

The Consultation Process

5.19 Consultation with specified bodies

BT have not directly approached this community council over any of their proposed removals, claiming not to know which community councils cover particular boxes – even when we had previously objected to earlier proposals.

At first BT's covering letter to the local authority they contacted instead made no mention of community councils in Scotland, but only to parish councils in England, leading to some doubt as to whether we were consultees

5.33. Understanding of the powers to object

We support the proposal for a standard letter, expanded though to give details of who can object, for what

reasons, and to whom. The incorrect information given by BT originally, and the difficulties in finding the correct information, significantly and negatively affected this community council's attitude to BT's removal proposals.

Questions related to Section 5 – Public Call Boxes ('PCB')

7. Comments are invited on the preferred approach regarding arrangements for the removal of PCBs (ie to retain but modify the existing arrangements), in particular on:

the principle of delegating power to local public bodies to object to PCB removal;

This should be retained

whether there are other bodies that could undertake this delegated power;

Any such group should be

- *Democratically accountable*
- *in addition to the current consultees not replacing them.*

an amendment to the definition of "Site";

Site could be widened from 100m, in urban environments, to perhaps 300m at most.

The suggested "5 minutes walk" is a useful guideline, providing it is reasonably leisurely, for the less athletic and non-optimal conditions, measured along suitable pedestrian routes not expecting the use of fully optimised short cuts; hence our opting for the lower end at 300m. Nonetheless actual local consultation/negotiation might lead to agreement over wider areas e.g. sites within a town centre.

the appropriate public bodies to have the power to object;

The lowest-level accountable, representative bodies. Where they exist, community councils, otherwise the appropriate unitary authority. Local government also has a rôle for the wider view even where lower level representation exists.

If BT are relieved of the requirement to directly contact e.g. Community Councils, the onus to inform community councils should be made clear to whichever council is directly contacted. Even if BT are freed of the requirement of contacting Community Councils directly, this should not be allowed to compromise the power to object to removals and other changes.

the consultation period for the public body to object;

Having experienced severe delays in notification reaching us, due to BT's policy of only approaching the local authority here (even when they have received previous objections from us), we agree that 90 days would be more realistic.

factors that might be considered in guidance for objecting;

In addition to the main factors suggested in the appendix, we feel that prominent public locations should be given more regard than just case-by-case detail as referred to in F11.

The old 'traditional' red boxes should be kept in preference to modern units purely on the practical basis that because of their more distinctive appearance they are more memorable and easily findable for casual and passing potential users.

the use and level of a revenue threshold

As most of the arguments for retention of PCB that BT wants to remove for unprofitability are social, the number and type of calls made seems a far more relevant factor than revenue. While we would not endorse the purely algorithmic approach the factors suggested for consideration would be of more value here.

8. Comments are invited on the approach to defining a Universal Service PCB, in particular on:

whether the use of an algorithm would be a practical, effective, transparent

A purely algorithmic approach would not be appropriate as it would

1. *have difficulty encompassing 'soft' social factors which are the nub of public concerns over removals.*
2. *would be unlikely to have confidence of the public and be viewed as a complexification and obfuscation of the issues.*

However as we have stated in the answer above the factors suggested for the algorithm are valid input to discussion of PCB retention.

mechanism for defining a USO PCB; and if so

No comment

the factors that might be included in the algorithm;

No comment

whether there are other alternative methods of defining a USO PCB that could be considered.

No comment

9. Should the existing requirement on BT and Kingston to offer cash payment facilities in the last PCB at a Site be retained or amended? Please give reasons.

Cash is still the most widely available and flexible method of payment and should be retained unless persistent vandalism renders it untenable at a site.

It may be that where there are several PCB sites relatively close together, not all of them need take cash.

It must be borne in mind that when cards run out, or cannot be used for some reason, it is often possible to beg or borrow cash from friends, relatives or charitable passing strangers. No one in their right mind would hand over a general payment card for someone "to make a quick call" at a distant phone box.

10. Comments are invited on the introduction of emergency and freephone call boxes. In what circumstances could they replace the PCB? Should the local public body have to consent if they are to replace the last PCB on a site?

