

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Minutes – June 2010

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/>)

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Ronnie Murphy, Ken Fraser, Ian Goudie, Penny Uprichard, Derek Skelhon, Andy Primmer, Patrick Marks, Judith Harding, Carol Ashworth, Henry Paul, Marysia Denyer, Audrey Macanaw, Izzy Corbin, Catherine Rowe

Students' Association Representative

Holly West

Nominated

Fife Councillors

Robin Waterston, Bill Sangster, Frances Melville, Dorothea Morrison

Apologies

Jill Hardie, Jude Innes, Meg Platt, Dave Finlay

2. Minutes of May 2010 Meeting

Mr Primmer pointed out that he'd been put down as attending twice and Mr Pead added that he'd be omitted.

5.1.1. Mr Fraser pointed out that a sentence starting on the 3rd line appeared to be incomplete. The sentence was corrected by omitting the wording, "and thought that the harbour". Dr Goudie added that at the beginning of that paragraph, it should read, "Miss Uprichard and Dr Goudie not just Miss Uprichard" The minutes were otherwise accepted as correct.

6.6.1. Miss Uprichard advised that the official mentioned was Mr McGroarty not Mr McGregor. Near the end of the same paragraph, the wording "still one draft plan" to be altered to "still one plan".

3. Presentations

3.1. Headon Presentation

This presentation was cancelled. Dr Goudie explained the reason for the cancellation by Mr Headon. His main areas of concern centre on the response from the Community Council with regard to the December minutes and the length of time his company would be allowed to make their presentation.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville

4.1.1. No.1 Greyfriars Garden

Clr Melville reported that a meeting had been set up for Community Council and Preservation Trust representatives with Alasdair Hamilton and Jim Birrell from Fife Council to see how the situation with regard to No1 Greyfriars Garden could be resolved.

4.1.2. "A" Boards

Fife Councillors had recently met to consider the report on "A" Boards. Three options had been presented, one being to refresh the current policy, option 2 was to ban "A" Boards from the footway, but this would cost £75000 because of the increased workload to enforce the ban. Option 3 was for a formal application and regulation and inspection system at a cost of £65000. The eventual decision was to refresh the current policy but there would be a concentrated leaflet drop to all the businesses involved to remind them of good practice. Dr Goudie expressed his disappointment at the decision, and wondered if there was any chance in getting the distinctive nature of the problem facing St Andrews recognised? Cllr Melville replied that she had suggested a pilot scheme for St Andrews without success. Miss Uprichard also expressed her disappointment at the decision and surprise at the cost quoted for enforcement of such a scheme. She wondered why it wouldn't be possible to employ someone to go around a couple of times a week to remind shopkeepers about proper location of their "A" Boards. Cllr Melville offered to send full details of the report to Community Councillors. Cllr Morrison added that officials had promised that enforcement action would be taken, though as this would be Fife wide she felt that would be a bit of a waste of resources. Cllr Melville and herself had argued about the issue of the 2 metre wide rule and its abuse in St Andrews, which affected users with special needs.

4.2. Bill Sangster

4.2.1. "A" Boards

Cllr Sangster reported that he'd sent a letter to Bob McLellan and to Tony Martin, Chair of the Transportation Committee detailing a system, which he felt could be cheaply and easily used to mark out the areas on the pavement where shopkeepers could locate items such as "A" Boards etc. This involved placing small steel studs in the pavement. Unfortunately his idea was turned down. He would however continue to report possible infringements to Transportation for enforcement action to be taken. He urged members of the public to report infringements. Miss Uprichard asked if "A" Boards required planning permission. Cllr Sangster didn't think planning permission was required.

4.2.2. Drain Covers Market Street

Cllr Sangster had reported the missing drain covers in Market Street. He hoped that there would be some action soon, depending upon which utility had responsibility for the covers.

4.2.3. Potholes

Cllr Sangster has continued to report potholes that have appeared for repair.

4.3. Robin Waterston

4.3.1. Japanese Pop Culture Exhibition

Cllr Waterston congratulated Mrs Corbin and anyone else involved in organising this event. He felt that it was a very interesting and unusual event.

4.3.2. Blocked Gullies

Work has been undertaken recently to clear blocked gullies. Cllr Waterston acknowledged that this is an ongoing problem, but he has continued to highlight it for action when necessary.

4.4. Dorothea Morrison

4.4.1. Wall at Claybraes

Cllr Morrison reported that she'd had a response back on this issue raised at the last Community Council meeting. There had been a site inspection, which had confirmed that there appeared to have been movement of the wall, but it wasn't clear when this had occurred. As the wall may be in Fife Council ownership the responsibility for its management is being checked out.

