

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council Agenda – October 2005

3 Oct 05

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm Monday 3rd October 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. Photo

Members are asked to attend at 7pm sharp for a group photo to better identify community councillors to the community and as a historical record [May 7.7.].

1. Apologies

Bette Christie, Elise Methven, Maggie Stracey

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

The Largo Road hospital site objection is a particularly long document so copies will be circulated at the meeting, for information, rather than included here as an appendix. The full document and its own appendices are on line at <http://www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/2005/hospital/index.html>.

Appendix A: 'Modernising the Planning System' – a response on behalf of community council to aspects of this white paper.

5.1. Minutes

6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

6.1. Primary Schools

Appendix B: information on formal options and consultation deadline from Fife Council.

6.2. Langlands Road Phone Box

Appendix C: objection to BT and their response.

6.3. Bus Station Phone & Information Boards

Transportation Service initially said that the phone box would not be reinstated as a phone would be available inside the bus station building during opening hours: 7am-midnight approx. It was pointed out that this was not acceptable as a replacement for a 24/7 accessible phone, especially as we object to BT removing them, so now:

WSP, the consultants for this project, have confirmed that the Public Phone box (24/7 access) will be retained in the final scheme and will be relocated adjacent to the new building when its complete.

Tourist historical information boards are to be updated by the St Andrews World Class group for next year, positioning will be considered then. Further details of this update are being sought in view of CC's input to the old boards.

A temporary location for the notice board is now being investigated at the front of the St Mary's Place Local Office car park, again the final location will be discussed closer to the bus station works completion.

6.4. Honoured Citizen / Honorary Citizen Scheme.

Discussion of the General Purposes committee report [September Appendix D].

6.5. St Andrews Day Reception

Pete Lindsay suggests that as he has heard Fife Council will not be holding this this year community council may wish to step in to mark our name saint's day. Presumably the Burgh Chambers will be free.

This would clash with the Fairtrade reception we've already agreed to support in the Victory Memorial Hall to announce Fair Trade Town Status for St Andrews. We should offer them the opportunity to 'upgrade' to the Burgh Chambers in a more joint enterprise than we'd thought of when we agreed to support them last month.

6.6. Civic Award

Ken Crichton to report [September 7.1]. Attention is drawn to provisions in the Scheme for Community Councils para 9.4e for excluding the public from this item, as it refers to individuals, by resolution of the meeting.

6.7. Any Other Matters Arising?

7. New Business

7.1. Scout Hall Renovation Funding

Appendix E: letter from Carol Drysdale, Secretary, 8th Fife (St Andrews) Scout Group.

7.2. Award Proposal

Withdrawn

7.3. Postwatch Scotland

Newsletter of the independent watchdog for postal services: Consultation on delivery exception policy (grounds such as safety, difficulty of access, and the appeals process); Certificate of Posting; Tamper-evident bags on request for special delivery items; Pricing in proportion (based on both weight and size) starts 21 Aug 06; Rural post office network – pilot schemes; Queue lengths in post offices; International 'signed-for' service problems; Licensed postal service providers; Change your postcode?; Pack securely for Christmas.

7.4. Community Council Seminar

Notes from the meeting 25 June.

7.5. Strandline

Newsletter of the Marine Conservation Society's Adopt-a-Beach campaign: beach survey 2006; Out and about with the Litter Team; Great egg-case hunt results; Plastic bag tax for Scotland (plastic bags make up 2% of beach litter and are reported as a significant cause of death of various marine mammals which ingest them); Clean Neighbourhoods Bill (England & Wales) and cleaner beaches; Alternative use for old litter.

7.6. Pressured Area Status Consultation

Received: Report on the outcome of the consultation undertaken earlier this year.

8. Reports from Office Bearers

8.1. Chair

8.1.1. St Andrews Day Holiday

Dennis Canavan MSP has written inviting CC to send a representative to a press conference at 1pm Wed 5 Oct, Committee Room 5 of the Scottish Parliament, the day before parliament debate his bill. Is anyone able to attend?

