

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Minutes – February 2011

For Approval

(Copies of Agendas and Minutes of the Community Council are held at Fife Council's Local Office, St Mary's Place and the Town Library, Church Square. Those from late 1997 on are on line at <http://www.standrewscc.net/>)

0. Preliminary Remarks by Chair

Dr Goudie welcomed Community Councillors, Fife Councillors and members of the public to the last meeting of the present Community Council. Dr Goudie took the opportunity to congratulate Community Councillors who had been re-elected to the Community Council. He expressed a regret that there hadn't been enough interest expressed to allow an election to take place, but added that it was also useful to still have a large number of experienced members back who would understand the operations of the Community Council.

Dr Goudie thanked Miss West and Miss Platt for organising the recent Coffee Morning, as well as all other Community Councillors who assisted in that event. Dr Goudie then thanked Mr Roberts for working to resolve the boundary issues with Cameron Community Council. Dr Goudie also thanked Mrs Denyer who has resigned as Chair of the Planning Committee for her excellent work in organising the committee meetings, and liaising with Fife Council officials on the often thorny issue of obtaining paper copies of plans.

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Patrick Marks, Ian Goudie, Ken Fraser, Ken Crichton, Henry Paul, Marysia Denyer, Audrey McAnaw, Penny Uprichard, Kyffin Roberts, Carol Ashworth, Judith Harding, Ronnie Murphy, Izzy Corbin, Catherine Rowe, Meg Platt, Andy Primmer.

Students' Association Representatives

Holly West, Rebecca Ladley

Nominated

Jude Innes

Co-Opted

Niall Scott

Fife Councillors

Bill Sangster, Robin Waterston, Dorothea Morrison

Apologies

Jude Innes, Dave Finlay, Frances Melville, Owen Wilton

2. Minutes of January 2011 Meeting

No changes required.

3. Presentations

3.1. TAYPLAN – a presentation by Miss Uprichard

Miss Uprichard explained that her presentation was a personal view of the Tayplan, which is intended to run for 20 years until 2032. The Tayplan will replace the Structure Plan and there will be four strategic plans in Scotland. The Tayplan covers four Council areas, Angus, Perth, Dundee and Fife. There is to be a consultation period between June and August 2011, with eleven consultation events across the Fife in June. The Strategic Plan will replace the Structure Plan. There will be two such plans in Fife the Tayplan and the plan covering the south of Fife and Edinburgh. The Head of Development Services is now proposing one local plan for the whole of Fife, even though the current draft Local Plan has not been approved. Ongoing developments in relation to the Tayplan are posted on the web, but Miss Uprichard thought that few people would be aware of the details of the Tayplan, partly a sort of “battle fatigue” due to having to deal with several years of Structure and Local Plan consultations.

Miss Uprichard asked, “What do we know about the Tayplan?” She reminded the meeting that once the Tayplan is approved it will last until 2032, but it is not clear when it will supersede the Structure Plan. She added that the Tayplan has much the same “baggage” as other plans, namely, special strategy, vision, issues and challenges etc. It will incorporate the Structure Plan without a reassessment of its current proposals. Miss Uprichard mentioned that the “CT” Planning Committee had written to Miss Ewart the author of the Tayplan questioning the statement in the Main Issues report that there would be 1.28 per cent growth in North Fife. The committee mentioned figures, which varied considerably depending upon whether population figures or house numbers were used. In a reply Miss Ewart said that analysis of population was not done at a settlement level across the Tayplan area, so she wondered how the 1.28% figure was reached. The Main Issues report under “Options for Population and Household Change”, quotes General Registry Office figures for 2006 based on 2004 figures, that annual net migration to northeast Fife was 315. She wondered what the logic was of publishing out of date figures for a Plan intended to last twenty years. She also felt that proposals using these out of date figures were being put forward by officials and nodded through by Councillors with minimal debate.