4.4.2. Local Plan Responses

Cllr Morrison had followed up on a request by Miss Uprichard to have all public responses, including those sent in during the previous consultation included in the process for the current consultation.

4.4.3. Councillors Surgeries

Mr Primmer asked all Councillors when their surgeries took place. Cllr Sangster reminded the meeting that there was a regular surgery just before the Community Council meeting downstairs in the Town Hall. Cllr Waterston also added that fewer people were attending these surgeries and that the vast bulk of enquires to Councillors came via other methods of contact, from emails to phone calls and letters.

4.4.4. Bins – East End Market Street

Mrs Rowe asked about problems with bins at the east end of Market Street. Cllr Sangster replied that this had been reported. He had sent photos of the offending bins to Environmental Services who had replied that they didn't have the authority to have them moved. Cllr Sangster agreed that if the householders couldn't take their bins into their houses they should be issued with black bags.

4.4.5. St Andrews Colts Changing Rooms

Mrs McAnaw asked who was responsible for the Changing Rooms at Tom Morris Drive, which were in a poor state. Cllr Sangster replied that they were being looked at by the Council. Mrs McAnaw replied that if necessary the parents were prepared to contribute towards improvements. Cllr Sangster in reply indicated that it would be helpful if one of the football teams using the facilities took on the responsibility of looking after them it would be appreciated by Fife Council. He added that both Tom Morris Drive and Cockshaugh Park needed work to improve them. Cllr Morrison added that she had raised the issue of the Football changing facilities with Jim Hootton of Fife Council recently. Cllr Morrison agreed to chase up Fife Council on how far any check on the state of the facilities had progressed.

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Planning Committee Reports

Mrs Denyer reported on recent Planning Committee matters. She felt that the reports spoke for themselves with the number of applications for which plans had not been received because of the householder status of the application being quite significant. There had been problems with the online aspect of the receipt of plans, but this had now been resolved and Mrs Denyer was also receiving plans when requested.

5.2. Letter from Planning Committee to Chief Executive

Miss Uprichard reported on the letter sent recently by the Planning Committee to the Chief Executive, Fife Council about the difficulties in receiving paper copies of plans. She commented on the increasing restrictions faced by the Planning Committee as officials of Fife Council sought to restrict the nature and type of planning applications they could receive, which included householder applications and applications for the back of buildings etc. The letter sent out by the Planning Committee was she said a last attempt to try and get the issue resolved. Apart from the Chief Executive, copies had been sent to the Chief Planner in Edinburgh and all Fife Councillors, COSLA and the Scottish Association of Community Councils. She added that the Scottish Government had indicated that the WEB shouldn't be the only method of access to plans. Part of the problem with online applications was that it was difficult to know when they'd been put on for consideration. She described the problems for both citizens without online access and those with online access. She felt that there was no reason why the applicant for a development shouldn't be able to produce extra sets of Plans.

5.3. Knightsbridge Site Plans

Miss Uprichard had recently attended an information day at this site, the former St Leonards grounds, in which the developers are proposing a major residential development. Miss Uprichard wrote to Bill Lindsay following this visit as the Developers had mentioned his name as a Planning contact with whom they'd had discussions. She'd asked Mr Lindsay a number of questions, one of which was about the fact that the Local Plan had not been approved so she wondered if the proposed plans by the developer would pre-empt the Local Plan. She also asked if it was correct to say that the developer was implying that they were being encouraged to put in an early application. A third question related to the fact that the Local Plan

talked about 120 units, whereas the developer was proposing over 200 units. She had been told that Council officials were happy with the higher number and were more concerned with the design.

She had also asked about the Master Plan of which she had not been able to obtain a copy. She informed the meeting that according to the Master Planning Handbook there were a wide range of details, which developers had to go into, and these included issues relating to Community Engagement. She felt that very few of the points relating to Community Engagement had been properly handled. She was awaiting a full response to her letter, which she had sent in, in her own name, but so far had only received an acknowledgement slip. More recently she'd received a letter from Robertsons with their plans for the application, the pre-application consultation papers. She informed the meeting that once these had been issued, a developer could put in their formal application after 12 weeks. She had given copies of her letter to Fife Councillors. She felt that because the Local Plan hadn't been approved such applications, of which Robertsons was only one, that no such plans would be allowed to go ahead prematurely.

