

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Agenda – July 2005

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm Monday 4th July 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

Patrick Marks, Ewen Sparks.

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.

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: 13/6/05 meeting

6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

6.1. Bandstand Concerts

Arrangements made for 6 concerts, but assistance is needed.

Sunday 10th July, Kennoway Town Pipe Band
 Sunday 24th July, Dysart Colliery Silver Band
 Sunday 7th August, Richfield Springs Group
 Sunday 14th August, Dunfermline Town Band
 Sunday 21st August, Clackmannan Brass Band
 Sunday 28th August, Madras College Bands

All Bands will perform between 2-4, Bow Butts Bandstand, The Scores.

6.2. Vacancy

6.2.1. Co-option

How do we fill the place?

6.2.2. Representative

Murdo Macdonald's departure leaves the following places vacant

- a Vice Chair
- Ceilidh Organiser
- Golf Liaison
- Arms Business Convenor
- Ohtawara Trust

6.3. Honoured/Honorary Citizen

[June 6.1.1.] Some more representations will be circulated.

[June 6.1.2.] Appendix B: some thoughts and proposed guidelines from Pete Lindsay.

6.4. Fife Coastal Path Partnership Steering Group

We're asked for a nomination for a representative on this group.

6.5. Calor Community of the Year

Deadline extended to 16th July.

6.6. Any other matters arising...**7. New Business****7.1. The Blue Stane**

Joe Peterson would like to renew efforts to make this historical feature a little more accessible for the town.

7.2. Newsletter / Publicity

Donald Macgregor / Pete Lindsay ask: Are we doing enough to get opinions from the town? Should we look again at a more regular newsletter, and other ways of canvassing opinion?

7.3. Scottish Water – Bulk Metering

Appendix C

7.4. Remembrance Wreath 2005

Our standard No. 2 wreath is £18.95 with insert. If we get the order in in good time we can arrange to have our Arms as part of the insert, as suggested by Joe Peterson last year.

7.5. Blue Flag Award

Award ceremony recognising the status of the East and West Sands (along with others) at the Beacon Leisure Centre, Burntisland, 1pm Friday 8th July.

7.6. Road Surface West Port/Bridge St

Appendix D: Bruce Ryan raises some concerns.

7.7. Traffic Survey

Appendix E: information on choice of dates forwarded by Cllr Frances Melville

7.8. 1 Greyfriars Garden Ground

Cllr Bill Sangster suggests community council might like to investigate buying this as it is officially for sale, and passes on some information about funding: <http://www.greenspacescotland.org.uk/>. Bruce Ryan has investigated a little further.

8. Reports from Office Bearers**8.1. Chair****8.1.1. Trust Fund****8.2. Treasurer**

Appendix F: Report

8.3. Secretary**8.3.1. Future meetings**

August: Canongate School Board on the review.

8.3.2. Web site**8.3.3. Entrust****8.3.4. Patras Book****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 Report

Minutes by Penny Uprichard

A.1 Planning Meeting – 13.6.05

ATP Submission – there was a discussion on the first half of the ATP submission, about which B. Ryan had produced a paper, based on the 7 submissions from members of the Community Council.

Site of school – there was a discussion on the possible site of a new school. All members of the Planning Committee agreed that there should be a school at the Tay Bridge head, but it was more difficult to agree on what should happen in the centre of St Andrews.

1	12 Huntly Place	erect boundary fence N.C.	4a Alexandra Place – internal alterations	N.C.
---	-----------------	---------------------------	---	------

		and waste pipe and extractor fan	
2	85g Market Street	replacement windows to flat (wooden sash and case)	N.C.
3	5 Shorehead	4 person HMO	N.C.
4	16 Wallace Street	erect dwelling house with integral garage	N.C.
5	33 South Street	replacement roof lights	N.C.
6	7th golf course, Brownhills	The Links Trust – display advance sign, revised scheme (2-3 years), two and a half metres high	Comment P.L.
7	Mast in Grange Road	Appeal – P. Uprichard to write reiterating our request for information on the levels of microwave radiation.	OBJ. P.U.