The Tayplan vision for Fife is “Our vision is of a confident, ambitious and caring Fife that is a great place to live, work and visit. We plan to deliver our shared vision of a stronger future for Fife by building a strong, more flexible and diverse economy, improving health and well being in Fife, creating a well educated and skilled Fife, sustaining and improving our environment and making Fife communities safer”. The Main Issues report also quotes Scottish Government strategy in 2007, “We aim to deliver a wealthier, smarter, stronger, healthier, a fairer, safer and greener Scotland based on sustainable economic development”. She voiced her view that that strategy had not been successful. The only mentions in the draft Tayplan, relate to a list of settlements, maximising the potential of the University, the Golf Open, stating (incorrectly) that there were two green belts in the Tayplan area, St Andrews and Perth. Miss Uprichard reminded the meeting that there was a Green Belt policy for St Andrews but not a Green Belt, because Fife Council had so far refused to set the boundaries. The Tayplan when agreed would be used as a framework for decisions by officials. The phrase planned economic opportunities would she felt be used to justify any development officials wished to pursue. Personally she found many of the aspirations in the documents unrealistic and incomprehensible to most people. The Tayplan is also intending to include flawed figures and forecasts from the Structure Plan, many of which start in 2002, without any reassessment. She thought that decision making was being taken ever further away from local control. Once approved the Tayplan will guide local developments until 2032. She was also sceptical that any comments from local consultation events would be taken into account.

There is an intention to produce a revised Development Plan Scheme in March 2011 for consideration by the joint committee to set out the programme for preparing a plan for Ministerial approval at a review. While this is taking place, Miss Uprichard reminded the meeting that the Local Plan Inquiry would be taking place around August time, as well as the Court hearing of her appeal in relation to the Structure Plan in July.

The Community Council’s response to the Tayplan written by the Chair, dated July 2010 raised serious concerns about various aspects of the Plan, such as the population figures for the next 20 years, the estimate for housing over the same period etc. The overall view from this response was to suggest there needed to be another option out with any of those listed. She felt that the Tayplan was ignoring these responses. She added that while it could be said that there was consultation in relation to the Tayplan in various formats, including public meetings she doubted that anything said would change the contents of the Tayplan. She acknowledged that there were a few encouraging intentions in the Tayplan, but too much jargon. She questioned the concept of sustainable economic development and wondered if anyone could give an example of this taking place in the St Andrews area in the past ten years.

The main issues report also gave a view of the area in 2032, as a result of the vision, including the phrase, "The countryside is more beautiful, varied and tranquil than twenty years before". She felt that these words were a mockery for a town facing huge housing development, with associated increase in traffic and destruction of a landscape setting. The Tayplan she added, claimed that after 2032 development pressures would be directed away from St Andrews, by which time she thought that there would be little left of the most important historic borough in Scotland.

Finally Miss Uprichard reminded the meeting that the Structure plan was intended to last for twenty years, of which there are now only fifteen years left of that period, which she felt made a nonsense of some of the figures in that plan. Undeterred by the credit crunch she added the Tayplan office was proposing another twenty-year plan. She thought that it was impossible for anyone to predict that far ahead.

Dr Goudie agreed that Tayplan was something little known to most people. He felt that his own view would be a bit less pessimistic on some aspects of the plan. One of the thrusts of tayplan as he understood was the importance of stopping the haemorrhaging of population from Dundee. If that was pursued he thought that it might result in more realistic planning policies in North-East Fife if done on a coherent basis. He was also aware that the initial drafts of Tayplan said that they were incorporating the Fife Structure Plan figures without re-examination but he hoped that that would not remain the case when it came to the final versions of the document. He added that as with all these plans the key question was not what was in the original draft, but with what rigour are plans eventually examined.

He added that if the job was being done correctly, population projections were crucial. He felt that one of the most frustrating things about the final treatment of the Structure Plan was that the job was not done properly. When the document went to Edinburgh for final approval the Scottish Government did not make a separate appraisal, did not rework the calculations. The Scottish Government stated different assumptions to those made by Fife Council, but adopted the same answer. He thought that if the job was to be done properly the effects of the recession had to be taken into account, particularly as all the population projections were pre-recession. The recent population growth he added, which was mostly concentrated in the Dunfermline area had not been going on in the past couple of years. He felt that the date of figures used in the Tayplan would be crucial and needed to be as up to date as possible.

Mr Crichton wondered if the possible closure of Leuchars had been taken into account in these calculations?

Miss Uprichard didn't feel that anything would stop the Tayplan's vision. She reminded the meeting that Tayplan already had all their consultation dates set out for the coming summer, and hoped to have the plan firmed up by 2013. Dr Goudie agreed with Miss Uprichard in being sceptical about the ability of Tayplan to project what would happen for twenty years. He reminded the meeting that in the CC response it had been argued that projections should only be for twelve years at the most.