8.1.2. Remembrance Sunday Service

Appendix I outlines the new, inclusive form of the service.

8.2. Treasurer

Appendix H: Treasurer's report.

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. August Minutes

[September 2.] Elise Methven queried the minutes regarding the status of nursery school provision in the four St Andrews primaries. Appendix G reports the outcome of a detailed check.

8.3.2. Standing Orders

I noticed that the most recently printed and on line versions of the Standing Orders differ not only from each other but also from the way the meetings actually run. An updated version, more closely aligned with actual practice, will be circulated to members with this agenda for formal adoption or amendment as appropriate.

Some items that might usefully be added as part of the SO, or in appendices 'for information' would be:

- the policy on press releases: in the first instance all press material goes to *The Citizen* and Dougie Miller in recognition of their attendance at meetings.

- Personal letters to the press as a community councillor
- The Hon. Cit. rules (when decided), and
- information about other awards and schemes run by community council

It would be particularly helpful if newcomers to community council would pass on the questions they have/had about the way we work so that answers can be included in the SO or an associated FAQ.

8.3.3. Constitution

If we have concluded discussions over the Hon. Cit. rules I hope to return to the update of the constitution which has been on hold since June.

8.3.4. Trust Fund

I have taken all Trust Fund business back from Bruce Ryan so as not to complicate the transition of treasurer-ship to Carole Tricker. The treasurer is not an *ex officio* trustee and strictly has no remit, unlike secretary and chair with whom the responsibility for sorting out the fund remains.

8.3.5. Upcoming speakers:

November: Gordon Pay (a former community councillor) on Community Wind Turbines.

8.3.6. Availability

I'll be out of town a lot this month. Normal levels of lack of service will be resumed in November.

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 – Modernising the Planning System

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council response to the planning white paper, by Pete Lindsay.

1) National Planning Framework

Suffering currently from the malign effects of the NPF 2004 into which we had no input (unlike other, selected, community councils we understand), in its setting of the agenda for a Structure and Local plan we find unsympathetic, we are concerned at the lack of any public consultation or public review for the NPF being mentioned in the white paper.

Leaving this to ministerial or departmental diktat, as it appears, does not meet the objective of delivering "a system where everyone's views are listened to and taken proper account of". It is centralisation; where is the participation ("everyone's views are listened to") when the NPF is set entirely centrally? How will "these proposals restore confidence in the planning system" when the rules are set in a realm far more easily influenced by professional lobbies, than it can be by ordinary people in local communities who have neither the money, the organisation, the access, nor the time to lobby ministers?

WE PROPOSE: that regular reviews of the NPF should be subject of wide and open consultation; and that even then the NPF be guidelines subject to review and questioning of assumptions (e.g. in planning enquiries), rather than as overriding strategic policy, as it is currently presented.

2) Widening Rights of Appeal

The Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council submitted its opinions to the consultation on Rights of Appeal in Planning last year. We are bitterly disappointed that our, and many other's, submissions on this matter fell on deaf ears.

We acknowledge that the white paper champions improvement in consultation. In principal we would welcome that, but our experience of some consultation exercises is such that we have no reason to trust the good faith of other parties, either public or private, in directly development-related consultations. Both from our own experience and those of colleagues in other community councils, consultation is treated by developers, and sometimes planning authorities, as a fishing expedition to identify and neutralise objections – or even advice – rather than take them into account and address them positively.

As there seems to be no duty to actually act on consultation results, the white paper does not seem to level the playing fields in any significant way here.

The current lack of faith in the planning system however does not centre on the problems of consultation. At heart of the lack of confidence is the massive inequality that if a would-be developer alone does not like a planning decision they, and they alone, can appeal that result.

It is a matter of equality and justice for all that a third party right of appeal be introduced.