These might well be a solution in some locations, as covered in para 5.50 but we agree that introduction would need to be with local agreement.

Appendix C – 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 D – Proposed Awards

From Keith McCartney

Proposal for the consideration of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council at its meeting in April 2005

Jack Nicklaus is certainly the greatest golfer of his generation and in terms of victories in major championships – eighteen in all, twenty if you count his victories in the US Amateur – his record is unsurpassed. This year marks his final opportunity to appear in the Open Championship as attains the age of sixty five and therefore the end of his automatic exemption from qualification as a past winner.

Jack won three Opens. Two of his victories coming at St Andrews in 1970 and 1978, only the third man in history – the others being JH Taylor and James Braid – to notch up consecutive victories here, and he acknowledged the special place our royal and ancient city holds in game when he said, "If you want to be remembered, you have to win at St Andrews."

In 1978 Jack was made an honorary member of the St Andrews Golf Club and in 1984 received an honorary degree from the University of St Andrews. With the demise of the Town Council in 1974 it was not possible for the citizens of St Andrews as a whole to honour the achievements of Jack Nicklaus in the sport so closely associated with the city.

However in 2000 the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council created two new honours – ‘*Honoured Citizen of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews*’, for those who are residents (this honour has been bestowed on Gordon Christie and the late Rev. Charles Armour) and ‘*Honorary Citizen of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews*’, for those who are non-residents. The title ‘*Honorary Citizen*’ has never been bestowed and I would propose that Jack Nicklaus be considered as its first recipient to acknowledge his place in the history of golf at the home of golf in the year he has his final opportunity to play in the game’s oldest major.

This year also marks the fiftieth anniversary of Peter Thomson winning the Open here in 1955. Since the Open Championship began in 1860, only three golfers have won three consecutive Opens on three different courses. Jamie Anderson of St Andrews had the honour of being first with wins in 1877, 1878 and 1879. Bob Ferguson of Musselburgh had victories in 1880, 1881 and 1882 and Peter Thomson, from Melbourne, Australia, became the third member of this particular ‘*triumvirate*’ with his wins in 1954, 1955 and 1956. Further victories for Peter in 1958 and 1965 elevated him into the elite group of golfers with five Open championships to their name – JH Taylor, James Braid, Thomson himself and Tom Watson, all of who achieved one less victory than Harry Vardon who achieved a record six victories.

To mark Peter Thomson’s achievements in the Open Championship on the fiftieth anniversary of his win here and in the year we once again host the championship I would propose that the Community Council consider presenting him with an inscribed quach to mark his achievements in the Open.

Appendix E – The Honoured / Honorary Citizen Award

Following a proposal from a member of the public (and former community councillor) Keith McCartney, the community council agreed in March 2000 to institute awards for

1. *Honorary Citizen of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews* when bestowed on any non-resident of St. Andrews, and
2. *Honoured Citizen of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews* when bestowed on any resident of St. Andrews.

Such an award should only be bestowed on very worthy candidates and then only on rare occasions so that the high status of the award may be maintained.

Bestowal of the award must have the approval of the majority at a full Council meeting.

Procedure

1. Candidate should be formally proposed and seconded.
2. To be successfully adopted the candidate must receive a minimum of 16 votes for, and no more than 4 votes against, out of the 23 possible in a secret ballot of all voting members of Community Council.

Award

Reception & presentation (if recipient in St Andrews) of:

- i) Scroll or certificate involving the Arms of the Community Council
- ii) Signing into a Book of H/H Citizens.

Appendix F – Doors Open Day

From Rosemary Mann, Development Services. 0131-557-1856

Fife’s Doors Open Days 2005

The co-ordination of this year’s Doors Open Day event in Fife has begun. The event will be held on the first three Sundays in September:

- St Andrews & East Fife – Sunday September 4th 2005
- Kirkcaldy & Central Fife – Sunday September 11th 2005
- Dunfermline & West Fife – Sunday September 18th 2005

One of the features of Doors Open Day in Scotland is that it is very much a grassroots event, with co-ordination being carried out at a local level. While the co-ordination of the event in Fife is presently carried out by Fife Council, we hope that local organisations will become more involved.

