

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Provisional Minutes – 7th March 2016

For Approval

0. New Community Council Member

Mr Greenwell introduced Mr John Jardine who was flagged up by Mr Stewart as a potential CC member. Mr Jardine introduced himself and gave the meeting a brief outline of his life. He informed members that he'd been born and bred in St Andrews but had lived away for much of his working life in various roles in the Black Watch. Following his service in the army he returned with his family to St Andrews and worked as a senior janitor for the university until his recent retirement.

Mr Greenwell asked if there was any objection to Mr Jardine joining the Community Council? There were no objections and Mr Jardine was welcomed as a member of the Community Council.

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Callum MacLeod, Howard Greenwell, Kyffin Roberts, Ian Goudie, Gordon Shepherd, Iain Munn, Izzy Corbin, Patrick Marks, Judith Harding, Henry Paul, Harry Stewart, Zara Evans, Chris Wallard, Penny Uprichard

Students' Association Representatives

Patrick Mathewson

Co-Opted

Lindsey Adam

Fife Councillors

Brian Thomson, Dorothea Morrison, Frances Melville

Apologies - Keith McCartney, Charlotte Andrew, Alicia Schultz, Niall Scott, Ken Crichton

2. Minutes of Meeting –February 2016

In the report on the University work at Guardbridge replace Mr Roberts name with Mr Stewart throughout the report.

In the second last paragraph of the University presentation Mrs Corbin said that the wording of the first sentence needed to be amended to read properly - "Mrs Corbin said she could see the benefits of the project to the University but how would it benefit the people of the town"?

In 4.4.1. West Sands Management Changes, Miss Uprichard said that in her comment about resisting the possibility of charging again for parking in the last paragraph she was making the point that it was unlawful to put a barrier across a public road for charging, whether it was adopted or unadopted.

The minutes were otherwise accepted as correct.

3. Presentations

3.1. West Sands Management – Gordon Moir

Mr Moir from the Links Trust introduced himself and gave a brief synopsis of the changing situation of Links management. He told the meeting that Fife Council had decided to pull out

of its role in managing the grassy areas mainly used for public parking due to financial constraints. He reminded the meeting that the land was actually owned by the Links Trust under the Act of Parliament, when the Town Council had been disbanded many years ago. The Trust owns the land up to the high water mark. In recent years they have been working with Fife Council and FCCT to improve the area helping with dune restoration amongst other projects. From 1st April the Links will take responsibility of the grassy area, Fife Council will manage the toilets and the road and FCCT will manage the dunes.

The Links Trust he said had no plans at this time other than cut the grass, but was wondering about trying to improve the drainage on the road although overall responsibility for the road was with Fife Council. He acknowledged that the only other objective the Links Trust would have would be to improve the state of the grassy area, which have been affected by the wet winter and the way cars access the areas to park leading to considerable loss of grass. He acknowledged that there were a few challenges in sorting out the grassy areas.

Mr Roberts asked whether the sheep would be remaining and Mr Greenwell queried about the sign which talked about areas to be left to allow ground nesting birds to breed during a specific time of year. Mr Moir thought that the sheep, which were owned by a local farmer, would remain as they provided a useful tool to maintain the grass they grazed. He acknowledged that the sheep should be removed in time to allow the birds to nest. Mr Greenwell was concerned that the sheep had left very little cover for potential ground nesting birds, as they had been on the area much of the winter.

Mrs Corbin asked about the reason for some areas being roped off. Mr Moir replied that this was basically to protect the areas from erosion by cars and to allow a good sward of grass to become established before allowing some parking.

Mr Jardin asked about the plans for the play park area. Mr Jardin was concerned that the loss of the play park would provide less in the way of alternative activities in the area for children. Mr Moir replied that the Links Trust would be working to tidy up the area and had to remove the vegetation as the latter was of an invasive type of wild rose which needed to be managed. In relation to the play park he thought that Fife Council might be looking to have a replacement but in a slightly different location on the West Sands.

Mr Stewart commented about the toilets situation and how when there had been the plan for the new Visitor Centre to have toilets to replace the old ones, but as this was turned down he was trying to clarify future plans and responsibility. Cllr Morrison explained that there would be a modular unit replacing the block, which is unfit for purpose and if the Visitor Centre ever got built then the modular unit would be moved elsewhere. The second set of toilet blocks further out are to be refurbished.