A.2. 37 Largo Road (former petrol station/garage)

Objection by Pete Lindsay

05/01663/EFULL: 37 Largo Road, St Andrews

I write on behalf of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council to object to this application.

We believe that this application exceeds the current housing land requirement. Community Council would prefer to see this business/industrial site remain as such, in this mainly business area of the town*. There is concern in St Andrews over the lack of small business premises particularly of the small business/light industrial type represented by the former garage. It is likely, in our view, that if this development goes ahead there will be an application sooner rather than later for it to be converted to fully residential, given the pressures on the St Andrews rented accommodation market and be completely lost for business use.

Should the Development Committee be minded to consent to a mixed business/residential development we suggest that:

- i) conditions should be imposed requiring the residential sections to be "affordable" for buying or renting over an extended period. This would help address the one area of housing need in St Andrews.
- ii) the design shown is too tall, at three storeys, both in the context of surrounding buildings and in its location relatively close to the edge of the built area. It should be reduced in height by a full storey to fit in.

[* Indeed we contend that this is more desirable as a business site than some of those sites proposed in the draft Local Plan.]

A.3. Hospital

Presentation by Ian Goudie to departure hearing 29/6/05

Public Hearing on proposed Hospital & Healthcare Centre, St Andrews.

29 June 2005

I must first apologise that the Community Council has only submitted a brief letter of objection to this application. Fife Council has given us an absolutely exhausting Spring. We do, however, regard this application as the most strategically important one for the town for many years. Until two or three years ago, the Community Council was closely involved in the hospital project. Frank Riddell, Joe Peterson and I often had seats at the table, and a primary aim of ours was to avoid the selection of a site that conflicted with the broader planning needs of the town. We are extremely disappointed that the NHS has allowed this situation to arise, and that they chose to keep from us for 17 months the details of their site selection process.

Consideration of alternative sites is a requirement of the 1999 EIA regulations, and Appendix 2 of Fife Council's scoping opinion listed the "*Rigorous and transparent assessment of alternative sites*" as one of the key issues. The assessment that the developer has provided is neither rigorous nor transparent. We have noted with interest recent press reports of the cogent arguments of Tony Jackson and the Green Belt Forum. We understood him to say the local authority would be open to possible judicial review, if it granted consent without ensuring that all environmental options had been adequately considered, and the evidence made available for public inspection. The focus of his argument was the visual impact of this proposal, but we would contend that similar considerations apply to the more fundamental question of site selection.

The Environmental Statement lists the 10 criteria used in the cost appraisal exercise, but makes no attempt to give a systematic comparison of the three short-listed sites under each of these criteria. PAN 58 says that, in an Environmental Statement, "*Conclusions should be drawn from the data, rather than tailored to favour the proposal.*" The comparability study here is largely devoid of data in the numeric sense, and it is not just the conclusions, but rather the whole discussion which is tailored to favour the proposal. Time and again they point out possible problems with the rejected sites, without giving the appropriate balancing comment for the Largo Road site. To pick one example from many, they highlight the gas pipeline problem at the Craigtoun Road site, but fail, in the comparability section, to mention the gas main and the high voltage power line at the Largo Road. This falls far short of providing a transparent exhibition of the environmental options to the public. Needless to say, the comparability section does not mention the less desirable aspects of the chosen site. It is adjacent to the recycling plant. It will be noisy, and, for patients worried about electromagnetic radiation, it is probably about the worst place in town.

