

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Agenda – September 2005

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm Monday 5th September 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

Co-option of a replacement full voting member of community council will take place at an appropriate point in the meeting.

1. Apologies

Donald Macgregor, Richard Douglas

2. Minutes of August 2005

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 F: Minute of 8 August.

6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

6.1. Selection of Second Vice-Chair

6.2. Newsletter

[July 7.2.] July's discussion left open the question of who would organise an occasional newsletter. If there is no one individual could a Publicity Committee be reformed?

6.3. Any other matters arising?

7. New Business

7.1. Civic Awards

Ken Crichton has a proposal. A paper will be circulated. We shall probably proceed with excessive caution and formality this time. Attention is drawn to provisions in the Scheme for Community Councils para 9.4e for excluding the public from this item, by resolution of the meeting.

7.1a. HMOs

Appendix E: Will Watson has some points to make about attitudes and recent decisions.

7.2. Langlands Road Phone Box

Appendix A: Letter from BT

7.3. East Fife Area Projects Fund

Appendix B: fund details.

7.4. Bus Station Upgrade

Passed on by Cllr Jane Ann Liston: Gary Moyes, Transportation Services, emailed the Fife Councillors to ask if there were any opinions on:

We propose to take the notice board and attach it to the wall opposite i.e. on the other side of Station Road at the entrance to the bus station. Likewise, we would relocate the heritage board to the pavement on the other side at this location too.

7.5. Scottish Language Dictionaries AGM

2.30pm, Friday 16 September. Followed by launch of the New Supplement to the *Scottish National Dictionary*. Followed in turn by a reception with guest speaker Henry McLeish.

7.6. Lade Brae Upgrade Consultation

Transportation Services are consulting on the draft proposals to upgrade the Lade Braes to multiuser status.

The public consultation will take place in the Town Hall, Queens Gardens, St Andrews on Wednesday 7 September 2005, 3-8pm.

7.7. Review Of Electoral Arrangements

This review is as a result of the passing of the Local Governance (Scotland) Act 2004 and the change to using the Single Transferable Vote form of proportional representation for the next Council election scheduled for 2007. We are encouraged to respond with views on the proposals. A map of the proposed St Andrews 4 member ward is available.

7.8. East Area Local Holiday Dates 2006

February	6 Feb
Spring	6 Mar
May Day	8 May
Autumn	2 Oct
Half holiday	Thursday

7.9. Best Kept Town etc

St Andrews 1st Medium Town in East and Fife-wide. Judge's comments:

- A larger input of floral displays would benefit the town.
- With the number of voluntary groups this should be a key improvement area for the town.
- I was very impressed with the quality of the landscape at key locations.

7.10. Campaign for the Sustainable Communities Bill

We have received information on this campaign, though it appears to be an Southron bill. The issues are cross-border though if anyone want to look into it.

7.11. Consultation on Green Belts Policy

Copies of SPP 21 Green Belts Draft received.

8. Reports from Office Bearers

8.1. Chair

8.2. Treasurer

Appendix C: report

The meeting needs to pass a formal motion identifying the (new) signatories for the bank account.

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. Madras representatives

A reminder has been sent to the Rector that we have two places open for nominees from the Whole School Board.

8.3.2. Town Hall Flag

Sat 3/9: Flag is stuck at half mast, jammed as it was being taken down to raise the Merchant Navy flag for the commemoration day. Being the weekend there is very little chance of it being fixed in time. I understand the saltire is looking a bit tatty now; we should probably supply a new one soon, once the old one can be retrieved...

8.3.3. Web Site

www.standrewscc.net is under development... Assistance in updating the articles there (which mostly date back to Frank Riddell's pages from 1998-ish), new photos, etc, would be appreciated.

8.3.4. Group Photograph

Will be October's item 0. 7pm prompt please.

9. Reports

9.1. From Committees

Committee chairs are reminded that it would be helpful to announce meeting dates and locations for the benefit of would-be committee members.

9.1.1. Recreation

Joe Peterson reports:

The Annual CC Garden Award Ceremony will be held in the Town Hall Supper Room on Thursday September 8th. Times 6.45pm for 7pm. Alistair Barnard from Fife Council has kindly agreed to attend to present the prizes.