We recognise that there must be practical constraints on TPRA to prevent it becoming the NIMBY road-block of choice to any development. Limitations would be necessary on both who and on what grounds appeals can be made. We believe that the 'who' should at least include statutory consultees (such as community councils) who have objected to the proposals in question. The grounds for appeal should include cases where

- the the application is contrary to policies in the local plan or national guidelines, or
- the decision is contrary to recommendation by planning officers, or
- an Environmental Impact Statement is needed

and possibly other grounds.

If there is no TPRA there remains the theoretical possibility of Judicial Review. However this does not address the case for and against a proposal so is of little use in planning terms. Practically, local experience of an attempt to mount a judicial review was that the sums of money required were such that community fund-raising to mount it took four months; the review was then dismissed as having not been brought quickly enough.

WE PROPOSE: A limited Third Party Right of Appeal against planning decisions, *“to secure greater fairness and equity” ... “a fairer, more balanced system”*.

3. Plan-Led Development

We support basing the planning system on development plans. The requirement for regular review of the development plans is welcome. This process must be inclusive of local communities and the open to examination, preferably without having to use the provisions of Freedom of Information legislation. The opportunity to become involved in the development plan review process is not a substitute for involvement in decisions on specific applications. Very few people have the stomach for the more theoretical side of planning policy. It is only when sites are named and plans drawn that the community becomes fully involved.

4. Consultation

The proposal that developers will be required to carry out pre-application engagement with communities in certain circumstances (departures, bad neighbours, proposals subject to EIA) do not appear to amount to anything more than a a box-ticking exercise. There are no mechanisms to ensure that concerns of communities are actually acted upon which risks generating meaningless consultation exercises or worse just provide developers with information on likely objections so they may circumvent them.

Meaningless or cynical consultation is as bad as no consultation at all, perhaps worse as it undermines confidence in all consultation processes, not just the planning system.

There is a danger too that in an area subject to much development activity frequent consultation can lead to consultation fatigue, and even if honestly carried out still fail in its objective of engagement.

(Members of this community council have responded over the last couple of years to consultations on two golf courses, a hospital, local plan, structure plan, transport plan and a planning white paper – in the planning arena alone...)

Pre-application consultation might address community concerns if there is a credible possibility that an application will fail if those concerns are ignored. Thus it could perhaps work in conjunction with ‘lack of consultation’ as a basis of TPRA, but will be useless or counter-productive otherwise.

5. Speeding up planning

Delays could be reduced without harming participation by ruling out repeat and duplicate “twin-tracking” applications. These practices give too much control of the planning system to the developer. We welcome the proposals for local authorities to be able to refuse to determine a repeat application within a certain period.

6. Applications and decisions

While it is helpful for local authorities to be required to give their reasons for all planning decisions, the lack of a facility to question poor decisions through a third party right of appeal does severely limit its utility.

A matter of concern to us in recent years is the lack of credible independent assessment of documentation. There seems to be no mechanism to challenge biased, scientifically dubious or innumerate documentation in such as traffic impact assessments, environmental impact assessments, population projections, etc. The quality of such documentation is sometimes very poor and often lacks the references and raw data to substantiate ‘facts’ and conclusions. There should be more emphasis on the critical examination of documentation.

CONCLUSION

Our major concern is the omission of a third party right of appeal. Without this the white paper must automatically fail its declared aims

- *“to secure greater fairness and equity”*
- *“a fairer, more balanced system”*
- *“these proposals restore confidence in the planning system”*

We would point out that *IF* improved consultation is as effective in involving the local community and addressing their concerns, as the white paper suggests, the presence of a TPRA will do no harm as it will only be used infrequently, but it will go a long way to convince the general public that the planning system is fair and balanced.