The consultation period is to be from the 8th June to the 1st August. All documents will be in the public domain from the following day. After the eight-week period all the consultation responses will be fully considered. The Tayplan Joint Committee will then decide whether to modify the proposed plan in late October 2011. If no modifications are made the plan and related documents will be set to Scottish Ministers by January 2012.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville

absent

4.2. Bill Sangster

4.2.1. "A" Boards

Cllr Sangster had sent an email to Transportation in November but never received a reply, so he has sent a further email on the matter. He was trying to find out why Fife Council hadn't sent out information to all shops using "A" Boards and street furniture about the regulations appertaining to their location etc. He has found from visiting many shops that there is still a degree of ignorance on the regulations. He still hoped to get a reply on the matter, and hoped that fife Council would have someone going around to explain the regulations if necessary.

4.2.2. Lawhead School and problem relating to car parking etc

There is an ongoing consultation with the residents of the properties beside Lawhead School about the parking problems at school times. At busy times parents are often parking on the roundabout area causing problems at morning and afternoon. The consultation is ongoing, but it is hoped that an agreement can be found about parents parking in the housing area.

4.2.3. Police Fire & Safety Committee

Cllr Sangster announced that Fife were now using the money gained from the Proceeds of Crime Act to fund youth projects for which eligible organisations could apply for funding for the next couple of years.

4.2.4. Martyrs Monument

Cllr Sangster announced that there was quite a bit of funding in the appeal fund.

4.2.5. Buchanan Gardens - Speed bumps

Mrs McAnaw asked about the possibility of speed controls such as speed bumps along Buchanan Gardens as she felt that traffic still speed along that road. Cllr Sangster suggested that the local Residents Association put in a letter to Transportation Services on the subject. Dr Goudie cautioned that there would need to be a clear support for such installation as previously there had been opposition from residents for such measures and warning lights had been installed instead. Miss West thought that the issue could be brought up at the Police Community engagement Meetings, which take place every five weeks at Madras Kilrymont.

4.2.6. State of Roads – Lawhead School Area

Mr Primmer mentioned the appalling state of the roads, particularly in the Lawhead School area. He said that the roads contained numerous potholes, which were a hazard for children cycling to school. Cllr Waterston replied that there was a procedure for reporting potholes online. Cllr Sangster acknowledged the problems, but added that given the weather and the limits on how quickly the Council could respond were an issue. Dr Goudie also commented upon the state of the roads, feeling that they were as bad as he'd ever seen. Cllr Sangster in reply said that repairs had to be done properly, and described a machine used to more effectively seal road holes. However he reminded the meeting to report the holes so they would be on the Council list.

4.2.7. Flooding in Market Street

Miss Uprichard raised the issue of flooding on an area of pavements in Market Street outside Boots. She wondered how flooding could occur on brand new pavements? Cllr Sangster replied that the flooding had been reported. So he hoped that a Fife Council official would come out to look at the problem. He thought that the problem was partly to do with blocked drains but the machine used to clear the drains was being kept very busy, hence a delay in dealing with Market Street. Cllr Waterston added that if there had been an error in the construction of the pavements, the Councillors would look into that matter with officials and contractors.

4.2.8. Grit Bins

Mrs Rowe, on behalf of a friend, asked about the status of the replacement of a grit bin which had been removed from a location at Cockshaugh Park. Cllr Sangster acknowledged the enquiry and said that the Council was still awaiting a delivery of Grit bins. Cllr Waterston thought that the grit bin in question might have been moved.

4.3. Robin Waterston

4.3.1. West Sands Partnership

There had recently been a meeting of this body which is promoting a management plan for the West Sands and the Outhead to help to provide a policy framework within which any uses whether recreation or Council Services will be able to understand how important it is to protect the systems. He hoped that there would be a fairly substantial draft management plan available for consultation within a few months. In the mean time there is an intention to extend the protective fencing, which has been used at the beginning of the dunes if funds can be found. He thought that the current fencing had been very effective.

4.3.2. Draft Policy on HMOs

At a recent North East Fife Area meeting it had been agreed that there would be a paper on HMOs, which will propose that there will not be any additional planning consents awarded to new HMOs in the central area of St Andrews. Cllr Waterston acknowledged that it was a difficult and contentious issue. He added that there were competing demands. He thought that the documents for consultation would appear quite soon, at which time he added there would be opportunity for all interested individuals and groups to make comments. He emphasised that this proposal was nothing to do with any battle between residents and students. He hoped that it wouldn't be taken that way. He thought that the policy was intended to help retain central St Andrews as a mixed community. Policy if implemented would be reviewed after two years.