As St Andrews reached the final stages of the Beautiful Scotland In Bloom competition this year four individuals have been asked to attend the award ceremony at Edzell on Wednesday 14th of September. The two Kens, myself and our local garden Judge Hamish Matheson are to attend as representatives of the CC.

9.1.2. General Purposes

Appendix D: report of 10 August: Hon Cit recommendations, Greyfriars Garden, Correspondence Secretary.

9.2. From Representatives

9.2.1. Fairtrade

Motion: this CC formally adopts the St Andrews Fairtrade Town Campaign's event on 30th November to officially make it a CC celebration of Fairtrade status.

(Proposed Bruce Ryan, seconded Pete Lindsay).

The event itself will run as planned and organised by FT campaign.

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 – Phone Box Removal

From Rick Thompson Project Liaison Office, BT Payphones

01334-474968, Langlands Rd, St Andrews, KY16 8BN. Removal.

TIME SENSITIVE – 42 Day Consultation period end date: 4th October 2005

BT's proposals to re-align payphone provision to meet consumer demand

BT has an obligation to provide access to public payphones to meet the needs of consumers, but it is a sad fact that consumers are choosing other methods of communication over payphones and as a result use of public street payphones continues to decline. BT wishes to continue to work with your council to re-align public payphone provision more closely to the demand that now exists. This letter is part of the formal consultation process regarding BT's current programme of proposed public payphone removals.

The increase in mobile phone ownership has led to a complete culture change in communication the number of calls made from BT payphones has more than halved in the last four years. Ninety nine per cent of UK homes now have a phone at home and 85 per cent have a mobile phone[1]. There are 66,000 public payphones in Great Britain and two thirds of these no longer cover their costs. Striking a balance between growing commercial pressures and providing an effective payphone service is vital. BT has managed to keep its payphone business viable by careful management of costs and the introduction of new initiatives focused on growing new revenue streams. Advertising on kiosks and internet enabled payphones are examples of our success in this regard.

As you may be aware, Ofcom (The Office of Communications) is currently undertaking a Review of Universal Service. The Universal Service Obligations include the requirement to offer access to public payphones to meet reasonable consumer need and define the consultation process that must be followed prior to the removal of a public payphone. The conclusions from this review are unlikely to be published until late in 2005. Faced with falling consumer demand for public payphone service, it would be unrealistic for BT to halt all consultation on removal proposals pending the review outcome and as a result our consultation programme is continuing under the existing regulatory regime.

We have already worked very successfully with councils throughout the UK regarding the first stages of our public payphone rationalisation programme and feedback from this has been provided to Ofcom as part of the Universal Service Review. One area which we hope will be addressed through this review is removal of the obligation to provide cash payment facilities at all public payphones.

Our past consultation with local bodies has clearly identified demand for access to a payphone but not necessarily with the ability to pay for calls with cash, for example access to the emergency services is regularly quoted as the primary reason for box retention. I am sure you will appreciate that providing cash payment facilities accounts for a great deal of the cost associated with running an individual payphone and of course it also leaves the payphone open to theft related vandalism. We have proposed to Ofcom that in certain circumstances BT should be allowed to remove the cash payment facility with the agreement of the relevant local bodies. In practice, this would mean that the payphone no longer accepts cash payment but still has all other functionality including the ability to make emergency, operator controlled, reverse charge, credit card and Chargecard calls.

[1] Office of Telecommunications (OfTel) Consumers' use of fixed telephony, Q14 August 2003.

Our rationalisation proposals in Royal Burgh St Andrews

Among the street based payphones in Royal Burgh St Andrews, 1 is little used by consumers and is therefore proposed by BT for removal. Full details of this box are shown on the enclosed sheets which include telephone number and address on a box by box basis.

This letter formally starts our consultation with you and the local community on these proposals. BT will place consultation notices in the relevant kiosks over the next three weeks to ensure that the local community are fully informed. To give the local community sufficient time to express their views to the Local Authority Planning Department and/or Parish/Community Council, BT has extended the consultation period by 21 days in addition to the 42-day period over which we are obliged to consult.

What you need to do next

The enclosed list shows the payphones that BT is proposing to remove and/or those we would like to retain without cash payment facilities.