Appendix B – Primary Schools Review

From Ian Robertson, Senior Manager (Resources), Education Service

Proposals for Provision of Primary Education in St Andrews

Consultation in accordance with the Education (Scotland) Act 1980

Extension of consultation period

Further to the late Roger Stewart's letter of 25 August to all parents/carers of children in St Andrews primary schools, I am now writing to tell you that the Council is extending the period for consultation on options for the future of the St Andrews primary schools by two weeks to 21 October 2005. The Council has set the date of 24 November 2005 for a special meeting of the Children's Services Committee to consider the school rationalisation proposals at which any representations made will be considered.

This is an outline of the Council's four proposed options for the future of the St Andrews primary schools:

Option 1

Relocate the pupils at Langlands Primary School to Canongate and relocate Greyfriars RC Primary School to the current Langlands site.

Option 2

Relocate the current Lawhead catchment to Canongate and Langlands Primary Schools and relocate Greyfriars RC Primary School to the campus at Lawhead.

Option 3

Relocate Greyfriars RC Primary School to a shared campus supporting denominational and non denominational children on the Canongate site, and retain both Langlands and Lawhead Primary Schools with a revision of catchment areas, if necessary, to best utilise the capacity in the schools.

Option 4

Amalgamate Langlands and Canongate on the Canongate campus, and refurbish Greyfriars RC Primary School.

Full details of the Council's four options for consultation can be found in the report to the Council's Children's Services Committee of 25 August 2005. You can collect a copy of this report in the primary schools affected, and at the Fife Council local office in St Andrews, St Mary's Place, St Andrews, KY16 9UY, or you can find it on the Council's web site at <http://www.fifedirect.org.uk/ChildrensServices>

The closing date for representations on the proposals is now 5pm on Friday 21 October 2005. Please e-mail your views to: education.services@fife.gov.uk or write to: Mr James Belishaw, Senior Manager, Education Service, Fife Council, Rothesay House, Rothesay Place, Glenrothes KY7 5PQ.

Appendix C – Langlands Road Phone Box

Objection to BT, by Pete Lindsay

Call box removals:

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

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

We believe that this box should be retained for reasons of community safety as the area includes sheltered housing for the elderly, Rymouth House residential home for people with learning difficulties and a number of student occupied properties. The box is also on a major pedestrian route from the centre of St Andrews to the residential suburbs.

While the vast majority of households have a phone we understand that it is not uncommon for rented properties not to have outgoing calls enabled. Not everyone carries a mobile yet, particularly in the groups served by Rymouth and the sheltered housing, and mobiles can run out of power. The presence of call boxes serves a community need for backup phone access in emergencies.

As we have said on previous occasions we do recognise that there may be over-provision of phone boxes in St Andrews overall to meet modern needs. However rather than these programmes of piecemeal removals backed by vague statements that a particular phone "is little used by consumers" we suggest that BT should engage with the community and the local authority to produce a coherent plan for public phone provision across St Andrews based on actual call levels and community needs.

Appendix D

Withdrawn

Appendix E – Scout Group Hall Renovation

From Carol Drysdale, Secretary, 8th Fife (St Andrews) Scout Group.

8th Fife Scout Group Hall Renovation Project

On behalf of the 8th Fife Scout group, I am writing to ask if the St Andrews Community Council would be prepared to assist in the scout hall renovation project's fundraising campaign. The group aims to raise just over £50,000. At present, the group has raised £33,000 through sponsored events, Coffee Mornings, donations from charitable trusts, and local government awards.

The renovation plan recently has been put into action, with building work starting at the scout hall along

the East Scores in July 2005. The project has been divided into 6 stages:

1. Disabled user's access ramp to the main entrance. Estimate cost £9,925.
2. Disabled user's toilet and shower facilities. Estimate cost combined with stage 3 £15,225.
3. Male and Female Toilet and Shower facilities refurbishment. Estimate cost see above.
4. Kitchen refurbishment. Estimate cost £13,996.
5. Formation of a new Scouter's Den (conference room). Estimate cost £2,500.
6. Hall redecoration, tiling, new floor coverings, and white goods (eg. Cooker). Estimate cost £7,000.