The problems with the site comparability discussion cannot be resolved by just asking the applicants to rewrite their essay in a more thorough and logical way. This section is but a somewhat spun version of site option appraisal, which we obtained under Freedom of Information. Appraisal exercises are intended to appear technical to discourage close examination, but don't be put off. Each site is given a score under each of the ten criteria and a weighted total formed. In the end, the Craigtoun Road site languishes on 3.91, St Leonards Fields gets 5.27 and the Largo Road 6.17. This is not science. These are not measurements accurate to two decimal places. Under the criterion "*Visual and Landscape*" all three sites

get 5 out of 10, with the low-lying Craigtoun Road site being described as “*sensitive*” due to views from the north. From your experience on this committee, I am sure that those of you who know St Andrews well could come up with numbers that are far closer to planning reality. If you’re also a computer user, we can gladly give you an Excel spreadsheet that will automatically revise the weighted totals as you change the scores to ones you think are more sensible. You will quickly see the extent to which the totals change, even without revising the highly debatable weights used for the different criteria. You will soon ask yourself, “Did they really take the decision on this basis, or is this just another layer of window-dressing?”

For us, the two key elements of the Green Belt are the view from the Strathkinness High Road, and the southern hillside from the Largo Road to the sea. If we lose them, we may as well forget the idea: the landscape setting will already have been destroyed. The NHS has said that the present application has no wider planning implications. We beg to differ. Use of this site makes continued development eastwards along the hillside inevitable, and the proposed road layout aims to facilitate this. We must thank the Fife officials for not attempting to hide the implications for the hillside in the draft Local Plan. They show a whole strip of land extending to the Grange Road left inside the Green Belt – a sitting duck for developers. The comparability study tells us that the owners of the two rejected sites may aspire to housing developments on their land: the reader is supposed to believe that nothing could be further from the mind of the Muir Group. If Muir is providing land at anything less than housing prices, it can only be a loss-leader to gain the richer pickings beyond. For the Muir Group the hospital is the Trojan Horse, opening up to them the profits denied them since 1993, when their proposals launched a thousand protests.

In Appendix 1 of the Scoping Opinion, Development Services say, “*The proposal is likely to prejudice the process of identifying the Green Belt and therefore be considered premature in terms of (Structure Plan Policy) SS8.*” We would strongly support a judgement of prematurity with respect to the Development Plan, as the implications of this application for the viability of the town centre, for the availability of industrial land and for transportation have to be seen in an overall context.

In April 2003, Bill Lindsay wrote to Jones Lang LaSalle quoting his colleagues in Transportation as saying, “*In terms of accessibility, the St Leonards Fields site provides the best potential access for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport due to its central location. ... As the Largo Road site is easily accessible by car, sustainable travel modes will be less able to compete. ... Fife Council Transportation Services does not agree with the statement that Largo Road is the best site in terms of transportation.*” After considering other aspects of the sites, Bill’s conclusion includes “*We remain to be persuaded at this time that an acceptable solution at St Leonards cannot be achieved.*” Why did Fife Council subsequently switch their support to the Largo Road site? To us the explanation in the draft Local Plan is implausible, but inquiries under Freedom of Information are still ongoing.

The St Andrews doctors do a superb job, and the Community Council is anxious to see them gain more appropriate accommodation. But we have a duty to look at the whole picture. Refusal of this application may mean that a project now forecast to end 16 years after it started may take somewhat longer. Consent for the application means the permanent loss of much, and quite possibly all, of the southern hillside. The choice is not a pleasant one, but there can be little doubt that we would be failing in our duty to future generations if we did not urge you to save the southern hillside.

Appendix B – Honoured/Honorary Citizen

Some thoughts from Pete Lindsay

Guidelines

These should help avoid some of the problems in which we embroiled ourselves recently.