Please return this list to the address above, or by e-mail to bt.authorisation.team@bt.com before 4th October 2005, with any comments or objections to BT's proposals. The regulations that cover box removals require that all objections are supported by reasons. Please feel free to provide this information on a covering letter or separate sheet along with any other comments you wish to make. The consultation period will close on 4th October 2005 and responses received after this date will not be accepted. Please allow at least two days for postal delivery, and kindly note that proof of postage may be required in instances of dispute.

Should your comments relate to a particular phone box, please clearly show the telephone number of the kiosk on your correspondence. This will ensure that we are able to deal with your enquiry efficiently. It would also be of great assistance if all responses could be collated and channelled via a single point of contact for your council.

We recognise that there may be concerns about our plans and are happy to discuss these over the telephone or to meet with Local Planning Authorities should you require further clarification. Please contact BT Payphones' Customer Services on 0800 661610 between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday if you would like to take up this offer.

If you are still awaiting a response to a previous consultation objection, please note that this letter supersedes all communications concerning that objection. Please be aware that a small number of boxes that have had an objection lodged in the past have been included in this revised proposal. Other Possibilities

As an alternative to removing unprofitable payphones, BT offers a range of innovative solutions. BT is proud to have worked with local government authorities to provide access to the Internet and e-government services. Indeed, rather than removing a number of our standard payphones, some local authorities have funded their upgrade to broadband enabled multimedia kiosks, not only retaining the voice service but also offering access to the Internet and a range of e-government information. This is an option you may wish to consider. These kiosks can be WiFi enabled to bring wireless broadband to the streets of your community and in addition offer a CCTV capability, providing added security for local people. If you require further information on these solutions please call Bruna Marengi on 020 7876 8825 or e-mail on bruna.marengi@bt.com

Appendix B – East Fife Area Projects Fund

East Fife Area Projects Fund

Could your community do with...

Improvements to its community centre or village hall ... harbour or riverbanks ... park, play and sports areas or open spaces ... paths, cycleways or car parks ... lighting ... visitor facilities ...?

Fife Council's East Fife Area Projects Fund provides up to £20,000 towards projects such as these to develop or improve Fife Council facilities in local communities. There are a few rules attached to how the Fund can be used for example, you'll usually need to find some additional funding from another source to match the Area Projects contribution. For details, see the enclosed sheet on Eligibility Criteria.

If your group has a project proposal, just contact your local councillor or locality manager. If your project meets the eligibility criteria and has the support of your locality's councillors, your locality manager will help you complete the application form for consideration by all the East Fife Councillors at the East Area Services Committee which meets monthly. There's no deadline for applications and the process, from application to approval, should normally be completed within 8 weeks.

There's only a small amount of money available for the whole of East Fife for 2005/6. However, even if the Fund can't help your project this time round, there may be another fund that can, so do make sure you contact your councillor or locality manager with your proposals.

Area Projects Allocation Eligibility Criteria

1. Project must not be being funded from existing mainstream revenue or capital budgets. The project must be representing additionality.
2. The maximum contribution towards a project will be £20,000.
3. A project will have strong community support and is likely to have been an unresolved issue over a lengthy period of time.
4. Higher priority will be given to a project which can attract matched funding from either a community planning partner of the Council or externally, eg lottery funding. In the case of a matched funded project, the maximum amount that can be allocated to a single project is 25% of the total allocation to the area.
5. A project will not be approved unless it has either no revenue implications or there is a clear statement of how any revenue costs can be met from within existing budgets.
6. The type of project that will be supported will result in the physical development of a Fife Council facility. The facility should be classed as General Fund – that means that Housing land and buildings are not eligible for funding.

7. Other types of project such as feasibility studies will be considered for funding on a case by case basis.
8. Projects will be approved by the appropriate committee.

For further guidance on eligibility criteria, please contact Laura Robertson, Accounting Team Leader, 01334 412857 or e-mail: LauraC.Robertson@smtp5.fife.gov.uk.

