

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council Minutes – June 2005

Approved

(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 on line at <http://www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/>)

Chair: Donald Macgregor

1. Attendance

Donald Macgregor opened by welcoming new member Les Beech.

Community Councillors

Les Beech, Bette Christie, Ken Crichton, George Davidson, Ian Goudie, Chris Lesurf, Dennis Macdonald, Murdo Macdonald, Donald Macgregor, Keith McCartney, Patrick Marks, Elise Methven, Joe Peterson, Bruce Ryan, Carole Tricker, Penny Uprichard.

Students' Association

Simon Atkins, Frederick St Johnston.

Nominated

Ewen Sparks.

Fife Councillors

Jane Ann Liston, Frances Melville, Bill Sangster.

Apologies

Richard Douglas, Ken Fraser, Stuart Holdsworth, Sheila Black.

2. Minutes of May 2005

Approved

3. Presentations

3.1. The 2005 Open

Inspector Edmonston from the Open Golf Planning Team, on this year's arrangements.

Most of the planning has gone into traffic management: visitors are expected to number 40,000 people a day which is a lot of vehicles – cars, buses, trains (as far as the rail stations), cyclists, etc. Also to be considered are people in St Andrews whether resident, working in town, or even non-golf visitors.

There are a series of road closures, waiting restrictions and car park closures announced in the press and available on the internet (www.fifedirect.gov.uk/opengolf); along with a tidal flow system on The Scores and North Castle Street which was very successful for traffic management in 2000. (Paper copies of the details also left with the Secretary.)

Residents Parking: Fife Council will be writing soon to those in the areas affected by the parking restrictions to inform them of the alternative arrangements being made for them.

Penny Uprichard asked whether the Inspector knew the normal level of visitors? He expected in the order of 200,000 over the week of the Open but did not know how that compared with visitors in 2004.

3.2. Other Police Matters

There being no other Open questions Insp Edmonston took some general policing questions.

3.2.1. Stanks Park

Chris Lesurf asked if the Police would be able to mount patrols of the Stanks Park area (as raised in agenda Appendix M). She was concerned that police officers had not known of the park's existence between Kilrymont Road, Priestden Place, Lamond Drive and Kilrymont Place. Insp Edmonston did know the area and would look into the problems raised. He emphasised that any incidents should be reported to the police so they could build a picture of what was going on.

3.2.2. Drivers' Behaviour

Joe Peterson asked if the Police could 'have a word' with the developers at John Knox Road about the behaviour of the drivers of the earth-moving tractors driving through the town from their site. He had noted drivers talking on phones on occasion as they drove through town, which was a particular concern given the size of the vehicles. Insp Edmonston said he would arrange for someone to contact the site foreman.

3.2.3. Balgove Accidents

Dennis Macdonald raised a series of traffic accidents at Balgove road end on the A91. These had involved vehicles leaving St Andrews crossing the carriageway and ending in the right hand fence. Insp Edmonston said that all accidents that were reported to the police were passed on to Fife Council Transportation Service who analysed reports to determine and common factors at 'hotspots' and take remedial action, be it signs, resurfacing or realignment of the road itself. Cllr Frances Melville said she would take the matter up.

3.2.4. Cockshaugh Park Glass

Ewen Sparks reported a new and unpleasant form of vandalism in Cockshaugh Park. Bottles are being forced into the ground then broken off to leave broken glass poking up. Insp Edmonston will pass this on to officers looking at the problems raised when he was last present [March 3.2].

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville (West)

4.1.1. Future of Secondary Schools

There is a second round of meetings following on from the responses to the first. St Andrews meeting is 7pm Monday 20 June, Madras College, Kilmont Rd.

4.1.2. Review of Primary Schools

There have been preliminary meetings between Roger Stewart (Head of Education) the Chairs of School Boards and Head Teachers on the coming review of primary schools in St Andrews. It will be a sensitive issue, but the matter of primary school provision in St Andrews has never been reviewed by either Fife Region or Fife Council, and is long overdue. She called for people to be prepared to get involved when the public consultation comes. Both this and the previous item are part of the overall School Estates Strategy review.

Ewen Sparks raised some points on behalf of Canongate School, which his children attend. He said this review is premature; there is a lot of concern in the school. It was not felt that sufficient regard was being given to educational concerns. If a school closes the remaining schools will have maximum class sizes in all years. There are space concerns notwithstanding class sizes. In determining schools' capacities he suggested that inspections had counted all rooms as possible classrooms – computer rooms, gyms, libraries etc. While these uses had developed as the school rolls fell, they were now essential parts of the school facilities. In Canongate, rooms used by the nursery were counted as classrooms – where would the nursery go? It was felt that Education Service were not thinking through consequences, particularly in talking of closing schools when the structure and local plans talk about massive expansion of St Andrews.