3.2. Statutory Consulteeship - Miss Uprichard

Miss Uprichard explained about Fife Council issuing a weekly planning applications list every Monday. Community Councils then had seven working days to register to be a statutory consultee. The interpretation of this timescale has become a point of contention and Miss Uprichard has been maintaining that the seven working days start from Monday, which means that Tuesday is the first working day in her view. However Fife Council have been maintaining that the time starts from the Monday and as a consequence there have been incidences of Fife Council officials telling Miss Uprichard that she is out of time by their calculation/interpretation of the timescale.

Miss Uprichard then explained about the situation once a CC had become registered as a statutory consultee. After being registered the CC would normally have 14 working days in which to submit its comments to Fife Council, whereas members of the public etc had 30 days or even more in certain circumstances, which she briefly explained. Miss Uprichard thought that in this case Fife Council was not complying with the legislation, which says there should be a minimum of 14 days and that the Council can allow longer unless it would impede the progress of an application. She added that giving extra days was quite unlikely to impede applications and cited several major applications which had been around for months and

during which time the applicants had submitted further information to Fife Council so they were clearly not being impeded by the Community Council Planning Committee. When she challenged Fife Council they maintained that the CC should reply “within 14 days” and have issued that advice to every CC in Fife. Miss Uprichard said she’d queried this with a Fife Council lawyer and he’d confirmed her understanding about the legislative comments on a “minimum of 14 days”. The lawyer had also claimed that Fife Council was correct in requesting a response within 14 days. Miss Uprichard has challenged this and is awaiting the outcome of discussion at higher level within Fife Council. She has also put in a request for CCs to have 21 days to respond and is awaiting the outcome of that request as she feels the legislation gives discretion to Councils to increase the time. She couldn’t understand Fife Council’s reluctance to allow the 7 working days then the minimum of 14 days for each part of the process. She hoped that the Fife Councillors would be able to take up the issue in some way. She ended her comments with an observation about the differences between what CCs are allowed in planning and the response time for Councils to FOI requests, which are a minimum of 20 days from the working day after receipt of the request!

In response to a query from Mr McLeod about the nature of statutory consulteeship, Miss Uprichard and Mr Greenwell explained that the CC had in law the right to request to be a statutory consultee on planning applications as a result of which any such applications would have to be determined by Fife Councillors in committee and would not be determined by officials. Cllr Morrison added that there were exceptions and explained that if an official recommended refusal an application to which a CC was a statutory consultee would not automatically come to committee. She felt that this was incorrect and that all applications to which a CC was a statutory consultee should still come to committee even if officials had recommended refusal.

4. Fife Councillors.

4.1. Frances Melville

4.1.1. West Port Pergola

June Barrie from Fife Council had written to Cllr Melville. This was to inform them that the West Port Bar had been sold, and that the new owners were looking to speak to Scottish Ministers before a decision was made about the Discontinuance Order. Ministers would then have to decide how to proceed and this would mean referring it to a Reporter to investigate.

4.1.2. Route Accident Reduction Plans for A91

Cllr Melville said there was a report to Area Committee on the above topic. This would be an attempt to improve safety at junctions on this road and Cllr Melville said that she was surprised to read that the Guardbridge-St Andrews stretch was the worst for accidents.

4.1.3. Speed Limiters – Strathkiness High Road

There has been a request for speed limiters for both ends of Strathkiness High Road irrespective of current traffic calming measures in place.

4.1.4. Common Good Fund – West Sands Toilets Application

This application may come to committee in March. Councillors had hoped to fund it from the local budget but due to the constraints on that fund Councillors are now looking for funding from the CGF. The Harbour Trust application will also be considered at the same meeting.

4.1.5. No Waiting Restrictions - Old Guardbridge Road

The local Area Committee is also going to look at the imposition of “no time waiting” on the south side of this road due to increasing parking and problems associated with that type of use. Mr Greenwell asked how the restrictions would be policed. Cllr Melville acknowledged that she wasn’t certain what arrangements there would be in policing the new restrictions. Mr Greenwell was concerned and said that in his experience the traffic wardens were not policing the road restrictions outwith the town centre and people flouted the parking restrictions in many outer areas parking on the double yellow lines. Mr Jardine informed the meeting that

double yellow lines did not come within the traffic regulations policed by the wardens so they couldn't book anyone in that situation. Only the police could book someone parked on a double yellow line he added.