Appendix C – Treasurer’s report

Treasurer’s report September 2005

1. Income and expenditure

	£
Balance brought forward 30 June 2005	27140.93
to 200 Club (See Treasurer’s report in July 2005 Agenda (2nd bullet point of item 3)	-50.00
Kennoway Town Band (bandstand concert)	-150.00
bank interest for July	+37.74
from Fife Council for Recreation Committee (floral decoration of St Andrews)	+750.00
Joe Peterson (expenses resulting from floral decoration of St Andrews)	-225.90
Dysart Colliery Silver Band (bandstand concert)	-200.00
Lee Mitchell (designing bandstand concerts poster)	-100.00
St Andrews in Focus	-100.00
Strachan & Livingston (advertisement for bandstand concerts)	-51.70
Secretary’s expenses	-52.08
Richfield Springs group (bandstand concert)	-60.00
Dunfermline Town Band (bandstand concert)	-350.00
Fife Council: hall hire May 2005	-31.25
University of St Andrews (printing bandstand concerts posters)	-107.94
Closing balance 30 August	26,449.80

There are two more bandstand concerts to be paid for. The bands have yet to submit their invoices.

Our income so far this financial year is £4106.38 (of which £2920.88 was our annual grant from Fife Council). Our expenditure so far this financial year is £2230.37. Hence our surplus so far this financial year is £1876.01. We need to spend a further £690.51 this financial year to qualify for the full Fife Council grant next year.

2. Bandstand Concerts

As in previous years, St Andrews Common Good Fund have agreed to fund the bandstand concerts and have voted to send us £2150, subject to us returning the difference between this and the total cost of the concerts.

3. Rationalisation of our nominal sub-accounts

We only have one bank account. However, my predecessors and I have tracked our income and expenditure in notional sub-accounts. In my report for June 2005, I suggested that we dispense with 3 sub-accounts that have been untouched for several years. Hence:

- I returned £50 to the 200 Club. This emptied the ‘Youth’ sub-account and so I have ‘closed’ it.
- Similarly, I have ‘closed’ the empty newsletter sub-account.
- I wrote to the Rector of Madras College offering him the £260.41 in the Upper Arlington sub-account for use in any cultural exchanges between Madras and Upper Arlington. I have just heard from his colleague Mr Benn that their exchange programme is still going strong so I can now empty and ‘close’ this sub-account. I suggest to CC that we send them a round £300. We can easily afford the extra £39.59!

4. Another signatory to the bank account

We normally have 4 signatories to the bank account: Treasurer, Chair, Secretary and another, traditionally one of the Vice-chairs. Cheques must be signed by the Treasurer and one of the other signatories. The duties of signatories are simple: seeing supporting documentation, then counter-signing cheques prepared by the Treasurer unless there is a good reason not to do so.

Since Murdo Macdonald resigned from CC we have not had a 4th signatory. The remaining Vice-chair is not keen to become a signatory. Therefore I suggest to CC that we elect a new Vice-chair who is content to be the 4th signatory.

5. My successor

As I announced a last month, I will resign as treasurer after presenting audited accounts at October’s meeting. I suggest we elect my successor now so that a smooth handover can be effected during September. So that candidates for this post can be aware of what they’re letting themselves in for, here’s a brief description of what I’ve been doing:

Routine duties

- Write cheques, get another signatory to counter-sign each one, then dispatch them to the payees.

- Track income and expenditure (I use a very simple Excel spreadsheet)
- Keep documentation (receipts, invoices, covering letters, etc) relating to income and expenditure
- Report to CC at least as much as CC deems necessary each month
- At the end of the financial year, have the accounts audited by an independent qualified accountant.
- Present them to CC for approval.
- Once the accounts have been approved by CC, forward copies and supporting documentation to Fife Council. This is also the time to apply for the Fife Council grant.

On average, this part of my rôle takes around 4 hours per week.

Trust fund

While not part of the Treasurer's duties as defined by Fife Council, because the Trust Fund involves funds that pertain to CC, it makes sense for the Treasurer to be involved.

In 1987, some money was put into a Trust Fund for donation to worthy St Andrews-centric causes. By being in a separate entity's account, this money will remain in St Andrews even if CC ceases to exist and Fife Council then takes over its assets.

The Trust deed states that eligible causes are those that are "*for charitable purposes only ... in particular the advancement of the education of the public generally in St Andrews and the promotion of the welfare of the public generally in St Andrews*"

The Trustees are the current Chair and Secretary of CC and Reverend Marie-Louise Moffett. According to the TF bank account's pass books, there was frequent income and expenditure up to October 1999, since when the account has just gathered interest. Currently there is £3465.65 in the Trust Fund bank account.