Cllr Melville said that there had been no preliminary discussion with elected members; that this exercise had 'come out of the blue' when they were informed of the review. She said Roger Stewart had 'his own firm agenda' so it was important for people to respond to the review.

Elise Methven asked whether the effect of closure of Greyfriars on the Cosmos Centre had been considered; it is the largest provider of after-school care in the area.

4.1.3. Hospital/Health Centre

Departure hearing provisional date Wed 29th June.

4.1.4. Draft Structure/Local Plan Consultation

Over 2,000 responses have been received – very high response for the local plan, far higher than for all the Fife Local Plans together in previous years.

The intention is that the Structure Plan will be considered one or two committee cycles ahead of the Local Plan. There will be further opportunity for public objections to the finalised plans, and a public enquiry if there are outstanding objections, which there almost certainly will be, she added.

Ian Goudie asked if the councillors had seen the Local Plan Core Policies document? He hadn't noticed until late on that there were references to these policies but no explanation of them in the Local Plan document itself.

Cllr Melville said that the structure of the documents was confusing. There is a Core Policies document if you know where to look for it on the Fife Council web site. Reading any of the main documents needed far too much cross-referencing with other separate documents – if you could find them.

4.1.5. School Crossing Patrols

No vacancies have been filled despite adverts in various sections of the press and other ways. There were only two responses and neither was taken up.

4.1.6. Petheram Bridge

Ironside Farrar have drawn up conceptual plans of a new bridge deck to take both pedestrians and cyclists. It is intended that there should be a presentation to community council and for the project to proceed to firmer design late in the year.

4.1.7. Bus Station

Work on the car park access wall is on schedule for completion by 19th June. Les Beech asked why it was he had not been given that information when he phoned, regularly, to check progress? Taxis had been excluded from the bus station for eight weeks so far, rather than the three initially stated; it was costing them a fortune, he said.

4.1.8. Leuchars Liaison Group

Confirmed no further budget this year for noise insulation. Low-flying: while some recently has been attributable to air show practice, current operations are serious training.

4.1.9. Recycling Centre

Murdo Macdonald asked when work will start? It had been supposed to start in May for an August opening, but there is nothing happening yet. Cllr Melville will find out the current schedule.

4.3. Bill Sangster (Central)

4.3.1. Petheram Bridge Car Park

A new area is being made on the north side of the road, to take about 80 cars.

Joe Peterson suggested this area be used for coach loading and unloading and as a coach park, to save them blocking up the town centre. Cllr Sangster felt there would be practical problems in contacting the coaches to tell them to use a new area. He wasn't sure the problem was serious enough to warrant it; most coaches stop at the war memorial or continue round to Madras College on South Street. Joe Peterson suggested that news of the change could be promulgated to the tour coach industry through Visit Scotland. Cllr Melville suggested the idea be included in responses to the Area Transport Plan. Murdo Macdonald thought it would be unfair to dump the often elderly coach passengers at the Old Course Hotel and expect them to walk the rest of the way in.

4.3.2. Hospital Bus Shelter

[April 4.3.6.] There are difficulties here due to the narrow pavement, possibly requiring a special design rather than a standard off-the-shelf model of shelter, but it is hoped one will be in place by the end of this year.

4.3.3. A-Boards and Pavement Tables

He has found out that Edinburgh have a licensing scheme for boards, charging £25 for a licence. This is being looked at centrally as an option, as is no change, and reviewing the free width of pavement required before permission is granted.

4.3.4. New Street Bins

In Church Square, the harbour and eventually throughout the town centre. These have a street map of the centre on the side. The bins will have to be modified to have a flap fitted, as the gap is wide enough for birds to get in and drag out choice pieces of rubbish.

4.3.5 Commercial Waste

Nine businesses in St Andrews have been fined for disposing of their waste illegally. Offences have ranged from using domestic black bags, through disposal in the Crail recycling centre, to outright fly-tipping.

Elise Methven was not impressed that she had been fined because students had been putting their rubbish in her (Cherries) bin. Ewen Sparks said the Merchants' Association had had complaints from members about the attitude of the council officer involved in monitoring business waste disposal. He has been taking photographs as evidence of what business people have been doing, then been very confrontational, talking to them as if they were criminals. The Merchants' Association felt persuasion, not confrontation, was the way to sort out problems.