Dr Goudie hoped that the Councillors would take cognizance of the concerns, as he felt that there were too many examples of piecemeal development in the absence of a coherent local plan. With regard to the number of units proposed for the area, Dr Goudie commented that the Planning Committee had debated the matter for some time. There was a view that traditionally the Planning Committee tried to keep the numbers of units on sites down to a reasonable number, given that developers often tried to increase the numbers. However given the range of problems facing the town, there was a feeling that a larger number on such a site was viable and the Community Council had supported a larger number compared to the Local Plan in which numbers had actually gone down, despite the site area increasing. There was a suspicion that the deflation of numbers was an attempt to make the western development seem more viable. Mr Paul asked the Fife Councillors if these numbers counted against the allocation in the Structure Plan or would they only count as infill and the numbers in the Structure Plan would still be the same? Cllr Waterston confirmed Mr Paul's suspicions. Dr Goudie queried Cllr Waterston's view, reminding him of the meeting with officials in the Local Office in which it had been pointed out to the officials that the Local Plan did not say that all 1090 houses had to be in the Western Extension. Dr Goudie felt there was scope for arguing what proportion of houses would need to be on green field land to the west of the town. He felt that areas such as St Leonards Fields, which were technically brown field sites, should be ahead of the areas in green field sites in priority. Cllr Waterston replied that there were several different aspects to this matter. He explained that there were questions of what was right and what was wrong and what St Andrews most needed, which was one question about which he felt most people probably were in agreement.

The question about what the Local Plan actually said, and the relationship between the Local Plan and the Structure Plan, and what the Strategic Land Allocation was and might contain was a separate question. He went on to explain that there were three categories of housing in the Structure Plan, one was Strategic Land Allocation, another was Land Allocation and a third was existing Housing Supply. He explained that the allocation for St Leonards Fields would have been counted in under existing Housing Supply and any extra would be classed as Local Plan Allocation. The allocation did not specify where these would be, as some sites would crop up, which had not been anticipated.

The point about Strategic Land Allocation he explained was that large numbers were needed to generate developer contributions to infrastructure, but that it wasn't legal to ask the St Leonards Field developer to make such a contribution to infrastructure elsewhere in St Andrews.

Miss Uprichard commented that in her letter that she'd asked if the additional 90 units at St Leonards Fields would be deducted from the Western Extension. Cllr Waterston replied that this wouldn't be the case. Cllr Melville felt that there should be a case for the deduction of the additional 90 units to be deducted from the Structure Plan numbers, if the current numbers in the St Leonards Fields Plan were above those quoted in the 2005 Local Plan.

Miss Uprichard also commented that she understood that the Local Plan was going to Committee about the 29th June and also 7th September. She asked if the Councillors had any opinion about what might happen at these meetings and what the prospective timetable might be? Cllr Melville replied that she'd been informed that reports on the representations on the Local Plan wouldn't be discussed until the September meeting.

Miss Uprichard asked if it was true that there wouldn't be any pre-enquiry modifications? Cllr Waterston explained that in his understanding it would come in the first instance to NE Fife Area Committee on August 4th for comments, then it would go to Planning Committee in September, after which it would go forward. He wasn't clear whether there had been any determination about the pre enquiry modifications or alternatively putting forward comments on the submissions to go forward to the Reporter had been made.

Miss Uprichard commented that she found the procedure of the Local Plan confusing and complex. Dr Goudie added that in his recollection that in the 2005 Local Plan an original 180 units on St Leonards Fields

but this had been cut back in the 2009 Local Plan version. The existing land supply he assumed only included sites, which had planning permission, and he didn't think that the St Leonards Fields site had planning permission. Cllr Waterston reiterated that the site was included in the existing land supply and the developer didn't have to have planning permission for that, because there was a calculation by Fife Council that they assumed that 70% would get planning permission. Dr Goudie replied that he would be surprised if the contribution in relation to the St Leonards Field site, didn't count towards the Housing Market Area or arguably towards the SLA, though he recognised that that would be up for debate.

Cllr Waterston made an additional point in relation to paper plans. He felt that it was important to distinguish between large and small applications. He recognised the need for paper plans for large applications, but small plans were increasingly only being published online. He added that these small plans were not going to be specially produced on paper for Community Councils.

Miss Uprichard and Dr Goudie made final comments on the issue of affordable housing, following a comment from Cllr Sangster who had expressed his strong support for a much larger growth in this market. There was a general consensus about the need for such housing, even if meant increasing the percentage, which had to be included in larger developments, though the issues of how developers would react to that was acknowledged.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. Climate Challenge Fund - Update

Mr Murphy reported on the progress of this project. The project is now advertising for a co-ordinator. Work is also taking place to prepare leaflets for public distribution, to coincide with a series of public events, the first being the Hidden Gardens on the 27th June. There will be interviews for the Energy Champions later in June. The website is progressing, but costs have been an issue. Mr Murphy described some of the content of the website. Dr Goudie put forward a suggestion via Holly West about the Climate Challenge Committee having a student representation, with the Students Association Sustainability Officer the obvious choice. Mr Murphy agreed that he would be happy to hear from the Student Association Sustainability Officer and have her along to a meeting. Dr Goudie thought that if that idea worked, and there was an ongoing role the Student Representative should be co-opted on to the Community Council. Mr Murphy also wondered about formally co-opting Roddy Yarr who had done a huge amount to get the project going. Dr Goudie felt that that was sensible. Mr Paul thought that he would have to be approached on the possibility.