The signatories to the Trust Fund bank account are currently Pete Lindsay and Murdo Macdonald. I feel that the signatories should be as for our main bank account (Treasurer plus one of Secretary, Chair and a Vice-Chair). This would mean that the CC is aware of what is happening to 'its' assets.

(The Trust Fund deed states "*The ... Trust Assets shall be vested in the Trustees and all funds, assets and monies whatsoever shall be held by them ...*")

However, to do this, we will have to

- Get the Trustees to meet, agree to these changes and minute this agreement.
- If it does, get the Trustees to meet, agree to these changes and minute this agreement.
- Present a signed minute to the bank, along with appropriate ID for the new signatories and the Abbey's rather complicated change-of-signatory form

Thereafter, the Treasurer should report to CC and Reverend Moffett about the TF assets in his/her normal monthly report. Also CC could put some of the money currently in its main account into the TF. CC should then invite local bodies and people to apply for grants and the Trustees should then meet much more regularly to consider them.

Of course, the TF could be closed down and the money transferred to the main CC account. Even then, the TF deed states that money so transferred must be held by CC "*for charitable purposes only*"

So far I've spent about 10 hours (over 2 months) on this part of the rôle. I envisage that once the signatories have been changed, this part will take no more than 30 minutes per week.

Coat of Arms

- Liaise with Sandy White of St Andrews Limited – this company markets the Coat of Arms on our behalf. So far we have received £9000 (less legal fees associated with setting up the marketing agreement) for the past 3 years' licensed use of the Coat of Arms. Mr White assures me that great things are due to happen in connection with marketing the Coat of Arms in America. However, I have yet to receive any sales figures from SAL. My replacement should continue to press for these, since the legal agreement between SAL and CC states that SAL must provide them.

So far I've spent about 10 hours (over 2 months) on this part of the rôle. I envisage that once the signatories have been changed, this part will take no more than 30 minutes per week.

Of course, CC may resolve that the new Treasurer does not take on the Trust Fund and CoA rôles but I feel they are part and parcel of the CC's financial aspects and so the Treasurer should at least be aware of these financial aspects.

Appendix D – General Purposes Report

Present: Bruce Ryan, Ken Fraser, Ian Goudie, Donald Macgregor, Pete Lindsay. Emailed comments from Ken Crichton were read out.

1. Honoured/Honorary Citizen Scheme

(hereafter Hon. Cit.)

This was examined in four parts, with close reference to the original intentions of the award scheme (March 2000) and vote procedure (July 2000), and a working paper by Pete Lindsay summarising the various proposals from June and July.

1.1. Awards

The questions discussed were:

i) whether any awards should be considered at all in future

It was felt that to abandon the overall scheme because of one upset would be an over-reaction and could be seen as dishonouring the previous recipients.

ii) whether there should be one scheme with two titles, or two separate schemes under the Honoured and Honorary titles, with separate criteria.

This was felt to be closely intertwined with the next major item, the question of eligibility – if there are two separate schemes and titles there could be two levels of eligibility. If a common eligibility was agreed then there is only one scheme, with two titles for the sake of pedantic correctness.

It was clear from the original proposal that the intention was for one scheme and two (pedantic) titles.

1.2. Eligibility

After a wide-ranging discussion it was agreed as a clarification that any candidate must have a credible connection, by residence or deeds, to St Andrews. To attempt to award Hon. Cit. to world figures with no connection to St Andrews could be seen to be acting outwith our remit as a community council.

It was agreed that a form of words based on the Young Citizen scheme would be a fruitful place to start, ie a candidate should have:

1. enhanced the environment of St Andrews in some way, or
2. brought credit by some action or deed to the name of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews, or
3. initiated and/or carried out a scheme which has proved to be of benefit to the citizens or group of citizens, of St Andrews.

(Young Citizen award 2003)

These criteria arguably do not exclude any previous candidate, but do set definite limits on the scheme.

NB it seems to be assumed generally, but not stated, that candidates must be living.

1.3. Procedure

A-1, based closely on the July 2005 suggestion by Pete Lindsay, taking into account suggestions at that meeting.