1. Proposer is **strongly** advised to canvas opinion of the voting members of community council on the suitability of the candidate before any formal move is undertaken.
2. Proposer notifies the Secretary of the nomination for inclusion on the agenda. Only the fact of a proposal will be included. Any information supplied on the candidate will be circulated on a separate sheet.
3. At the meeting it is **strongly** advised that the Hon. Cit. item be taken in private in accordance with section 9.4 of the Fife Council’s Scheme for Community Councils. Note that this must be done by formal resolution of the meeting, it is not automatic.
4. Following whatever discussion seems necessary to the meeting the candidate is formally proposed and seconded then a paper ballot taken. The result is determined by whatever method has been agreed for these things (see below).
Meeting may prefer to put the vote off until a later meeting, to allow time for reflection, or to meet a quorum. Nonetheless the vote will take place within a meeting.
5. The decision is final. A candidate may not be reconsidered* within the session of community council, i.e. until after the next community council election.
(*excepting major procedural flaws in the vote of course)
6. Meeting re-opens and the simple fact that an award was not made / is to be offered (delete as appropriate) is announced.
7. It is the proposer/seconders’ job to establish that the candidate will accept the award. Acceptance should be announced, with the name of the Hon. Cit., at the next meeting. If the award is rejected the bare fact of the refusal should be notified to the next meeting – no names, no pack drill...
8. It is also the proposer’s/seconders’ job to make the arrangements for any formal presentation, reception or whatever.

The ballot

The current effective system of a postal ballot of the whole of community council’s voting members is cumbersome for the secretary (or whoever manages it) to operate as it means a lot of chasing up people’s votes. The only good point about it is the insistence on a decision by all of community council.

However it leaves the Secretary with uniquely privileged information as to the individual votes – and as a result under unique pressure if an unpopular decision is taken. In this Secretary's opinion the game is not worth the candle.

While I agree with Murdo Macdonald that the unintended consequence of the fixed requirement for 16 votes making abstentions effectively votes against, should be fixed, I find the the simple percentage of the vote system proposed last month badly flawed. Consider the extreme case: community council quorum at the moment is 40% of the elected members – 8 people. A requirement for a simple 65% yes vote of a meeting leaves an Hon. Cit. being decided by 6 votes out of 8. I find that possibility unpalatable, even if I were one of the six.

As a compromise between the two systems we might establish a quorum for the vote, perhaps that 75% of the voting members be present for the vote, which is then taken on a simple majority. This would need at least 9 yes votes for an award.

Eligibility

This is the other can of worms. As it stands the formal system is that the award is an open one so that CC can grant Hon. Cit. to whom and for what it likes. I think that is a good idea and allows each case to be determined on its merits.

If however community council as a whole wants to restrict the scheme specifically to intimate St Andrews connections only, or advise proposers that that is the probable case I think that needs to be spelled out, so would-be proposers don't waste time. In any case any rule like this can be waived as a special exception if the proposer's case is good enough.

Honoured / Honorary?

Are these two schemes, separate awards, separate criteria, or just one with logically correct titles?

Appendix C – Water

*From Iain MacLellan, Business & Community Liaison Manager, Scottish Water.
iain.maclellan@scottishwater.co.uk*

Improvements to our services in Fife

As part of our Capital Investment Programme and ongoing commitment to improve our services to customers, Scottish Water has a long-term programme for the improvement to the operation and management of existing service reservoirs and water mains.

The enclosed fact sheet will provide you with additional details of our Bulk Metering Programme and how this essential works will affect our customers. This programme will enable Scottish Water to provide our customers with real improvement in water quality and consistency of supply.

In order to deliver these improvements, work will be carried out across the Fife area starting in July 2005 with a completion date of April 2006. Wherever possible, this work will be completed overnight to minimise disruption to our customers, however this may not always be possible.

A programme of work detailing the service reservoirs involved along with timescales will be available after initial survey work has been completed

We are committed to a proactive programme of communication with our customers and will ensure that they have all the information that they need in advance of any work in their area..

If you need any additional information then please do not hesitate to contact our

Customer Helpline on 0845 601 8855 quoting "Fife Bulk Metering Project".

The fact sheet:

Bulk Meter Installations – North East

Managing a precious resource

Why are we doing this work?

As part of our ongoing commitment to improving our service to customers, Scottish Water has a long term programme for the improvement of our water supply network. In order to maintain and operate our water supply network effectively and reduce our operating costs, extensive work is required to be carried out throughout Scotland.

The £6.6 million Bulk Meter Installation Programme is part of Scottish Waters £1.8 billion Capital Investment

Programme and is being managed by Scottish Water Solutions.