6.2. Arms Report

Taken in camera

6.3. Election of Convenor/ Deputy Convenor

Miss Uprichard nominated Mr Crichton, seconded by Mrs Rowe. Mr Crichton was elected unopposed.

Mrs Corbin was nominated by Mr Pead and seconded by Mr Marks for the post of Deputy Convenor. She was elected unopposed.

6.4. Reports from Representatives

6.4.1. Report on Meeting about Martyr's Monument

Mrs Corbin reported that the meeting had been a very constructive one, with much headway being made and an action plan and targets being set. A theme of community, environment and the economy is being considered and contributions will be sought for both the restoration and possible enhancement of the monument. There has also been talk about a steering group in relation to the project. The Pilgrim Trust had been approached and the Preservation Trust was going to be involved. In relation to press releases St Andrews Partnership had been asked to emphasise the joint/shared roles of the Community Council and the Partnership. Mr Paul added that it had been requested that a representative from the Community Council should be on the board of the project. Mr Paul suggested that Mrs Corbin should represent the Community Council because of her work on this matter. Miss Uprichard to act as deputy if Mrs Corbin couldn't attend any meetings.

Dr Goudie asked if the issue of an account and donations had been resolved. Mr Paul replied that the Preservation Trust would receive donations, as it was already a charity. He also added that a potential

source of funding was the Fife Enterprise Trust, which Cupar Community Council had successfully accessed for a project relating to a local monument in that town. The Community Council would also have to be registered with Entrust the UK regulating body for environmental projects receiving such funding. Mr Paul suggested that such a registration would allow the Community Council to become involved in a range of projects, not just Martyr's Monument.

Dr Goudie summarised the proposal from Mr Paul that a group be formed consisting of Mr Paul, Mrs Corbin and Miss Uprichard for the purposes of being able to access funding from the Fife Enterprise Trust. The proposal met with the approval of the Community Council.

Dr Goudie also summarised the proposal that Mrs Corbin continue to represent the Community Council in relation to the ongoing Martyrs Monument project. The Community Council agreed to Mrs Corbin being the Community Council representative.

Mr Paul also commented on the need to join Entrust so that funding could be accessed from the Fife Enterprise Trust. Mr Marks informed the meeting that Entrust already appeared to be aware of the Community Council as he received an annual request for a return on an official Entrust form, even if there had been no funding requested. He agreed to check on the exact status of the Community Council membership and inform Mr Paul.

6.5. Any Other Matters Arising

6.5.1. Yacht Club Boat Yard Lease

Dr Goudie mentioned that at the previous meeting Mr Paul had expressed concern about Fife Council's refusal to give the Yacht Club a clear commitment to renewing its lease for the use of the Boat Yard on a long term basis. There was a suggestion that Mr Alan Paul be contacted in relation to this matter. Miss Uprichard had been in contact with a Miss Livingston to ask if the comments from the recent consultation were going to be made public. She had informed Miss Uprichard that they would be made public when the report went to committee. Miss Uprichard requested that the comments be put in the public domain. Miss Livingston had agreed to see what could be achieved.

7. Reports from Committees

7.1. Recreation Committee

Mr Roberts reported that the change over of Convenor/Chair of the Recreation Committee between himself and Mrs Rowe was being organised. Dr Goudie suggested that it would be useful to send an email around to members reminding them about the work of the Committee. This would be especially useful when there were new members seeking to find their role in the Community Council.

7.1.1 The Bandstand Concerts

Mr Roberts had put in an application to the Common Good Fund for a grant towards the band payments and awaited an outcome. There had also been further donations.

7.2. General Purposes Committee

No meeting since last month.

7.3. 200 Club

Mrs Harding talked about work in progress to make the work of the 200 Club more transparent. Forms for joining and for grants were available in the Library and the Local Office. Hopefully more information would go on the Community Council Website as well, including forms, which could be downloaded.

The Constitution will go on the website. Awards continue to be made. Mrs Denyer suggested that posters could go in the Community Council notice boards.