He also asked when there would be a paper and cardboard recycling collection for businesses, rather than these materials going to landfill in the general business orange bag collection as it does at present. The lack just encourages environmentally-minded businesses to go to the recycling centres to dispose of it, but of course that is forbidden.

4.3.6. Beaches and Parks Staffing

Ewen Sparks said that the Merchants' Association had also had complaints about the state of the beaches. There are only two tractor-mounted beach rakes for the whole of the Fife coastline. Similarly he understands that the bins in the 19 parks in Fife are emptied by just three men. Much better systems for both of these are needed, especially this year in St Andrews, and hopefully for the future too. Cllr Bill Sangster was fairly sure that one of the rakes was fairly permanently stationed in St Andrews last year, but will look into the points raised.

4.3.7. St Andrews World Class

Ken Crichton drew attention to recent press coverage of the World Class organisation, noting it was all about funding for business with no reference to the effects on the people living in St Andrews.

4.3.8. Graffiti

Keith McCartney asked when something would be done about the paint on the side of the town library, raised [March 4.3.5]. Cllr Bill Sangster replied that there were problems over removing the paint without damaging the soft sandstone; options were still being examined.

4.4. Jane Ann Liston (South East)

4.4.1. Crossing patrols

Oddly the recruitment problem mentioned earlier only affects St Andrews, other areas are covered. There are about four vacancies here at present.

4.4.2. Primary Schools

She has been told that the formal public consultation starts in August. As far as she is aware nothing has been decided yet. One thing she will be asking about is the method used to determine capacity, which she has heard dates back to the 1970s. Teaching methods have changed since then, primary schools in particular no longer involve neat rows of desks facing the teacher so she wonders if the old formula is entirely appropriate to the early 21st century.

4.4.3. St Andrews World Class

She drew attention to the appointment of Cllr Peter Douglas as a director of the organisation rather than a

St Andrews elected member. The reason for this, rather than a St Andrews councillor taking up the place, is so that St Andrews members would be able to speak and vote at the East Area Development Committee on any plans associated with World Class. Cllr Douglas will not, of course, be able to take part in any such discussion or vote.

4.4.4. Street Addresses

She has been pressing officials for more consistent numbering of the new flats at the corner of James St/Largo Rd. Officially this is Murray Bridge, 111 Bridge Street, an address chosen by the developer. However the entrances to the properties are on James St, so it should have a James St address, numbers 25-32. She raised the inconsistency a year ago, but it seems officials have done nothing. She noted that while community council is consulted on the names for new streets, developers are naming individual blocks and setting the de facto postal addresses. She is advocating that once the detailed plans are approved by the development committee, street names should be set to forestall developer-led inconsistencies.

Ian Goudie suggested that clarity of naming, for the purposes of Emergency Services' ease of location of an address, was a priority.

4.4.5. End-of-Term Rubbish

She regrets that lots of people put bins out at the end of lets, or when they left, heedless of when the bin would be collected, whether it was the right sort of bin, or who would put them away again after collection. She praised the work of Environmental Services in dealing with the problems this caused – they ended up emptying any bin they saw in the rented property areas for a period of a couple of weeks, and collecting bags too. Offending properties will be billed. She called for landlords to be required to have agents located close at hand to St Andrews as part of the HMO requirements, who would be able to deal with the effects of clearing flats and putting the correct bins out and away once tenants had left. An owner in Glasgow or wherever can't come and manage the bins on the proper days.

Environmental Services do a sterling job with skips and special collections, etc at the end of term. It does have an impact on their regular tasks which may have slipped under the strain, but she hoped these would be getting back to normal now.

5. Planning Committee

Ian Goudie reported that the East Area Development Committee had rejected the application for housing on a part of St Leonard's Fields, and thanked the Fife Councillors on the Development Committee for their robust stance.

5.1. Minutes

5.1.1. Holiday Chalets

Joe Peterson queried the objection to this application for 100 Acre Wood, Brewster Wells, [D.2.4. item 9] as it is well within the area of Cameron Community Council. He could not believe that the St Andrews green belt would extend that far for a Green Belt-based objection to be relevant. Ian Goudie felt that the point was that it was not yet known what the extent of the green belt would be – Fife Council's proposal is minimalist, but there has been strong reaction against that. Murdo Macdonald suggested that discussing it with Cameron Community Council would be courteous.