What are we doing?

As part of the leakage detection programme, meters will be commissioned to monitor flow to and from service reservoirs. We are investing £1.1 million in our water network in the North East of Scotland. This includes: What are we doing?

As part of the leakage detection programme, meters will be commissioned to monitor flow to and from service reservoirs. We are investing £1.1 million in our water network in the North East of Scotland. This includes:

- Dundee – commission 40 meters at reservoirs serving this area
- Aberdeen – commission 8 meters including two meters on the brick built aqueducts at Manofield and Cattofield

- Fife – commission 50 meters at reservoirs serving this area
- Angus – commission 20 meters at reservoirs serving this area

Our commitment

Individual customers affected by any of the work related to this improvement programme will be given advanced notification, guidance and assistance on how we can help customers prepare for planned water supply interruptions. This will always carry the clear branding as featured on this information leaflet.

How will the work affect you?

In order to carry out the essential works, we may have to interrupt your water supply.

- We will supply 48 hrs warning should your water supply be interrupted
- When your water supply comes back on, it may be cloudy, discoloured or contain sediment
- Before you use any water you should turn on the cold tap in the kitchen until the water runs clear
- Do not use washing machines, dishwashers, showers or other water reliant appliances until the water clears

Clear benefits

This programme will lead to an improved level of service to all of those customers who have in the past been vulnerable to water supply interruptions resulting from bursts in the local network. Following completion of this programme, customers will benefit from improved quality drinking water and a more reliable supply.

Appendix D – Road Surface Bridge Street/West Port

Email by Bruce Ryan to Cllr Bill Sangster, Locality Manager Kate Hughes

I write concerning the road surface outside the new flats on the corner of South Street and Bridge Street. For quite a distance, the road surface has been worn away, such that it is a hazard to cyclists heading downhill, away from the city centre.

I presume that the contractors building these flats were under an obligation to make good any extra wear and tear their work caused to the road surfaces at the site. If so, can they be made to do so and, at the same time, repair contiguous damage to the road surface edges?

If the building contractors can't, will Fife Council's own contractors undertake these repairs? If so, when?

Appendix E – Traffic Survey

From Tony Kivistik, Transportation Engineer/Planner, Transportation Services.

I am e-mailing to inform you that Fife Council Transportation Services have commissioned Sky High Traffic Ltd. to carry out a traffic study of St Andrews this week. The study will consist of vehicle registration surveys, junction turning counts and parking surveys.

Junction turning counts will be carried out between 07:30 and 18:00 on the 21st and 22nd of June. Vehicle registration surveys and parking surveys will take place between 07:30 and 18:00 on the 24th of June.

The surveys will be used to further inform the St Andrews Transport Plan. The study has deliberately been scheduled to coincide with the St Andrews University Graduation week to ensure that 'peak' traffic data is gathered.

Appendix F – Treasurer's Report

By Bruce Ryan

Treasurer's report July 2006

1. Last year's accounts have been accepted by Fife Council and our full 2005-6 Fife Council grant was paid directly into our bank account on 13 June.
2. My thanks go to previous treasurers for leaving easily-understood summaries of previous years' accounts. From these, I have constructed a spreadsheet showing the total incomes and expenditures of our sub-accounts for each year since the start of the 1995-96 financial year.
3. I have been concerned, as was the previous treasurer, about amounts of money sitting in sub-accounts, untouched for years.
 - We have £260.41 in the Upper Arlington sub-account. This came from a grant we received in 1997-98 from Upper Arlington school to 'further cultural links with them' (according to minutes of 7 April 1997). This account has not been touched since 2000. With CC's approval, I'll write to the Rector of Madras College, offering him the funds in this sub-account (or a CC-approved rounded-up amount) to be spent on any cultural exchange programme still running. This will empty this account so it can be closed.
 - We have £50 which has been in the Youth sub-account, untouched since its donation to this account 1997-98 from our own 200 Club. Hence it is ours to do with as we see fit. With CC's approval, I will transfer it into the General sub-account and close the Youth sub-account.
 - The balance of the Newsletter sub-account is now £0. Since we appear unlikely to produce a regular Newsletter, and the last one exhausted this sub-account, I have closed this sub-account.
 - None of this should be seen as irregular. A number of sub-accounts were closed at the