4.1.6. Leuchars Station Car Park Development

Construction and redevelopment of the car parks is scheduled for April/May with completion around August. There may be a traffic regulation order to stop parking on the north side of the station road and a £1 per day service charge for using the car parks. The new car park will have 185 spaces thus more than doubling capacity as the old one has about 151 spaces.

4.1.7. Fife Council Computer System Problems

Cllr Melville had emailed Pam Ewan in Fife Council to flag up concerns about difficulty getting access to the planning applications due to the computer being down particularly at weekends for various reasons. She'd also forwarded a letter from Miss Uprichard on the matter and made the point that it was unfair that the CC should be penalised by Development Services not taking into account the loss of time due to computer problems in Fife Council.

4.2. Brian Thomson

4.2.1. Abandoned Cars

Cllr Thomson reported back about a couple of abandoned cars reported via the CC Facebook page. One car parked in Queens Gardens in fully taxed and has a full MOT so is legitimately parked. The car parked down the Scores is being investigated and he said he'd report back via the Facebook page.

4.2.2. Students Union External Ductwork

Cllr Thomson reported that the University had acknowledged that the ductwork had been put up following a major error in the planning of the refurbishment of the Union. The original plan had been to have the ducts within the building and the building of the external ducts was done without planning permission. One of the vice-principals Verity Brown had been approached by Cllr Thomson to discuss the issue. She'd promised to take some action whilst acknowledging that she'd been aware of the construction but had thought something had been done to correct the error. Cllr Thomson said that a planning application had been submitted at the end of February to do work to screen the ducts. The application hadn't been validated by officials at the time of the CC meeting so wasn't available for the CC to examine.

4.2.3. Planters at the West Port

Cllr Thomson noted that the planters positioned by Mr Paul and his gardening group at the West Port appeared to be having an effect upon the parking of the lorries which had been concerning CC members.

4.2.4. West Sands Play Area

Cllr Thomson explained that the area had been taken down as it was considered not to be fit or safe for purpose by officials. Officials are looking at a possible way to replace the play area.

Cllr Thomson acknowledged that finding a source of funding might be an issue given Council cuts due to take place.

4.2.5. Double Dykes/Hepburn Gardens Junction

Cllr Thomson acknowledged that it was unfortunate the way the new junction had been designed. He said he'd see cyclists come to grief as they'd been unaware or hadn't noticed the changes. There had been a quick response when the issues were notified to officials and warning signs etc were put up. He hoped that cyclists would become used to the changes and that the signs might not be needed eventually. On a positive note he thought that the new junction had slowed motorised traffic thus reducing the risk to cyclists and pedestrians.

4.2.6. Graffiti on the Pier

Mr Wallard had reported graffiti, which had appeared, on the pier to Cllr Thomson. However as it wasn't classed as racist or offensive the responsibility for dealing with it had been passed back to the Harbour Trust.

4.2.7. Parking on Hepburn Gardens in Advisory Cycle Lanes

Cllr Thomson had been contacted by a constituent concerned about the number of cars parked in the advisory cycle lanes in Hepburn Gardens. Cllr Thomson had raised the matter with officers who had considered the residential nature of Hepburn Gardens so had advised that the parking should remain. He sought the views of the members of the CC on this matter. Mr Marks commented that the problem was exacerbated during the week with people parking when coming into work. Mr Marks acknowledged that there was the issue of house owners along the road who didn't have parking places and this might make any decision about imposing parking restrictions more difficult unless the home owners could be offered a viable alternative to parking in front of their properties.

Dr Goudie reminded the meeting about former plans by the university to put a cycle path just inside the University playing fields along Buchanan Gardens, but eventually the university pulled out of that and proposed an alternative, less direct route into town from David Russell via Andrew Melville. Another possible University plan was for a path from the observatory to St Leonards Gardens but again this didn't happen. The main gain in recent years has been the route through University Hall and Kennedy Gardens, but a quicker route from David Russell to University Hall is still needed. Cllr Thomson was keen to see more local people use routes through David Russell to Andrew Melville even if it was a more elongated route and the University hadn't flagged it up as a route. He agreed to take it up as a suggestion of the Buchanan Gardens route in discussions with the University.

4.2.8. Cycle Racks

Mr Marks asked Cllr Thomson if there was any news about the collaboration between Fife Council and the local Bike User Group who were looking at the bike parking in the town? He commented upon the continuing mess particularly by Tesco where bikes clutter the existing racks and others are tied to lampposts. Cllr Thomson acknowledged that he'd hoped that Fife Council officials would have had a report by the time of the CC meeting. So far the report hadn't materialised and Cllr Thomson acknowledged that it was frustrating not to have been able to get things moving on and he would chase up officials again about the report. He did hope that an extra area would be confirmed at Tesco making use of a car parking space.