There was concern at the possible problem of 'leaks' during the month between the initial proposal (C) and the vote the following month (D); however the view of those who spoke at the July meeting was in favour of this gap, and it seems inescapable if all voting members are to be given the opportunity to vote on a proposal.

Suggestion that a fixed, annual date for considering proposal were felt to be too inflexible to deal with situations where a potential recipient's health might impose a literal deadline. There was also concern that setting an annual date would tend to impose the expectation of an annual award, which would go against the original intention that the award be made 'only on rare occasions'.

[A fixed date might also lead to two proposals arising in the same year being seen as competitive – PL]

A. 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.

B. 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.

C. 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.) The candidate must be formally proposed and seconded for an Hon. Cit. (counter proposals will not be accepted as pre-empting the agreed procedure).

D. At the following meeting, in a private session again (it is strongly advised), following any further discussion that seems necessary, a vote is taken.

E. The vote will be by a paper ("secret") ballot. The result is determined by whatever method has been agreed for these things.

F. 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).

G. The simple fact that an award was not made / is to be offered (delete as appropriate) is minuted, without names.

H. 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 full meeting. If the award is rejected the bare fact of the refusal should be notified to the next full meeting, again no names.

I. It is the proposer's/seconders' job to make the arrangements for any formal presentation, reception or whatever.

1.4. Voting

The question was discussed of Hon. Cit. being awarded by a low proportion of community council members if a simple majority vote at a meeting is adopted.

It was agreed that continuity is important and that it would be undesirable to adopt a change to the voting

system that could change previous results if applied retrospectively. A further aim is to avoid an individual member having privileged information of voting and potentially being subject to pressure to reveal it.

It is therefore proposed that the basic requirement for 16 votes For be retained (69.6% out of 23 voters).

As no one could remember the full justification for the veto provision of the original system it is proposed that this be dropped. This clarifies the voting to simply needing votes *For*.

Given the high bar for success some system of absentee vote will be necessary. This will also maintain the broad basis of the decision by the whole of community council. This will likely involve votes being accepted from absentees in sealed envelopes to be opened at the voting meeting. There should also be provision to suspend the vote if substantial new information comes to light immediately before the scheduled vote, so that information can be communicated to the absentees in case their decision is changed. Of course the decision to suspend must be taken before the envelopes are opened.

Despite these provisions it is for the proposer to consider when to launch the process – a vote scheduled for August is hardly sensible.

2. 1 Greyfriars Garden Ground

Pete Lindsay has contacted Cllr Sangster and Fife Council for contact details of the District Valuer but has received no encouragement from one, WS is now looking into compulsory purchase, and no response from the other.

Noted the question of maintenance: we would need to satisfy FC of arrangements to keep the area in good order before permission to attempt to buy would be forthcoming. We have no such arrangements.

Looking into purchasing property such as 1GGG is a complex matter needing focussed attention. Agreed to recommend this to be delegated to an individual (or ad hoc committee).

[Probably superseded by events; a deadline was set for offers of 17 Aug. Cllr WS believed to be looking for funding from other sources as CC cannot respond in time. – PL]

3. Secretarial Work

Discussed weight of work for PL – basic secretarial duties are compounded by other, non-secretarial activities such as the web site, Event newsletter and (somewhat sporadically at the moment) planning committee. He reported several offers of help with letter-writing after August meeting, but feels that the work of gathering the information now from outstanding issues to pass on to would-be writers would be much the same work as writing the letters etc himself.

Agreed to suggest a Correspondence Secretary post, and failing that a more active approach to delegating letter-writing etc at meetings.

Appendix E – HMOs

Will Watson writes:

Not wishing to be perceived as anti-student appears to feature large on the agenda of Fife Council, and several local residents who I have spoken to over the issue of the granting of local HMO licences. Unfortunately, I do not believe this is true as they seem to dismiss the students who are going to be directly and indirectly affected by these actions as some kind of wholly acceptable collateral damage.

Having signed a lease with my two flatmates on a property in Southfield back in March entirely unaware of the impending doom it would face, I now find myself in possible danger of eviction through no fault of my own – something which is not only causing me sleepless nights but would be a serious disruption to my studies at the medical school should it come about. (As an aside, this was dismissed by gentleman who identified himself as a resident of Dempster Court and a protester against the HMO licences as being wholly acceptable as there are “plenty of other places” – I hope this is not the attitude yourselves would take as it, to me, displays a shockingly callous disregard for student welfare).