beginning of 1998-99, at the start of previous treasurer's 'reign'. At the beginning of 1997-98, the Floral Basket sub-account was closed and the funds therein donated to the people/organisation now maintaining the baskets. Since all our money is contained in one bank account, rearrangements of our sub-accounts will not affect the total in this bank account.

4. I was slightly concerned this month to receive an invoice for £100 when I had no documentation to prove that we had ordered the services in question. Since I know that the invoice was for an ongoing arrangement we have with St Andrews in Focus, I was content to pay it.
 - o However, it is sound financial practice to record in writing first what is being bought, from whom and when it is to be supplied. These records avoid invoices turning up out of the blue and prevent uncertainty about whether invoices are valid. They also allow treasurers to be sure that enough funds will be available to pay the invoice when it arrives. These records are usually created by the buyer giving the vendor a written and signed purchase order. A copy of the purchase order is also passed to the treasurer. When the treasurer receives the invoice, s/he can check that it is for the agreed amount and whether the goods and/or services were delivered as ordered.
 - o From now on, for any item of expenditure, I require a purchase order or its equivalent. Examples include
 - a till receipt for up to £20 total
 - a screen-shot of an on-line order
 - a 'please renew your membership' letter from an organisation (plus CC's agreement to do so)
 - a full purchase order.
- I am very used to writing purchase orders at my work and so am happy to do so for CC.
5. I have become slightly concerned that some of our fund-raising activities may be considered as 'trading' and that hence we may be liable to pay tax on the income from such activities. I have asked Fife Council to advise and will report to CC in due course.
6. We need a replacement fourth signatory for the bank account. I understand this person should be either the remaining Vice-chair or whoever is elected to Vice-chair in place of Murdo.
7. Income and expenditure for June 2005

Brought forward 31 May	£24,009.14
Scottish Language Dictionary subscription	-£20.00
Planning Aid for Scotland subscription	-£10.00
Association of Scottish CCs subscription	-£15.00
Donation	+£250.00
Fife Council grant for 2005-6	+£2,920.88
hire Burgh Chambers	-£31.25
Bank interest for June	+£37.16
Closing balance 30 June	£27,140.93

Correspondence

Post received

Date	from	subject
2 Jul	Charles Riddoch	Jack Nicklaus
1 Jul	Scottish Water	Service Improvements
1 Jul	Forestry Commission	Scottish Forestry Strategy
28 Jun	ASCC	Calor deadline extn 15/7
28 Jun	Fife Council	Open reception invite
27 Jun	Stewartsturf	Sports surfaces – advt
27 Jun	NHS Fife	Hospital project newsletter
27 Jun	Forrestry Commission	Review of forestry strategy
25 Jun	Lady Haig's Poppy Factory	Price list 2005
25 Jun	Mrs Mercer	Obj Morrisons Supermarket – for info
25 Jun	Fife Coastal Partnership	Steering Committee Representation
19 Jun	Postwatch Scotland	Newsletter summer 05
19 Jun	SEPA	SSEPAView
17 Jun	Scottish Language Dictionaries	Receipt £20
16 Jun	Law and Administration	Community Council
15 Jun	Development Services	Development Plan Customer Charter
15 Jun	Crown Estate	Scottish Marine Newsletter
13 Jun	Kompan Ltd	Advert playground equipment
13 Jun	ASCC	Calor award reminder
10 Jun	James E Stuart	Jack Nicklaus
10 Jun	Fife Millennium Cycle Project	Cycle Clips Newsletter
9 Jun	Law and Administration	CC Support working group
6 Jun	Shaws & Sons	Council stationary