Stages 1 to 4 are under way. In consultation with our builder/joiner, we are looking to provide an effective yet economically viable Scout hall. Stages 5 and 6 will be started once enough funds have been raised. (However, the committee has decided to purchase in advance a new cooker for the new kitchen. This cost £399 on sale.)

The 8th Fife Scout group has a membership of nearly 80 young people, and the hall is used by community groups (for example, the Ceilidh Club and Judo Club) of all ages and abilities.

For and on behalf of the 8th Fife Scout Group, I would like to thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Appendix F

Withdrawn

Appendix G – August Minutes

Response to Elise Methven by Pete Lindsay

You queried part of the minute of item 3.3, questions on nurseries (two thirds of the way through, para starting "Cllr Jane Ann Liston". You felt that I had not included a point you'd made about "joint" nursery provision at Langlands serving both Langlands and Greyfriars.

Having checked again, the discussion at that point in August was about the physical presence of nursery units in the primary schools, not the provision of service to a school community. I have tried to reflect this in the minute by use of the word 'hosting' in relation to nurseries locations.

The question you asked was whether the nursery at Langlands "covers both Greyfriars and Langlands, is that correct?". John McLauchlin replied that nursery catchment was "not co-terminous" with the primary catchments "it is larger than that", not just St Andrews but peripheral areas as well. He makes no reference to joint provision, nor for that matter do you. JAL added that the nurseries are independent of their host schools.

This does not sound like a full endorsement of the point you were trying to make with your question. In view of the inconclusive outcome of the exchange it would not be correct for me to minute that he agreed with your question. As the exchange was something of an aside to JAL's question about locations anyway I didn't minute it. A minute is not supposed to be a transcript of every single point made or question asked. If anything I should have left more out of 3.2-3.3 than I did.

Appendix H – Treasurer's Report

From Bruce Ryan

I have mixed feelings about writing my final Treasurer's report – I've enjoyed this rôle despite occasionally regretting the time it requires. I also looked forward to streamlining and automating more of the processes. Giving up this rôle is a significant marker along my path towards leaving St Andrews and a complete change in my lifestyle.

Many thanks to Carole Tricker for succeeding me as Treasurer.

1. Firstly, here's this month's transactions:

1-Sep-05	balance brought forward	£ 26,449.80
8-Sep-05	Irvine Engraving (floral awards)	£ 29.00
8-Sep-05	Fife Council (planters)	£ 200.00
27-Sep-05	Alan McGeoch (Madras College Band)	£ 150.00
27-Sep-05	Derek Wishart (Clackmannan Brass band)	£ 250.00
27-Sep-05	Joe Peterson (expenses for floral awards)	£ 45.53
27-Sep-05	St Andrews in Focus	£ 100.00
27-Sep-05	Pete Lindsay (secretary's expenses)	£ 43.79
27-Sep-05	Lady Haig's Poppy Factory (wreath)	£ 18.95
27-Sep-05	Madras College (Upper Arlington exchange programme)	£ 300.00
30-Sep-05	closing balance	£ 25,312.53

I haven't had time this month to have the accounts audited before handing over to Carole. I will have done so by the time Carole and Ken are able to meet me at the bank to be accepted as a signatory. In the meantime, Carole can run the accounts but will need to get Pete, Donald and I to sign the cheques.

Once the accounts have been audited, I can provide a full spreadsheet to be minuted as CC desires.

2. There is still a large amount of money in our account. With CC's permission, I would like to call a General Purposes Committee meeting early in October to discuss what we are going to do with it.

3. The bandstand concerts in July and August have been a part of our turnover. We paid the bands a total of £1160 and spent £259.64 on advertising them. However, as in previous years, Fife Council have agreed to fund the concerts this programme has cost us nothing. Thanks again to Elise for keeping me up to speed on the transactions.