4.3. Keith McCartney - apologies

4.3.1. Street Lighting - the street lights listed below were not working and were reported for repair:

City Road – lighting column number 10 (this column has a Scottish Power fault. They were programmed to come in on 23/2/16 to repair their cables).

Fraser Avenue – lighting column number 1

Hepburn Gardens – lighting columns numbers 31, 33 and 35

James Robb Avenue – lighting column number 2

Largo Road – lighting columns numbers 25, 27, 28, 32 and 33

North Castle Street – lighting columns numbers 2 and 3

North Street - lighting columns outside house numbers 36a and 72 on the south side of the road and house number 37 on the north side of the road (no numbers on lighting columns)

Schoolbraids – lighting column number 10

South Street – lighting column outside number 156 (no number on lighting column)

Trinity Place – lighting column number 1

Winram Place – lighting column number 5

4.3.2. Illuminated Road Signs - the illuminated road signs listed below were not working and were reported for repair –

Bridge Street – one ‘Roundabout’ sign on west side of road beside The Whey Pat at the junction with Argyle Street

North Street – two ‘One Way’ signs on either side of North Castle Street at its junction with North Street

North Street – two ‘No Entry except for access’ signs at junction of North Street and Gregory Place

St Mary’s Place – one ‘No Right Turn’ sign beside phone box on north side of road near the junction with Greyfriars Garden

South Street – one ‘No Entry’ sign on south side of road next the West Port by West Port bar

The Scores – one ‘No Left Turn’ sign on the east side of the junction at North Castle Street

The Scores – one ‘Cycle Path’ sign on the west side of the junction with North Castle Street

4.3.3. Potholes - potholes were reported for inspection and remedial action as necessary at the following locations –

Bogward Road – centre of road beside triangular cover just east of Lawmill Gardens junction – passed to NRSWA inspector 5/2/16 to issue repair to utility company.

Buchanan Gardens – south side of road between lighting columns numbers 18 and 19 and across from lighting column number 20 – works order issued for Cat B repair.

Canongate – centre of road west of Maynard Road junction – Cat B repair – works order issued.

Craigtoun Road – a number of potholes on the north side of the road between lighting columns numbers 6 and 10 – Cat B repair – works order issued.

Double Dykes Road – on south side of road by entrance to Thornton’s – Cat B repairs issued 19/1/16 – re-inspected 4/2/16, minor erosion not at intervention level.

Hepburn Gardens – across from lighting column number 26 – Cat B repair – works order issued.

Hope Street – on east side of road outside house numbers 2, 4 and 11 – Cat B repairs- works order issued.

4.3.4. John Knox Road

Cllr McCartney reported that water reported on south side of road not draining properly following heavy rain - works order issued for investigation work on road drains – survey carried out – outcome pending.

4.3.5. Lamond Drive

Cllr McCartney reported that the road drain outside house number 7 reported blocked – inspection carried out – works order issued for gully clean. Drain on pavement outside house number 121 reported blocked – outcome of inspection pending.

4.3.6. St Andrews Museum

Cllr McCartney reported that the flagpole has been secured at the top of the building having blown down in one of the winter gales. Building Services have arranged for a contractor to either repair or replace the flagpole as soon as possible.

4.3.7. Morrison's Roundabout

Cllr Morrison reported that one of the two 'Keep Left' bollards on the island on the south side of the roundabout had become detached and was lying in the bushes on the east side of the roundabout. This was reported and bollard re-attached

4.4. Dorothea Morrison

4.4.1. West Sands

Cllr Morrison talked about the good informal partnership between the Links Trust, FCCT and Fife Council in recent years working to improve aspects of the West Sands. She commented on the need to remove the play park and the surrounding shrubbery and how these were separate operations for different reasons. The shrubbery she reminded the meeting was of an invasive rose variety not really suited to the location unless well managed to reduce unwanted spread. A new play park along the West Sands would probably be in a different more appropriate and open location. Mrs Corbin commented that a lot of parents had been upset at the removal of the play park. Cllr Morrison replied that because the shrubbery had hid it the extent of use wasn't obvious. She hoped that eventually a replacement might be able to be planned but not necessarily in the same location.