5.2. Submissions

Ian Goudie said he was disappointed about the problems over relevant documentation mentioned earlier. That there were further documents that were not on the CD nor in the box of printed documentation, made life extremely difficult for any member of the public, or community council, to respond fully.

The Local Plan submission [agenda appendix P] is not much more than a checklist, which should be refined over the summer for the next stage in the consultation, but has been accepted as a clear and adequate submission by Fife Council planning officials. He felt one major element to follow up and refine was the reinstallation of the rail link, perhaps following the Hazel methodology, in the face of Fife Council's apparent desire to push the issue aside or onto the back burner and leave it there for twenty years.

An unfortunate side effect of all the work on the plans is that other items have not been attended to. Chief among these he singled out as being the John Knox Road development which would go to committee the following day. The concerns here were whether the plans submitted were actually feasible on the hillside in terms of accessibility to the houses for the disabled at the top of the site in terms of gradients, and access to public open spaces within the site. There are also concerns over the 'affordability' of some of the properties; rather than any measure to ensure affordability 'in perpetuity', all that is on offer is the short term form that will be quickly undone.

He drew attention to the submission in agenda Appendix R, arising out of a request from a member of the public which had been brought up at the General Purposes committee due to the short timescale [agenda appendix Q item 3]

5.3. Hospital/Health Centre

A draft letter of objection to the proposed hospital site was circulated at the meeting.

Application for outline consent for erection of hospital (class 8) and health centre, including formation of access road and parking areas, Largo Road, St Andrews.

I write on behalf of the Community Council to object to the above application. Our grounds for objection include the following:

- (i) The failure of the Environmental Assessment to meet the requirements of the European legislation;
- (ii) Prematurity with respect to the St Andrews and East Fife Local Plan;
- (iii) The implications of planning consent for this site for the remainder of the southern hillside of the town;
- (iv) Accessibility;
- (v) Visual impact on an AGLV;
- (vi) Traffic impact;
- (vii) Implications for the viability of the town centre;
- (viii) Loss of a designated light industrial site;
- (ix) Proximity to the Largo Road TETRA mast;
- (x) Proximity to the recycling centre.

It is our intention to make a detailed submission as soon as we are able.

Ian Goudie explained that most of the arguments had been aired in the recent newsletter – to general expressions of support, and no dissent that he had heard. This is really just a holding letter to ensure community council gets to speak at the departure hearing later in the month. It simply formalises the points presented in the newsletter, plus the point about proximity to the recycling centre which had not been made previously.

Joe Peterson felt that the hospital should be built sooner rather than later and that the Largo Road site was suitable for the purpose. He felt there was a groundswell of opinion in favour of this; he did not want community council to be responsible for any further delay to the project and he called for a serious reconsideration on this one aspect of community council planning policy. We have to look to the future, not keep harking back to the past and the old preferred site at St Leonards Fields, he suggested.

Ian Goudie said it would be surprising if community council were now to reverse the position it had taken only a few weeks ago in the newsletter, which had been agreed by community council as a whole. Pete Lindsay said that while there had not been a formal vote on the text of the newsletter, drafts had been circulated to all members. In response he had received only one query, from Stuart Holdsworth, on one point of the arguments on the hospital. There had been no objection from any member on the maintenance of the position of community council on the location of the hospital. Carole Tricker said she had some concerns over the hospital site stance, but as a new member of community council had not expressed them when the various drafts of the newsletter came by as she thought there was a formal, voted policy.

Bruce Ryan said that Bette Christie and Chris Lesurf had recently attended a meeting with other groups and the hospital project team to discuss what facilities and services should be provided in the new buildings. They seemed to expect to be building soon.

Dennis Macdonald said he had always supported St Leonards fields but now thought it was unrealistic because of the cost of the land. He thought that with the history of the proposed Muir development to the south of town it was obvious that the health service would opt for the Largo Road site where he was sure they were getting a low cost deal on the land as a form of 'planning gain' for later development.

Murdo Macdonald suggested that the letter be submitted, as suggested, as a holding letter for now so there would be a voice at the enquiry, meanwhile community council could discuss its hospital position in the light of the apparently changing balance of views.

Les Beech asked if one site was being objected to surely an alternative should be suggested? Do we want a new hospital or to stay with the old one? Donald Macgregor replied that community council had always supported a new hospital, but at the preferred site of St Leonard's Fields.

There was then some discussion on the fine detail of what points should be included in a holding letter out of those suggested in the draft, particularly whether prematurity to the new local plan was relevant and the possible effect on the viability of the town centre.