4. Sandy White of St Andrews Limited, which markets use of the St Andrews Coat of Arms on our behalf, has contacted me again about the Coat of Arms deals. He says

'As promised, I have just heard from the Americans [who are interested in using our Coat of Arms – BR] that they wish to visit St. Andrews in mid-October [18 to 20 I believe – BR]. I have yet to hear of their actual travel details but ... my understanding is that everything is now in place for their Business Plan etc. and that the St. Andrews visit is more the 'icing on the cake' as it were plus to meet with the likes of Gavin Hastings to see if he would be able to arrange golf for top level licencees. As Captain at the Duke's Course that should be easy for him.

It might be well to meet with you again prior to their visit and I shall ask my secretary to try to fix this with you.

However, he later told me that this visit would need to be postponed until November. I have replied to let him know that Carole is succeeding me but that I would be happy to attend a meeting to introduce her as my successor if necessary.

Appendix I – Remembrance Sunday Service

New service launched for Remembrance Sunday

A new Order of Service for Remembrance Sunday was unveiled today, for those who gather in silence on 11 November round war memorials across the nations.

The existing Remembrance Day Order of Service has been in use a long time. Now, sixty years after the end of World War II, the Churches and The Royal British Legion have prepared a new Service for today's generation as it picks up the torch of Remembrance – and brings to it images of more recent conflicts and a greater awareness of new terrors and dangers.

The Order of Service for Remembrance Sunday is published by Churches Together in Britain and Ireland and prepared with The Joint Liturgical Group of Great Britain and The Royal British Legion.

Revd Canon Lucy Winkett of St Paul's Cathedral Precentor said: 'Standing together in silence, remembering those who have died in war is an act that brings the people of this and many nations together. The silence is more important than any words. This new Service enables people of all faiths and none to stand together in profound silence and penitence and in commitment to work together for peace and justice.' As Precentor at St Paul's Cathedral she has overseen the liturgy for commemorations of the war in Iraq and the tsunami tragedy. St Paul's is currently preparing to host the memorial service for those killed in the recent bombings in London.

The two minutes silence is framed by a familiar hymn and comforting words from the Old Testament. The Kohima Epitaph is read: 'When you go home tell them of us and say, for your tomorrow we gave our today.' Then there is an act of commitment that does not mention God – a deliberate decision to make the Service as inclusive as possible for people of all faiths and none. Those gathered commit themselves to strive for all that makes for peace, seek to heal the wounds of war and work for a just future. Then there is a Christian blessing.

Laurence Binyon's words 'From the Fallen' are retained but in a new move it is suggested that a young person completes the phrase 'At the going down of the sun and in the morning, we will remember them.' Mr Bill Clark, The Royal British Legion Director of Administration said the new Service was designed to hand the torch of Remembrance on to the next generation. 'The act of Remembrance is as significant as ever in recalling the debt owed to the war-time generation.'

Prayers refer to 'all who in bereavement, disability and pain continue to suffer the consequences of fighting and terror,' recognizing that many non-combatants die in modern warfare and conflict. There are prayers for peace-makers and peace-keepers.

A companion volume to the Order of Service was published in 2004 under the title: Beyond our Tears, an anthology for times of Remembrance, including civil disasters and tragedies.

The Order of Service for Remembrance Sunday ISBN 085169 329 6 price £2.99 is available from CTBI Publications, phone 01733 325 002. A version is downloadable from www.ctbi.org.uk

Correspondence

Post received

Date	from	subject
25/9/05	Scouts	Hall Renovation
25/9/05	Stewartsturf	Sports surfaces advt
21/9/05	Sustainable Scotland	Annual conference
20/9/05	Friends of the Botanic Garden	Newsletter
19/9/05	Volunteer Centre Fife	Volunteer of the Year
17/9/05	Postwatch Scotland	Postwatch Newsletter
15/9/05	Wickstead Leisure	Sports Equipment advt

15/9/05	Law and Administration	CC seminar 25/6
8/9/05	The Local Channel	The Local Channel
8/9/05	Marine Conservation Society	Adopt a beach Newsletter