Cllr Morrison also mentioned the issue of camper vans saying that she'd had an email from a camper van owner keen to be able to use the West Sands. She thought that there could be responsible camper van owners as well as those who were irresponsible. A decision hadn't yet been taken about how to manage the camper van use of the area.

4.4.2. Church Square

Cllr Morrison had noted the concerns about Church Square and the need to restrict access due to damage being caused by heavy vehicles. She thought that a traffic regulation order would be discussed soon at the Area Committee. Cllr Morrison added that the Pilgrim Foundation in conjunction with Fife Council would be doing work in the Logie's Lane area and she hoped that the former would be able to fund better quality materials to use in its work conserving the area's character. Cllr Thomson also commented on the TRO and made the meeting aware of the plans to only allow wedding cards and hearses to park once the TRO was in force.

4.4.3. Benches in Market Street

Cllr Morrison reminded the meeting that Cllr McCartney had asked for CC suggestions as to where benches could be located in Market Street and possibly elsewhere. Funding would be available from the local budget, but it would be up to CC members to identify locations and then planning permission could be sought.

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Planning Committee Report

Miss Uprichard told the meeting that the Planning Committee met twice in February and looked at 20 applications. She added that according to the Preservation Trust newsletter there had been some 112 applications over the past 4 months in St Andrews, which she said was probably lower than the average. The ongoing issue of statutory consulteeship was frequently discussed. The committee supported correspondence with Fife Council on this subject to try and get an answer as to whether Fife Council was following the correct procedures in law in relation to the timing of the CC application and response on this subject.

The committee made objections to aspects of the following applications:

1. Holly Lodge, a listed building in Kennedy Gardens – the objection related to the request to install metal windows inappropriate to a listed building in a conservation area.
2. The Rule, South Street – the objection related to inappropriate external alterations to a listed building.

3. 8 Queens Gardens - the objection related to the application to create a gate in a wall between Southgait Hall and Queens Gardens.
4. The Gatty Development - objection on the grounds of the lack of a Masterplan as required in the local plan 2004.
5. 49 North Castle Street - the objection related to a plan to add a two-storey extension and a roof terrace to a small listed building
6. Century House, Hepburn Gardens - the objection related to a plan for an extension of this listed building. However the official dealing with the case ruled that the CC was out of time in submitting its objection and determined the matter by delegated powers, so it did not go to the Area Committee. A letter of complaint was submitted to the case officer and a manager in the planning department. In a reply received a Fife Council official confirmed that the official had been incorrect in their decision and that the CC objection had been on time. However he then told the Planning Committee that the only way to seek recourse was to seek a judicial review to ask for the decision to be overturned on the grounds of procedural impropriety.
7. Feddinch Mains – Miss Uprichard reported that SEPA had put in an objection on the grounds of insufficient information on surface water disposal and also about the Biomass plant. Miss Uprichard reported that she wrote to the case officer to ask if the consultation period would be extended and was told that it wouldn't be extended but if there was a need they would start the process again. Miss Uprichard then wrote to ask that the consultation be started again and the case officer replied that it was up to the local authority to make that decision. She thought that there was an undemocratic aspect to the process as the public wouldn't be able to see information received after the consultation period had finished. Miss Uprichard asked Councillors to note that this was happening to a number of applications where the consultation period had finished and several months afterwards the Council was still receiving information from the applicant and the applications had still to be scrutinised by Committee.
8. Mr Wallard whilst acknowledging the logic in relation to the way the Planning Committee had to respond felt that with respect to some of the bigger planning issues that there should be an attempt to engage the CC as a whole. Miss Uprichard explained that anyone could put in a letter of support to an application. She reminded Mr Wallard that anyone with a computer or Internet access could look at applications on line. Mr Wallard in reply said that part of the issue was that CC members outwith the Planning Committee couldn't always respond to public concerns about a Planning Committee decision as they'd not had a chance to discuss the matter with the Planning Committee. He thought that there must be times when there was a bigger planning issue that it would be useful to involve the whole of the CC. Miss Uprichard replied that to discuss applications on planning grounds it was generally necessary to look at the applications and determine whether they complied with the local development plan and other legislation and documents before making a comment. She added that one had to be able to respond quickly to most applications due to the time limits on the CC being allowed to become a statutory consultee and then sending in its comments.