However, I am all too aware of the wider issues – chief amongst your concerns being the disruption of local communities and local residents being priced out of the housing market. Unfortunately, I do not think blocking HMO licences is the answer to this and if you will indulge me your time, I would like to outline why.

The major causes, as you well know, are a lack of university-owned accommodation combined with an increasing student population – creating a demand. Given the restricted supply of housing in such a small town, this has created a seller's market (a fact I lament every time the rent is due). Once HMO licences are no longer granted in certain areas, supply unfortunately becomes even smaller while demand continues to grow and the situation becomes that little bit worse. Flats to be let to two people (and hence not requiring HMO licences) are likely to increase – I have already heard several anecdotal accounts of properties being converted to two bedroom by landlords pre-empting the council's decisions. Two bedroom flats tend to be more expensive and without an HMO they are less tightly regulated – to the detriment of locals as well as students.

I learnt the other day that St Andrews has been earmarked by the Scottish Executive as an area for economic growth. Local Housing plans (I note not received tremendously by yourselves) seem to suggest large new housing developments. Surely this is a better answer than attempting to stall this economic growth? Ultimately, however, this is a problem of the University's creation and I feel they will be the ones to rectify it rather than Fife Council. But then I wonder – is a block of flats regulated by HMOs too different from a hall of residence watched over by a warden? Better at least than a block of two bedroom flats governed by nothing at all...

To sum up, I'd encourage you all to consider the innocent student victims of this course of action and to explore alternative solutions. I appreciate that decisions on these matters are not taken lightly, and hope this letter has provided some useful insight from a different perspective for you all.

Appendix F – Planning Minutes

Planning Meeting 08-08-05

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

1	54 Lamberton Place	Change of use of public open space to garden ground	N/C
2	19 Freddie Tate St	Dormer extension	N/C
3	St Andrews Bay Golf Resort	Erect toilet blocks/shelter on golf courses	N/C
4	Morrisons 45 Largo Road	Extend supermarket to rear and into new 1st floor acc + Demolish existing workshop premises	OBJ R.D. loss of other business premises; visual impact; lack of further parking; economic threat to town centre
5	The Sea Food Restaurant, The Scores	Erect extension to bin store + enclosure for air con. units	N/C
6	13 Roundhill Road	4 person HMO	N/C
7	Castlecliffe	Erect bicycle sheds	N/C
8	Shell Garage, Bridge Street	Relocate pipes	N/C
9	Rose Park	Replacement windows	N/C
10	11 Crawford Gardens	1st floor and porch extension	N/C
11	Castlecliffe	Alterations to provide additional office space	N/C

Correspondence

Post received

Date	From	Subject
1/9/05	Transportation Services	Lade Braes upgrade to multiuser
1/9/05	Fife Council Policy & Org Dev	Review of Electoral Arrangements
29/8/05	Volunteer Centre Fife	Questionnaire: Young People & Volunteering
29/8/05	Scottish Language Dictionaries	AGM 16 Sep
26/8/05	Planning Service	Doors Open Days
26/8/05	Law and Administration	Local Holiday Dates 2005
25/8/05	Community Services	Best Kept Town 05
24/8/05	Stewartsturf	Advt: bark surfacing replacement
23/8/05	Local Works Campaign	Sustainable Communities Bill
20/8/05	RuralScotland	Newsletter Summer 2005
15/8/05	Fife Council	Invoice – town hall
15/8/05	FoE	What on Earth Newsletter
15/8/05	SEPA	SEPAView Newsletter
11/8/05	Planning Aid for Scotland	Newsletter
10/8/05	Chief Executive's Service	BT Phonebox Removals
8/8/05	Law and Administration	Children's Panel recruitment
8/8/05	Scottish Executive	Planning Consultation: green belt
6/8/05	Fife Environmental Network	Newsletter Aug 05
6/8/05	SMP Playgrounds	Advert
6/8/05	Osprey Company	Advert
5/8/05	Tricia Marwick MSP	CC contact details
3/8/05	BT	Phone Box removal Langlands R
1/8/05	Fife Council	East Area Projects Fund