7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee

Mrs Corbin reported that there would be a committee meeting towards the end of June. Mrs Corbin also reported on the Japanese Pop Culture Exhibition, which she felt had gone well with over 70 attending. The Exhibition may be repeated in the future locally and further afield. Her main disappointment for the

organiser of the Exhibition was a total lack of response from local schools. Mr Paul felt that the timing was unfortunate as this was the exam period for the Secondary Schools. Mrs McAnaw felt that it might have been better to have phoned the schools.

7.4.1. Public Partnership Forum

Mrs Corbin mentioned she'd received an invitation to join this body. She outlined the nature of this body, which dealt with health issues. Dr Goudie suggested that Mrs Corbin send an email around to allow members to see the detail and have time to absorb the idea behind this body. Mrs Corbin agreed to forward details to Community Council members. Matthew Guest suggested that it would be useful to pass on information on this body to the Student Association.

8. New Business

8.1. Review of the Scheme for Community Councils

Mr Marks had forwarded the email with attachments about the current version following the initial review. He explained briefly some of the changes proposed, including issues to do with signing up for contracts with outside bodies, how much money from an annual grant that a CC could hold year to year etc, etc. Mr Marks suggested that this could be discussed at a GP Meeting. Dr Goudie agreed that this needed a response. Mr Paul felt that most of our suggestions in the first consultation had been accepted except for the planning ones. Miss Uprichard felt that there were matters in the scheme, particularly the planning which required answering. Dr Goudie said that it would be possible for other members to attend a GP Meeting to discuss the scheme and what further comments needed to go in before the end of July 2010. Mr Paul suggested that the planning matters in the scheme could be discussed at Planning Committee as he felt that nothing else was controversial and met most of our needs. Dr Goudie thought that the 20% rule for financial carry over might require careful financial thought.

9. Reports from Office Bearers

9.1. Chair

Dr Goudie said that he had circulated the agreement, which he and Mr Crichton had worked out the previous week. He wondered if this was acceptable to the Community Council? Mr Paul sought clarification about the Ceilidh, which he said was described as a Hogmanay Ceilidh. He wondered whether it had to be a Hogmanay Ceilidh as he felt that St Andrews Night was also a suitable time for a Ceilidh. It was agreed to delete the word Hogmanay. Dr Goudie commented that now the situation had been resolved, he felt that the Community Council needed to be willing to become more involved in such events in the future. Holly West commented that the Student Association would be willing to become involved in such events.

9.2. Treasurer's Report

Mr Pead presented the financial reports, starting with the Annual Accounts. He took questions on this account. Mr Primmer asked for clarification on one aspect of the accounts, which related to the legal costs of the Arms Contract. Mr Pead confirmed that the figures Mr Primmer was querying were those relating to the Arms.

Mr Pead asked for formal approval of the Annual Accounts so that he could send them into Fife Council and the Community Council could then get the annual grant. The Community Council approved the Annual Accounts.

Mr Pead then presented the current monthly accounts. Mr Primmer asked about the ex-Trust Fund and how this fitted in with the 20% as detailed in the Community Council review documentation. Dr Goudie thought that the ex-Trust Fund wouldn't be affected, as the 20% related to the grant not other capital accumulated by Community Council. However he agreed that the matter might need to be addressed in the GP Committee.

Mr Paul as the new treasurer reminded members to put in bids for funds, to help him be able to project the annual budget. Dr Goudie acknowledged the difficulties in predicting what the Planning Committee might

require depending upon what issues arose in a given year. Miss Uprichard thought that it would be useful to have a contingency fund for areas of expenditure, which couldn't be easily planned in advance.

9.3. Secretary's Report

Not a lot to report, but willing to take questions.

10. AOCB

10.1. Request for Filing Cabinets

Miss Uprichard made a plea for two filing cabinets for the use by the Planning Committee. She felt that the cupboard in the local office didn't conform to what was required. She wondered if the Town Hall was a possibility. Cllr Morrison agreed that it was important to have a place to store such documentation. Cllr Waterston agreed on the need for storage, but also on the need to ensure that only relevant material was stored. Dr Goudie asked about the Fife Council policy on the storage of planning documents. Cllr Waterston agreed to find out about the disposal of paper plans. Miss Uprichard still felt that two filing cabinets were needed and that the cupboard in the local office was not sufficiently accessible.

10.2. Daniel Stephens

Mrs Denyer brought up the issue of the request by an American student, Daniel Stephens and asked the Community Council to consider how he could be helped to fit into the work of the Community Council during his period of internship in St Andrews. Mr Marks explained the background to the contact and the information he'd given to Mr Stephens. There was some discussion about possible ways to help Mr Stephens become involved. Mr Paul thought that Mr Stephens could become involved with Standen.