This can be in several ways:

- You could propose buildings for inclusion in the programme. These may be in your area, or anywhere in Fife. In Fife Council we try to vary the venues open each year to bring variety to the event and allow different geographical areas to be featured. This maintains interest for visitors and brings the event to new audiences.
- You could provide volunteers to act as stewards for participating buildings in your area. The onus is on the owners of buildings taking part in Doors Open Day to provide stewards, and many building owners,

especially of private houses, would welcome having a pool of volunteers to call upon.

- You could advertise the event locally. This could be by distributing the Doors Open Day leaflet in your area or by including an article in your newsletter or website, perhaps featuring a building open in your area.

Above all, we are looking for ideas. It doesn't have to be a historic building. Rather it should be a building to which the public does not normally have access, or a way of explaining the heritage of an area to the public. Examples of this in last year's programme include behind the scenes at the Byre Theatre, the Fife Arts and Crafts Enterprise Training centre and the Coastguard Station at Fife Ness.

There was also a bus tour of the Rosyth Garden City area, organised by the Rosyth Garden City Association.

Do let us know how you would like to be part of this event, a Europe-wide celebration of our wonderful heritage. Please remember that any suggestion you make can always be borne in mind for future years, if it proves not possible to be used for this year's event.

We look forward to hearing from you. If you wish to discuss ideas, please do not hesitate to contact myself, or Geoff Moy (01334 412795)

Appendix G – Suspending “Right to Buy”

From David Robertson, Team Leader (Partnership & Development), Housing Service

Consultation on use of Pressured Area Status Suspension of Right to Buy

I am writing to you to inform you of our consultation process on proposals to suspend the Right to Buy in areas where there is a shortage of social rented housing.

There is an information sheet enclosed with this letter explaining what pressured area status (PAS) is and who it will affect.

We are asking for the views of samples of tenants and applicants on the issue, through the completion of a questionnaire. Your views are also important to us and although the questionnaires are not directly relevant to you as a community council, we would be grateful for any comments you may have on the proposals.

After the questionnaires have been returned to us, there will be a further chance to give us your views through small local discussion groups. We will also let you know the initial findings of the consultation. Please let us have the contact details of anyone interested in taking part in one of these and the days/times which would be most convenient.

We will let you know of any further developments but in the meantime, if you have any further enquiries, please contact Claire Mackinlay on 01592 414113.

Appendix H – Treasurer's Report

This report is only interim – I have not yet received the bank statement for March 2005. Since our bank doesn't permit internet banking for "treasurer's accounts", I cannot access an up-to-date balance.

Our overall activity is summarised in the table

Account	opening balance	nett income and expenditure to end of Feb 2005	nett income and expenditure March 2005	closing balance
Administration	1,369.62	474.40	-163.83	1,680.19
General	2,752.68	757.14	77.42	3,587.24
Millennium Fund	3,666.03			3,666.03
Youth	50.00			50.00
Recreation Committee	356.17	-40.57		315.60
Senior Citizens' Party	3,152.13	248.00		3,400.13
Band Concerts	764.24			764.24
Upper Arlington	216.41			216.41
Coat of Arms	7,910.35			7,910.35
Newsletter	644.78		-524.13	120.65
Ceilidh	3,330.38	735.16	-457.64	3,607.90
Total	24,212.79	2,174.13	-1,068.18	25,318.74

detail for March 2005

opening balance	26,386.92
interest	41.62
interest	35.80
hire of Burgh chambers	-29.75
hire of Burgh chambers for ceilidh	-57.64
newsletter distribution	-699.13
treasurer's expenses	-4.00
hire of Burgh chambers	-29.75

donation towards newsletters	175.00
secretary's expenses	-100.33
closing balance	25,318.74

A full statement will be presented to CC at the AGM, by which time our accounts will have been audited.

I understand that we will receive an administration grant of £2920.88 for 2005 to 2006.

