

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council Agenda – December 2005

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

The meeting will be preceded by the formal presentation of a cheque for £500 from community council to representatives of the local Scouts. Members are asked to be present for this at 6.45pm.

(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

Chris Lesurf, Bill Sangster

2. Minutes of November 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 A: minutes of meetings on 14/11/05, 21/11/05, letters on Langlands 20mph zone and South Street, and an exchange of correspondence on disabled access.

6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

6.1. Secretary

As announced at November's meeting, Pete Lindsay will leave the post at the end of this meeting. Who will take over which parts of the secretary's tasks?

6.2. Order of business

Joe Peterson suggests that committee business be brought forward in the agenda, in order to encourage the rôle of committees.

6.3. Lade Braes Upgrade

Despite an overall favourable response to this scheme Fife Council Transportation Service is recommending to the Area Services committee (Wed 7 Dec) that this scheme not go ahead. Joe Peterson is concerned.

6.4. Awards

Appendix B: Outline principles from meeting 17 Oct

6.5. Hogmanay Ceilidh

7. New Business

7.1. Common Good Property

Tom Minogue, 94 Victoria Terrace, Dunfermline, KY12 0LU. (tomminogue@btinternet.com) writes:

Andy Wightman has just published *Common Good Land in Scotland – A Review and Critique* <http://www.caledonia.org.uk/commonweal/commongood.html> ... I would recommend it as a must read if you are concerned about the abuse of common good assets such as parks, green areas, libraries etc. If you have any information on the abuse of common good assets please contact me ... All information is treated as confidential.

8. Reports from Office Bearers

8.1. Chair

8.2. Treasurer**8.3. Secretary****8.3.1. Contact Details**

Ted Brocklebank MSP (Mid Scotland & Fife) has requested and been sent a full list of community council contact details in order that he may circulate a newsletter keeping us up-to-date on his activities in Parliament. This newsletter will not, he says, be party political.

8.3.2. Town Hall Flag

A new flag (144"x72") was sourced from www.MrFlag.com just in time for the St Andrew's Festival, for £82 (£104.56 inc delivery & VAT). Unfortunately it turned out that they haven't heard that the flag colour has been defined as the lighter blue (Pantone 300) rather than the older navy, which might be checked when the next is ordered.

9. Reports**9.1. From Committees****9.1.1. Health Education & Welfare**

Chris Lesurf is still unwell, but sends some notes [Appendix C] on the hospital.

9.2. From Representatives**9.2.1. Fairtrade**

St Andrew's Day reception report

10. Any Other Competent Business

Please notify Chair of AOCB items before the start of the meeting or at the break. Hint: Given that the end of the meeting is often taken in something of a rush, unless items are urgent it might be better to submit them for next meeting's New Business.

Appendix A – Planning Minutes**1. Minutes of 14/11/05**

Minutes by Pete Lindsay

Present: PL, IG, GD, RD

1	Core paths	PL has some maps from Archie Strachan relating to past CC submissions on footpaths and rights-of-way. Waiting for exhibition at Library later this month.	
2	Largo Road	Pelican crossing by Broomfaulds junction	nc
3	20 mph zone, Langlands PS	Too many speed humps in Lamond Drive, Kilrymont PI; query inclusion of wider residential 20mph zone	PL
4	2-6 Golf Place	extension to shop, additional retail space	nc
5	28 East Scores	alter & extend dwelling house; windows, extension	nc
6	3 Links Cres	satellite dish	nc
7	2 Ferguson Place	extend dwelling house	nc, outwith conservation
8	35 Lindsay Gdns	extend dwelling house	nc, outwith conservation
9	NPH, North St	telecoms aerials	check previous: IG
10	Hamilton Hall	install period light at door	nc
11	15/16 Howard Place	internal alterations	nc
12	Madras House, South St	install cctv	no plans
13	107 South St ('Citizen Office')	install retractable awning	nc
14	Old Course Hotel	erect boundary wall at car park area	nc
15	Kinburn Castle	change domestic->office use	nc
16	Morrison Supermarket	display illum/non signs	prob retro, PU check?
17	19 Bridge St	satellite dish	nc
18	22 Buchanan Gdns	conservatory rear extn	nc
19	11 Greyfriars Gdns	internal alterations	nc
20	47 Lade Braes	replace windows	nc
21	68 South St	HMO	nc

22	70 Hepburn Gdns	extension to form granny annexe	nc
----	-----------------	---------------------------------	----

2. Langlands 20mph

Comment to Transportation Service, by Pete Lindsay.

Thank you for the plans and the opportunity to comment. I apologise for the late response, due the pressure of timescales and other community council business. The plan has now been studied by the planning committee of the community council; we would like to raise the following points:

The CC has supported 20 mph zones outside schools for some years. The part time 20mph zone on Lamond Drive and Kilrymont Road mostly falls into this category so we support this.

In the wider area we're happy to see plans for anti-skid surfacing at various places around the school and in the wider residential area.