Miss West asked how consultation material would be made available? Cllr Waterston replied that the documents would be available online, as well as being publicised in the press etc. He would try to ensure that a hard copy of the consultation would be available in the library.

Mr Roberts asked what would happen to current applications for HMO status in the town centre. Cllr Waterston replied that the current policy would remain unchanged until a decision was made about the proposed new policy.

4.4. Dorothea Morrison

4.4.1. Road Closure on the Scores

Cllr Morrison brought to the attention of the Council a temporary closure from 14-18th February. This is to allow a problem with blocked sewers to be investigated.

4.4.2. Road closure on Golf Place

There will be a temporary closure from 21st to 25th February. This closure relates to work, which will be starting at Hamilton Hall.

4.4.3. Meeting about Kinnessburn – 16th February.

Cllr Morrison announced that there would be a special meeting to discuss the report's proposals for the Kinnessburn. Cllr Morrison hoped that as many members of the public could attend as possible. The meeting will be at 10.30 am.

4.4.4. Seagull and Pigeon Problems

Cllr Morrison is receiving frequent calls on this matter. She acknowledged the frequency with which this problem arises, but did not have a solution to the problem as long as people continued to feed these birds.

4.4.5. Mud Problems near Plashmill Cottage

Cllr Morrison reported that there was a "sea" of mud close to this property. She was trying to get Scottish Water to deal with the problem.

4.4.6. Long Term Strategy to Increase Tourism

Miss Uprichard mentioned that she'd read an article in the Courier about this subject. The key attraction in the strategy was St Andrews. She quoted Fife Council as estimating that there had been about 650000 visitors to St Andrews in 2009. Money generated by the Council from visitors she said went into the general Council "pot" with no clear indication that anything came back to St Andrews. She added that there was a huge amount of wear and tear on the town. She wondered if anyone had assessed the effect on a small town of such a large number of visitors? She also wondered what the long term strategy was and what it would mean for St Andrews? She also wondered who represented St Andrews on the Fife Tourism Business Network?

Cllr Morrison replied that members of St Andrews Partnership were on the Fife Tourism Business Network. In relation to the strategy she replied that there were six areas in Fife including Cupar involved to try and increase tourism.

She thought that Fife Council, particularly the Transportation Dept was very aware of the impact of traffic etc. She added that money had come back into St Andrews, citing the £3 million for the work in Market

Street for which Councillors had fought quite hard. She also added that Councillors are pushing for more money to come to the local area so that more decisions can be taken locally.

4.4.7. Need for better Toilet Facilities

Miss Uprichard commented on the need for more toilets to accommodate visitor needs. Cllr Morrison in reply mentioned the "Comfort Scheme" adopted by Fife Council in some areas, including St Andrews. She acknowledged the difficulty in finding toilets in some parts of St Andrews and the need for good, clean toilets.

Mr Crichton mentioned an issue relating to the toilets at the East Sands, where the café close to the toilets had been responsible for handing out keys for visitors to access the toilets. Fife Council had taken the keys back using health and safety issues as the reason for the decision. Cllr Morrison acknowledged that while the decision to take away the keys might seem silly, she thought that Fife council might not have had any option legally. She hoped that if the harbour Trust took ownership of the toilets they would be able to organise the opening and closure times. She agreed that facilities for both tourists and local citizens working at the harbour, such as the fishermen there weren't suitable facilities. Mrs Hughes, Area Officer confirmed that the toilet situation did relate to legal requirements in relation to health and safety.

4.4.8. North Street Work

Mrs Rowe asked Cllr Morrison about the work going on in North Street, which is making access very difficult for her and many other local residents. She wondered what the work was about and when it would be done. Cllr Morrison replied that the north street work was a new lighting system going in. This involved putting in the new lighting first, then removing the old lighting later. She acknowledged that there would always be disruption during such work. Cllr Waterston added that there were serious delays in the North Street work because of the weather. He also understood that part of the delay also related to the need to connect to the electric mains and this involved Scottish Power who have still to do this work. He acknowledged the related problems with the pavements and hoped that they'd be reinstated to a satisfactory standard and wouldn't create a hazard for Mrs Rowe and others. Mr Scott thought that the work would be completed by the end of February.