Ian Goudie pointed out with the departure hearing at the end of June there would not be an opportunity for further discussion of the principles by the full council before then. He was disappointed by the emergence of these arguments now when there had been long discussions in the spring and during the production of the newsletter. It seemed to be forgotten that the biggest dispute in the planning of the town in recent years was the Muir controversy in the early 90s over the proposal for 1,000 houses on the southern hillside. If the hospital application goes ahead, he said, the sooner we get further development on the southern hillside. It was for that reason that members of community council attended meetings with successive health trusts to give a local insight into the planning implications of the project that the medics might not fully appreciate. This application has huge knock-on effect on the town as a whole. Pete Lindsay added that the planning committee of the late 90s had seen draft plans for the Largo Road site which clearly showed a road leading off across the hillside, marked 'further development'. He didn't fear the hospital itself at Largo Road, but the houses, industrial sites, whatever, built across the back of the town as a likely consequence. Carole Tricker did not accept that these fears were good reasons to object to the hospital; it should be treated in isolation, on its own merits.

Pete Lindsay proposed that the letter be sent as it stood, 2nd Penny Uprichard.

Against: Joe Peterson, 2nd Carole Tricker. Votes:

For	15
Against	3
Abstain	0

Ian Goudie to write

6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

6.1. Honorary Citizen

[May 6.1.]

6.1.1. Representations

Representations received by the Secretary were circulated during the meeting, as was Jack Nicklaus's response to Donald Macgregor's apology. Identifiably from St Andrews there were 14 in favour of an award being made, 2 against and 1 unclear. Of unclear origin or from outwith St Andrews there were 30 in favour (of which at least 8 were from a standard form letter – one helpfully included the template as well as the personalised version), 2 against, and one contact from an artist specialising in awards, scrolls and certificates just in case we should happen to have a need for something after all.

6.1.2. Criteria of the Honorary Citizen Scheme

As background information Pete Lindsay circulated extracts from the meetings which established the current form of the Honoured / Honorary Citizen Scheme (see: March 2000 agenda and minutes, May 2000 minutes, June 2000: agenda and minutes). He pointed out that there was no single clear statement of the procedures at present, which had probably contributed to the current situation.

Murdo Macdonald felt that the events of the last two month had done more damage to St Andrews and the community council than many believe. He personally has spent more time in the last month dealing with this issue than any other in his 10 years on community council. He called on community council to be prepared to admit to mistakes. When the Honoured and Honorary Citizen award was set up the same criteria were used for both. With hindsight he felt this had been a mistake. While the two Honoured Citizen awards were successful he felt that the result last month indicated that the Honorary Citizen was unawardable, 'no one on the planet' could be expected to gain the level of support necessary. It would be easier to gain an OBE, MBE and a knighthood than an Honorary Citizenship.

Of the more than 150 people who have contacted him on the subject of the decision last month the overwhelming majority were in favour of the award. Former community councillors had contacted him with similar experiences. In view of this level of response he felt the matter must be revisited, as community council is specifically here to represent the views of the people of St Andrews. He believed his experience represented the overall view of St Andrews.

He proposed that the Honoured and Honorary Citizen awards be split, with Honoured Citizen left as it stands, but Honorary criteria and procedure amended along the following lines of a proposal he then circulated.

Honorary Citizen Award

Proposal – amendment to the criteria for such award.

- 1) Nominations for such awards to be put forward at a monthly meeting with either the Proposer or Seconder presenting to the Council full details of the person concerned with as much history and details to allow fellow councillors to vote constructively.
- 2) At the following month's meeting all councillors having had time to consider the nomination. Will vote in the chamber (any person/persons unable to attend this meeting and wishing to vote must before this meeting have delivered their vote in writing to the secretary.
- 3) Once the votes have been completed all abstentions will be discarded.
- 4) To allow the nominated person to qualify for the award they must have received at least 65% of the votes (65% yes vote).

NB

A) it is vitally important that all community councillors are fully aware that to receive such an award it is not necessary for the person to have been involved with St Andrews or have done anything special for St Andrews.

B) Votes for such awards to be taken in private with a request to the press that no reporting on such matters to be recorded or commented on until decision finalised.

He added that he'd used percentages rather than fixed numbers to allow for absences due to holidays, illness etc.

Keith McCartney supported Murdo Macdonald, saying the May minutes showed that the situation had arisen through confusion over the award and criteria; this must not be allowed to happen again. It is essential to set out clear criteria and procedures for the award.