An subject of concern is the speed cushions on Lamond Drive west of the 20mph zone. We feel these to be unnecessary as part of the Langlands scheme. The proposal to raise the level of the crossing on Lamond Drive we do support however. On the north-south section of Kilrymont Road we query the need for cushions, but these are less contentious than those on the west of Lamond Drive.

We are a bit puzzled about the inclusion of the wider 20mph residential zone between the Kinnessburn and Lamond Drive. While happy to see the anti-skid surfacing, we don't think the residential area 20mph issue should be bundled with the specific school-related scheme. We would like a wider public discussion of the residential area scheme, especially as Phase 2, south of Lamond Drive, is not detailed.

We note that Roundhill Road is not included in the part-time 20mph zone but Kilrymont Road is. It seems to us that at least part of Kilrymont Road would be considered residential and subject to a full-time 20mph limit if residential areas are implemented. Is it a matter of emphasising the schools over the residential status – if so why isn't Roundhill road part of the part-time zone – or a desire not to create anomalous sections of full-time within the part-time zone? An puzzling effect of the school zone appears to be that the residents of Kilrymont Road and pupils walking to and from the Langlands/Madras schools have only part-time protection in an area that will be predominantly a permanent residential zone?

3. Minutes of 21/11/05

Minutes by Penny Uprichard

Present: RD, PU, IG

1	100 South Street (Dynamic Hair)	alterations to shop window, including new lettering	nc
2	The Town Hall	display signboard	nc
3	Abbey Walk	erection of bus shelter opposite Balfour Place	nc
4	31 Tom Morris Drive	extension to dwelling-house	nc
5	10 Pipeland Farm Steadings	extension to dwelling-house	nc
6	12 Balrymonth Court	replacement windows	nc
7	19 Bridge Street	satellite antenna	nc
8	82 Hepburn Gardens	extension to dwelling-house	nc
9	5 City Road	5 person HMO, renewal of licence	nc
10	70 South Street	change of use, alter/extend derelict building to form two houses	nc
11	19 Sandyhill Crescent	alterations to flatted dwelling, including roof lights	nc
12	Episcopal Church	new entrance door opening and entrance ramp	nc
13	10 Rose Lane	dormer extension to dwelling-house	nc
14	145 Market Street	illuminated sign within window	nc
15	85 Hepburn Gardens	extension to dwelling-house	nc
16	16 Leonard Gardens	extension to dwelling-house	nc
17	Football Club	erect new football club facilities, building maintenance store etc	nc
18	South Street	Removal of 10 parking spaces, addition to outcrops, premature to Local Plan	OBJ PU

4. South Street Refurbishment

Objection to Transportation Service, by Penny Uprichard

The Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council Wishes to OBJECT to the plans for South Street – which seem to have come a very short time after the last plans were so decisively rejected.

The Community Council objects to the removal of 10 further parking spaces from South Street. To drive people into circling the town looking for a space is pointless unless more spaces are provided somewhere else, and the 88 spaces mentioned on the A91 would be too far for most shoppers.

In its letter of 30th November 2004 the Community Council said that it wished to retain the present number of car parking spaces, with echelon parking. It also said that it was against the narrowing of the width of South Street; it hopes that the present rash of outcrops will be the last in this street.

Are these plans not premature before the finalisation of the Local Plan?

5. Disabled Access

From Stuart Winter, Planner, Development Services

05/03289/EFULL, Queen's Terrace

Thank you for your representation regarding the above on behalf of the St Andrews Community Council. Your concerns regarding disabled access have been noted and discussed with the applicants agent. The applicants agent does not consider it reasonable to provide disabled access to this property as there are to be no external changes and due to the proposal being the re-use of a traditional building.

On design grounds it is my informal view that the absence of an access ramp would be preferred as this would have the potential to spoil the frontage of the building. The proposed change of use has its building warrant from Building Standards who deal more directly with disabled access issues.

The applicant is very keen to start works and they can not do so until planning permission is in place. In the interests of economic development and encouraging tourist related development I would be very much obliged if you would consider withdrawing your objection. If the provision of disabled access is a legal issue the applicant can always submit the requisite applications for the required consents at a later date once the principal of this change of use has been decided.

I appreciate your time in considering the above and I look forward to your response.

Response by Bruce Ryan on behalf of Planning Committee

Many thanks for your email. I'm sorry that I wasn't able to immediately reply: I had to consult with my colleagues on the Community Council planning committee.

Having considered your request, we feel we cannot withdraw the objection we have made. We feel that disabled access is an important ideal to work towards. We also believe that adding disabled access wherever possible would promote tourist business by increasing any concern's potential market.

We would not wish to spoil the look of any building but feel sure that disabled access can be added without doing so.