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Stakeholders Meeting for Knightsbridge Proposed Development

There is to be a Stakeholders meeting later in the week, set up by Knightsbridge, followed by a meeting on the 14th February with the Planning Committee at the Cosmos Centre at 19.00.

5.2. Westburn Lane Development proposal

The Planning Committee has put in an objection to the plans for Westburn Lane.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. Climate Challenge Fund Update

Mr Murphy reported that the project's budget had been rejigged to allow them to employ two more Energy Champions. This has been necessary to allow the Project to get as much work done as possible in their hope to knock on as many doors as they can in St Andrews, in an attempt to make sure everyone is aware of the benefits of energy conservation etc.

Mrs Kell has been busy planning the Energy Fair on the 18/19th February in the Town Hall and also writing up the bid for a possible continuation of the energy project in St Andrews in the new financial year. The project proposes to extend the remit to include communities within the KY16 area, north of St Andrews, namely, Balmullo, Strathkiness, Leuchars and Guardbridge. The proposal also plans to look beyond insulation to include renewables. The bid has to be in by the end of the present week.

6.2. Martyrs Monument Update

Mrs Corbin reported on this project. Mrs Corbin reported on the process of meetings and attempts to acquire further funding for the Project. Dr Goudie asked Mrs Corbin whether the questions about the nature of the Project had been resolved. In reply, Mrs Corbin admitted that the architect employed, Steven

Newsome hadn't so far been able to visit the Martyrs Monument because of the weather. Access to the whole monument required the use of a Cherry Picker. The Partnership would not be applying for funding until a report on what was possible was available. Dr Goudie reminded Mrs Corbin that she and Cllr Sangster had not been happy at having the project cranked up to a higher level, feeling that that would be unrealistic. Mrs Corbin felt that at the present time it was important to get the monument repaired, to reduce the risk of further erosion, before deciding if a restoration was possible.

Mrs Ashworth reported that the Cherry Picker would be going out at the end of the week with the architect.

Cllr Sangster reported that there was about £6000 in the Project fund, with an application for £30000 being made to Fife Environmental Trust. Cllr Sangster was also hopeful of some funds being received from foreign sources. Cllr Waterston recognised that there had been some problems in setting up the management group for the project, but he hoped that that had now been sorted.

6.3. St Andrews Community Trust Update

Mr Paul reminded members about the importance of getting a good selection of candidates to stand for the new St Andrews Community trusts as soon as possible. He reminded the meeting that applicants couldn't be Community councillors, Fife councillors, and Links Trust employees or live outside of St Andrews and Strathkiness. Applicants for the position of Trustees can contact Mr Paul or Murray and Donald.

6.4. Craigtoun Update

Mr Roberts reported about a recent meeting in the local office in St Andrews. Mr Scott from Cameron Community Council had written a report for the group. The report highlighted the issues and complications related to the running of Craigtoun. Operational maintenance costs are a major factor. The report has gone to Fife Council. Cllr Sangster had had contact with a gentleman who is a railway enthusiast who has offered to work on the train to try to bring it back into action.

Miss Uprichard queried why Craigtoun had been allowed to get into the present state and why there had been no maintenance. Cllr Sangster acknowledged that Fife Council and its predecessors had not put much money into the upkeep of the facilities in the Park, but that Craigtoun wasn't the only such facility neglected through lack of available capital funding. He thought that Fife Council was catching up slowly with the back catalogue of such problems. The only funding given to the Park related to staff costs to run the facilities and some management such as cutting the grass.

6.5. Community Council Election

There were 18 candidates for the 20 positions. The actual date of the election for the remaining Community Councils, not involved in last year's election being the last Thursday in February. The new Community Council will be formed at the March Community Council meeting. The only Community Councillor who had not put his name forward was Mr Finlay, who had indicated a willingness to continue if no one else put his or her name forward for the possible election. Dr Goudie suggested that the new Community Council could consider co-opting him, given that there are two vacancies. Dr Goudie expressed his disappointment that the Community Council's best endeavours had aroused greater interest in the election. In reply to a comment from Miss Platt, Cllr Waterston said that in the majority of cases where Community Council elections had actually taken place there had been a major local issue, which had stirred up the community. He added that there were also quite a few communities where there had not been enough candidates. He acknowledged that it was a real problem and concern and might require a greater attempt to publicise the existence of Community Councils and their benefits to local communities.