Mr Wallard thought that the use of social media would be a good way to get rapid responses and he felt that social media was an under used resource by the CC to get feedback. He thought that the community could be made aware of applications needing comment using social media. Miss Uprichard reiterated her view that anyone could look on the Fife Council website at applications and could make comments to the Planning Committee. She also reminded the meeting that the Planning Committee did assess applications on planning grounds and looked at the documents and to determine whether they complied with the local development plan.

Mr Greenwell explained to Mr Wallard that the whole CC had the right to direct the Planning Committee to discuss any major application in the full CC. He added that timescales didn't often permit that way of working. He thought that there was a safeguard in

that the whole CC could discuss applications as deemed necessary otherwise the Planning Committee had delegated authority.

Mr Wallard was concerned that if there were press releases coming from the CC or one of its committees the whole of the CC should have an opportunity to feed into the matter in question. Miss Uprichard commented that there were times that copies of objections were sent to the media and sometimes the press picked up on these to fill a space.

Mr Roberts thought that it would be useful if objections were circulated to CC members. Dr Goudie thought that that raised more questions than answers and wondered at what point would objections be circulated given the limited time there might be for objections to be submitted? Mr Roberts in reply explained that he thought that objections should or could be circulated after they'd been submitted so the objections circulated would be for information purposes.

Dr Goudie thought that it might be useful to have the minutes of the Planning Committee incorporated in the CC agenda when distributed.

9. Miss Uprichard formally announced her resignation as Planning Committee Convenor. Her decision was partly based on the time the role took up. She added that this was not helped by the way Fife Council planning operated and the debate with them about issues like statutory consulteeship. Dr Goudie thought that the CC should record its thanks for huge amount of work, which Miss Uprichard had put in during her time as Planning Convenor.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. Community Trust

Mr Greenwell reminded the meeting that he had circulated a paper detailing his proposed amendments to the Articles of Association the previous month. The proposals were then discussed at the recent GP Meeting. The GP Committee accepted the proposals made by Mr Greenwell. Two changes were made and Mr Greenwell reminded members that he had circulated the proposed changes accepted at the GP Meeting a few days ago.

One change suggested by Dr Goudie was that the Nominations Committee should be self organising and not driven by the directors of the Community Trust. However Dr Goudie acknowledged that if the Nominations Committee hadn't met within three months of the Trust AGM it would be reasonable for the directors to call for a meeting to be held. That amendment was made by adding in an appropriate sentence at the start of the clause.

The second one had been amended to try and avoid the situation, which could arise if all three co-opted directors reached the end of their terms of office at the same time. Mr Greenwell had put in wording, which would allow the partner directors to appoint co-opted directors for period not exceeding three years after which they can be re-elected for another three years. He hoped that the amended wording would allow a better circulation of co-opted directors without the issue of all reaching the end of their tenure at the same time.

Mr Greenwell asked members if they were happy with the proposed changes? There was general agreement that the amended wording was satisfactory. Mr Greenwell said he'd forward the proposals to the Directors of the Community Trust for them to vote and decide if they would agree the changes.

Mr Greenwell hoped that if the Nominations Committee was able to meet and put forward names for possible co-opted directors by the time of the AGM at the end of May then the Trust could begin to start the process of change of co-opted directors in a more staged manner. He also recognised that the other members of the Nominations Committee from the Links Trust and Fife Council had to be sorted out as there had been changes in the past five years with some committee members no longer in post in those organisations. He hoped that Cllr Melville would be able to represent Fife Council on the committee.

6.2. Proposals for a Minutes Secretary

There was further discussion about the proposal for a minutes secretary. Dr Shepherd said he had checked with other CCs, which employed minutes secretaries and asked about their set up for payment. The main comment coming back indicated that the minutes secretaries were generally self employed and paid their own tax. Dr Goudie expressed his view that he felt that the CC should organise this in a manner, which would be beyond reproach and avoiding pitfalls. He wondered whether the university might be able to assist as they'd done early on with StanDen in sorting out the employment. He thought that with a more substantial income the CC might be able to ask the university what they would charge to assist. Mr Greenwell agreed to make enquires to the university about this possibility.

6.3. Reports from Representatives

7. Committee Reports

7.1 Recreation Committee

Mr Greenwell noted that there was no longer a Chair since Dr Shepherd had resigned from the post. Mr Greenwell confirmed with Mr Paul that he'd be willing to take the lead on the Coffee Morning planned for April. It was agreed that there would be a meeting to discuss the Coffee Morning on Tuesday 22nd March in the Cosmos Centre.