The funds in the all accounts apart from Administration and General are earmarked for various purposes. Most of these are reflected in the accounts' titles. The Millennium, Coat of Arms and Ceilidh accounts are eventually to be put into a trust-fund for the benefit of St Andrews' citizens (including continuation of the ceilidh and senior citizens' party), even if the Community Council is wound up. (Normally, all assets of a CC would revert to Fife Council.)

Correspondence

Date	from	subject
10/03/2005	Scottish Executive Environment Group	General Binding Rules
14/03/2005	NHS Fife	Board meeting Cupar
15/03/2005	Transportation Services	Bus shelters
16/03/2005	Development Services	Local Plan CD & errata
16/03/2005	Development Services	Consult meeting posters
16/03/2005	Marine Conservation Soc	Beachwatch 04 & Strandline Newsletter
16/03/2005	Law & Administration	East Area Services Agenda notification
16/03/2005	Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator	Monitoring Scottish Charities
17/03/2005	Planning Aid for Scotland	Newsletter feb 05
17/03/2005	Law and Administration	Community Council Funding
17/03/2005	Scottish National Heritage	Tay & Eden Estuary Conservation Area
21/03/2005	Dupliquick	Printing for Charities prices
21/03/2005	Development Services	Open Doors Day 4/9/05
23/03/2005	Scottish National Heritage	Inventory of Gardens & Designed Landscapes – Fife supplement
23/03/2005	Development Services	Corrected Address
24/03/2005	Fife Community Safety Partnership	Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy
25/03/2005	Housing Service	Suspend Right-to-Buy consultation
25/03/2005	East Area Services Committee	Agenda 30 March
27/03/2005	University	Bell Pettigrew Museum
31/03/2005	Community Services	Best Kept Town and Village Competition
q/04/2005	SEPA	SEPAView newsletter
2/04/2005	Rural Scotland	Newsletter
2/04/2005	VONEF	Volunteers Week 1-7 June

Additional Agenda Items

Circulated at the meeting.

0. Co-option

Les Beech

I am writing in reply to your letter in this weeks Citizen concerning [the cooption].

I had intended to apply for the C.C. earlier but somehow missed the advert in the paper.

As I am still interested in the C.C. I was wondering if I may reapply? I am deeply concerned for the future of the town as it seems that Fife Council are determined to exploit every opportunity to enlarge our town. As you will well know St. Andrews does not have the infrastructure to support any of the proposals being put forward by the Council.

I am also very worried as to the continued attempts to change the town centre, none of the proposals that I have seen, will benefit the townspeople to any great degree. It seems to me that we have a lot of outsiders with money to spend and have some idea that St. Andrews is the place to spend it.

They need to have much greater consultation with local people as to what we want, and not to go of half-cocked on some plan that nobody wants. the South Street upgrade was a fine example. they are now proposing to alter Market Street and I hope that the townspeople will be properly consulted over this issue.

Maggie Stacey

I have brought up my family in St. Andrews for almost thirty years, my three adult sons now working and studying locally.

Having gained my professional qualification in Social Work at Dundee University in 1970, I practised in a variety of settings in Fife and Tayside, and prior to my present employment as a Support Worker at St Andrews University, was for 12 years the Malcolm Sargent Social Worker for the catchment area of Ninewells Hospital, giving psycho-social support to children suffering from malignant disease, and to their families.

I therefore have a wide and significant emotional investment in the town and its environs, and would welcome an opportunity to represent and help further the interests of its citizens.

Anna Spackman

Phoned Monday evening – no time for a printed intro.

5. Planning

We objected to the lack of pedestrian access to the new recycling centre – pedestrians can and do use the current facilities at Morrisons (Safeways).

Addressing our objection the Development Service report on the application says:

Road Safety Issues

2.7 Transportation Services were consulted on the proposals and have recommended that the layout is acceptable. It was agreed with them that pedestrian access should not be encouraged for safety reasons therefore there is no pedestrian footpath into the site. The council is making arrangements for wheel cleaning facilities at the site entrance.