6.6. Reports from Representatives

6.6.1. Greyfriars Garden

Mrs Denyer outlined progress in the work of the group looking at the future of this garden. Work is ongoing and details will be given publicity when considered appropriate.

6.6.2. St Andrews Partnership

Mrs Ashworth reported on the work being planned and undertaken by St Andrews Partnership. One plan is the possibility of a Visitor Donation Scheme. Initial soundings had indicated a good degree of support from local businesses, so the Partnership is likely to go ahead with a pilot scheme before too long. There

had also been some talk about getting the fountain in Market Street going, as well as lighting for the Castle and Cathedral.

6.7. Any Other Matters Arising

No matters arising.

7. Committee Reports

7.1 Recreation Committee

No further business to report

7.2. General Purposes

No meeting as taken place since the last Community Council meeting.

7.3. 200 Club

February winners: 1st Mrs B Mackenzie, 2nd Miss H Perrie, 3rd Mr G Seaton

7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee

7.4.1. Student Dissertation Questionnaire

Mrs Corbin reminded members about the questionnaire relating to the impact on St Andrews of the Golf open and urged members to consider complete it for Daniel Sadd, a student who was doing a dissertation for which this was a part of his research.

7.4.2. Travel Plan

Mrs Corbin had attended a meeting relating to the hospital Travel Plan. One matter, which had arisen, was the lack of uptake of the bike lockers at the hospital by staff. There would be a further attempt to encourage use of this facility, which is being used by only one person at present. Another issue related to the lack of a board with bus times at the hospital, but now a board may be getting erected inside the hospital to allow users to know bus times, instead of having to check at the bus stop. Mrs Denyer pointed out that there are difficulties in finding a suitable area of wall inside the reception area and any area has to be agreed with Morrisons who built the hospital.

A Community Well Being course is being held throughout February in the hospital.

8. New Business

8.1. Letter from Patrick Laughlin re Renewable Energy Consultation

Mr Laughlin from St Andrews Partnership had written to the Community Council to make them aware of this Scottish Government consultation on the potential of communities benefiting from the proposals for Offshore Windfarms. The idea centres on the potential for a form of payment to communities adjacent to the Windfarm sites once they are up and running. The consultation lasts until 18th February and the Partnership are investigating its potential in benefitting St Andrews. They were asking about the possibility of the Community Council supporting the Partnership in indicating an interest locally in this possible scheme.

9. Reports from Office Bearers

9.1. Chair

Dr Goudie started his report by reminding members that Leuchars Community Council is looking for support in relation their campaign to save RAF Leuchars from the possibility of closure as an RAF base due to the Government defence cuts proposals.

Dr Goudie had received a letter from Douglas Kinnear, the Clerk to the Harbour Trust, which discusses the new structure of the Trust. In the new structure there will no longer be observers at their regular Trust meetings, but there will be a yearly open meeting at which the Trust will be able to be asked questions about its operations. The letter thanked the Community Council for its contributions in the past to the Trust.

Dr Goudie then announced that he would like someone else to stand for chair at the next meeting when the new Council is formally constituted. He hoped that he had made a reasonable contribution as Chair to the running of the Community Council and appreciated the support he'd been given while in the role. However given the amount of planning issues ahead, he had decided that his strengths would be best deployed in the Planning area, with the Local Plan Inquiry and the TayPlan examples of the work to be done. He asked the members to give due thought to who should be the new Chair of the Community Council.

9.2. Treasurer

9.2.1. Treasurers Report

The January accounts have been distributed separately. Mr Paul reported mentioning that the money allocated by Fife Council for the Civic Reception, but not used would be kept for this year's Civic Reception. Mrs Hughes, Locality Manager had advised that this could be done.

Mr Paul put in a request for outstanding financial claims by March so that they could come within the current year's budget. He then suggested that the Community Council needed to have a discussion about how the coming year's budget was going to be spent. Given that the Community Council income would reduce by around a third because of the changes to the funding method, there would have to be some examination of what the priorities would be for expenditure and whether this would mean a requirement for fundraising. He suggested that this would be best to be resolved by the end of April.

9.3 Secretary

9.3.1. Correspondence – see appendix A.

The only other correspondence of relevance related to training for new Community Councillors, which would take place the week before the first meeting of the new Council in March.

10. Any Other Competent Business

10.1. Preservation Trust Quiz night

Mrs Denyer announced this event, which will take place on Friday 25th February. She hoped that there would be good CC representation for this fundraising event.