Chris Lesurf queried note A. If the candidate need have no connection to St Andrews what was the point of the award? Murdo Macdonald replied that the purpose was to have an award for community council to give for anything it wished to acknowledge. He agreed a connection should certainly help a candidate, but it should not be a necessary condition for what had been intended as an open award.

Ken Crichton thought it had been agreed that the awards were specifically for connections to St Andrews, though others' recollections were different; Pete Lindsay was sure that the original intent was for the award to be as open as possible so as not to constrain future proposals.

Bette Christie said that Note B was the essential item; not splashing proposals all over the press. This was generally acknowledged as the major procedural mistake and was the core point of Donald Macgregor's apology to Jack Nicklaus. Pete Lindsay pointed out section 9.4 of Fife Council's Scheme for Community Councils which specifically mentions consideration 'civic honours' as an case where community councils may go into closed session, which he took as strong advice to do so.

Bruce Ryan asked if any proposal for Honoured Citizen had failed: none had.

Les Beech felt any awards should be made on a straight majority of the meeting and that setting percentages of the total vote was over-fanciful, noting that the UK Government party has far less than a majority of the total possible vote, just a majority over its rivals. Murdo Macdonald replied that the intention of the higher requirement originally was to make the award difficult, to discourage casual proposals and make it special. He now felt though that the level had just been set a bit too high.

Donald Macgregor felt that the proposal needed more reflection and consideration than could be given in a short period at this meeting. He noted that the original scheme had taken several months to thrash out, but had still proved flawed in practice. He suggested a committee be formed to examine the proposals further and report in three months time. Murdo Macdonald was opposed to this course as he said it would make the next item pointless. Joe Peterson supported a delay for proper consideration. He did not want to rush into something in an attempt to rewrite history. Patrick Marks felt the proposed changes were simple enough to be decided immediately. Ken Crichton felt that rushing in would be a mistake, and noted there was the impact on rest of the agenda to consider. Ian Goudie said that the discussion so far had highlighted quite fundamental disagreements about what this award should be for; the original proposal in 2000 had been for a 'Friend of St Andrews' and the awards developed from there. He was concerned that the proposal's note A seemed to cut all links with St Andrews. Murdo Macdonald clarified that this was merely a footnote on his understanding of the open nature of the scheme and was not a formal criterion.

Murdo Macdonald proposed that a decision on the revised scheme be taken this month, 2nd Keith McCartney.

Donald Macgregor proposed further consideration be taken next month, 2nd Joe Peterson.

Next Month	10
Immediate	7
Abst	2

July Agenda

6.1.3. Reconsideration of the proposed award to Jack Nicklaus

There followed some discussion of whether there was any point in proceeding to this item. Joe Peterson asked if there was any limit on re-proposal of an item following a formal vote. Pete Lindsay said there was nothing preventing this in Fife Council's Scheme, or the community council's own Standing Orders. Eventually, as permitted by item 9.4 of Fife Council's Scheme for Community Councils, the meeting went into closed session to hear more information about Jack Nicklaus and the proposed reconsideration.

Closed session: proposed Donald Macgregor, 2nd Murdo Macdonald. None against.

Meeting agreed not to reconsider the proposed award to Jack Nicklaus.

In protest at this decision, which he did not feel represented the will of the people of St Andrews, Murdo Macdonald submitted his written resignation from community council and left the meeting.

6.2. Oil Transfer Terminal, Firth of Forth

Meeting agreed to act in accordance with Ken Fraser's report.

Pete Lindsay to write

6.3. Bandstand Concerts

Elise Methven unsure how to proceed in the absence of Murdo Macdonald but agreed to carry on and see if organising these was practical.

7. New Business

7.2. Graffiti at Stanks Park

Agreed to support the general points made.

Pete Lindsay to write

7.3. Planning Aid for Scotland

Agreed subscription renewal: £10.

Bruce Ryan

7.4. Local Holidays 2006

Proposed dates – agreed

Pete Lindsay to write

7.5. Association of Scottish Community Councils

7.5.1. Subscription

Agreed: £15.

Bruce Ryan

7.7. Gumley Golf Trophy

We have no golfers with a recognised handicap

7.8. Scottish Language Dictionaries

Renewal agreed: £20?

Bruce Ryan

7.9. Fife Coastal Partnership

Joe Peterson may be able to attend

Joe Peterson

8. Reports from Office Bearers

8.3. Secretary

8.3.3. Picture

Investigate September

Meeting ended at 9:50pm