7.2. GP Meeting

Mr Greenwell went through the minutes of the GP meeting in February sent by email to members. The main point of discussion had been the Community Trust.

The meeting had agreed that events coming under the banner of the Recreation Committee would be organised on an event-by-event basis until a possible Recreation Convenor could be found.

In relation to the Greenbelt Forum he reported that Sam Taylor had told him that they were definitely looking to wind up the organisation. There is to be a winding up on the afternoon of the 22nd March with the CC members attending as part of the process.

There had been some discussion about the Harbour Trust application to the CGF and the CGF in general. Mr Greenwell sought the views of members on this proposal. Mr Paul was critical of the possible use by Fife Council of the CGF for dealing with the toilets on the West Sands commenting that the Council had let them get into a poor state. He wondered whether the CGF would be used more frequently by Fife Council as a source of funds because of the shortage in the locality budget? In response to a query from Mr McLeod, Mr Paul confirmed that Fife Council could use the CGF as they saw fit. The official who informed Mr Paul was Mr Ferguson a lawyer in Fife Council and an expert on CGF according to Mr Paul. Some CC members expressed concern about the way the CGF was suddenly being used to fund more projects because of the shortage of funds in the locality budget of Fife Council. Cllr Morrison informed the meeting that it wasn't Fife Council applying for funds to do the toilets but FCCT. Cllr Morrison also added that the toilet proposed for demolition is so bad it might be condemned. The Sands Committee had looked at how to deal with the urgent need for a replacement given the shortfall in the locality budget and the CGF was viewed to be the only way to get work done in time for the new tourist season.

Mr Paul suggested that there might be a case for a sub-committee of the CC to take a look at CGF applications and come back to the full CC with comments on the applications so that the CC could issue its opinion. Mr Greenwell said he'd send out an email to ask for volunteers for the sub-committee. Mr Greenwell then asked the meeting if there was support for the expenditure. The CC agreed that there was no objection to the use of CGF for the toilets and the Harbour Trust application.

Mr Greenwell confirmed he'd reply to Fife Council on the agreement of the CC about the two applications to the CGF.

7.3. 200 Club

1st Mrs Selwyn 2nd Mr Peterson 3rd Mr Primmer

7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee

Mrs Corbin reported on a licensing application for a premises at the Sea Life Centre to which she'd sent in an objection. She detailed the application and the reasons the applicant was applying and to whom the alcohol would be sold. The application included the ability to sell and deliver alcohol to residential and business addresses. Mrs Corbin wondered how the applicant would police the sales and ensure that only people over the age of 18 would be in receipt of the alcohol. She added that the official dealing with the application had contacted her and had also been concerned about how this would be policed. The Licensing Board has approved the application.

7.5. Rail Sub Committee

Dr Goudie gave a brief update on behalf of the Rail Sub Committee. There had been a useful meeting with Mr Byiers, Chief Executive of the Fife Chamber of Commerce. Work is also continuing on the pre STAG document.

8. New Business

None

9. Reports from Office Bearers

9.1. Chair

Mr Greenwell in his report commented on the request from the East Fife Sports Council for the CC donation for one of the sports awards. This award for older athletes is given annually and the CC has been sponsoring the award to the tune of £50. Mr Crichton and Mrs Corbin have attended the event in the past with Mr Crichton presenting the trophy. This year it is to be held in the Gateway Building in St Andrews on 4th May.

Mr Greenwell had also had email contact with Alistair Lang of the BID group to try and get a presentation organised at the next CC meeting. So far this hasn't been set up but Mr Greenwell and the CC Vice Chairs may meet up with him prior to firming up any possible presentation date.

Mr Greenwell informed the meeting that he was also going to Loches later in the month to sign the second half of the Twinning agreement.

9.2. Treasurer

Mr Munn reported that everything was up to date including the payment now to Mrs Ashworth. Details were available on the members area of the website. Mr Greenwell reminded Mr Munn to bring a printed copy of the end of year accounts to the next CC meeting.

9.3 Secretary

9.3.1. Correspondence

Mr Marks commented on the new grants available for community paths details of which he'd forwarded to members. He thought it might be useful to look at this in case the CC decided to look at any projects, which could be eligible for support. He thought it was worth checking out.

He reminded the meeting about the AGM which will come up in the May meeting. The May meeting will be on the 9th May because the 2nd May is a public holiday.

10. Any Other Competent Business

No other public AOCB.