Appendix B – Disbursements Meeting Minutes

Report by Bruce Ryan

Disbursements Meeting, 17 October

Present: Ken Fraser, Carole Tricker, Ken Crichton, Pete Lindsay, Richard Douglas, Bruce Ryan

1. Initial discussions

1. PL explained the status of the trust fund and why it may well be best to shut it down. What happens to it is up to the trustees (PL, Donald Macgregor and Marie-Louise Moffat). However PL hopes to make it more accountable to CC.
2. BR explained status of Coat of Arms sub-account. CC received an initial £9000, less legal fees, for setting up marketing agreement with St Andrews Ltd, from SAL. However CC has not yet received details of any sales they've made because 'there haven't been any yet'. SAL is soon meeting potential investors and BR has suggested to them that the potential investors might like to meet some CCllrs.

Budget

1. Meeting was curious as to how CC came to have so much money. BR provided summary of accounts he'd pulled together from last few years' treasurers' reports.
2. Meeting also queried whether all this was available to spend – some came from FC admin grants. BR has checked with FC. So long as CC's total spend (no matter what it's on) exceeds that year's FC grant and CC submit audited accounts for FC to check, CC will get the full grant next year. FC appear to have never questioned CC's spending so it appears all the money in CC's account can be spent as CC wishes, provided such spend is in line with FC's rules for CCs.
3. Most of meeting was concerned that CC shouldn't spend its funds recklessly. Therefore meeting recommends that in any financial year CC should only disburse the interest paid to us by the bank the previous financial year. (For the £25,000 currently in the bank account, CC receives around £400 interest.) Exceptionally, CC could disburse more but should remember that this will reduce the interest we receive.
4. Meeting also recommends that if CC doesn't disburse the full amount in any year then the remnant should be added to the capital that's gaining interest rather than being disbursed next year. [BR notes that this will happen naturally: whatever CC doesn't spend remains in its account.]
5. Meeting recommended that Treasurer be able tell full CC meetings the amount available to be disbursed. [BR notes that all interest payments CC has received are noted in the accounts spreadsheets. It should be no problem for the Treasurer to sum them and then subtract any disbursements made under this 'scheme'.]

Guidelines for receiving a grant

1. Meeting recommends that CC does not give grants under this 'scheme' for purposes outwith St Andrews because it might then be acting outside its remit.
2. Meeting recommends that awardees must have a 'strong connection' with St Andrews. (Some further research may be needed here.)
3. Meeting recommends that people seeking grants should be aware that their request may well be discussed in public meetings of CC. (CC can go in camera during such discussions.)
4. Meeting recommends that awardees must be told that all grants are one-offs. Application for further grants would be allowed but not necessarily awarded.

5. We can create a form which notes all the details above.

Guidelines for amounts of grant

1. Since we can't set up hard-and-fast rules, amounts are at discretion of full CC. [BR points out recommendation in item 3 of 'Budget'.]
2. Meeting recommends that CC beware historical inertia (*i.e.* be aware that any amount we award for any type of need is likely to be the minimum the next person with that need will request.)
3. Meeting recommends that CC ask that if an award is not spent (for example, the awardee may also receive funding from another source) then the awardee should be asked to return the unspent remnant. This request should be made on the 'request form'.
4. Awardees should be made aware that all grants are one-offs. Application for further grants would be allowed but not necessarily awarded.

Who makes the decisions?

1. Full CC – apparently we can't set up a standing set of rules to devolve this power to a committee.
2. Also spending our funds – which are public money – should be open to discussion by all of CC to be as democratic as possible

Appendix C – Hospital

From Chris Lesurf

I had intended to bring copies of the Hospital/Health Centre newsletter feeling that even though we had not achieved our aim wrt its site we should continue our efforts to make it serve its purpose as well as possible.

[Bette Christie] and I had both joined the Public Reference Group but unfortunately I did not get to the meeting on 22nd November. Yesterday I received notes on the meeting from Isla McBain the Project Secretary. It includes the intentions to gather ideas/feedback from local organisations, especially CCs and send a request to St A CC for Dr Andy Kilpatrick to attend one of our monthly meetings (possibly 6.02.06).

If Bette Christie did attend the Public Reference Group meeting and does attend Monday's CC meeting, then I expect she'll be willing to answer questions. She would have received a copy of Dr Kilpatrick's Draft Clinical Model paper but I have not.

Correspondence

Post received

Date	from	subject
Dec 03	SEPA	SEPAView Newsletter
Dec 03	Ian Joy Photographic	Invoice
Dec 02	Transportation Services	East Area Transport Plan
Dec 02	Preservation Trust	Pride of Place minutes
Dec 01	FoE	Campaign Funding Request: planning white paper
Dec 01	Planning Aid for Scotland	Newsletter
Nov 28	Marine Conservation Society	Strandline Newsletter
Nov 28	Friends of the Botanic Garden	Newsletter
Nov 28	WRVS	Query on grant awards
Nov 23	Fife Council Finance	Invoice: Burgh Chambers, July
Nov 22	ASCC	Newsletter Nov 05
Nov 22	Development Services	East Area Agenda 22 Nov
Nov 17	Fife Environmental Network	NNewsletter
Nov 17	Friends of the Earth	What on Earth Newsletter
Nov 14	NHS Fife	Community Involvement Workshop
Nov 14	Ted Brocklebank MSP	CC Member contacts