

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Provisional Minutes – November 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

1. Attendance

Community Councillors

Patrick Marks, Ian Goudie, Marysia Denyer, Izzy Corbin, Andy Primmer, Robert McLachlan, Howard Greenwell, Keith Cordrey, Penny Uprichard, Carol Ashworth, Judith Harding

Students' Association Representatives

Patrick O'Hare
Chloe Hill

Nominated

Stuart Foulkes
Niall Scott

Fife Councillors

Bill Sangster, Robin Waterston, Dorothea Morrison, Frances Melville

Apologies

Callum Corbin, Henry Paul, Ronnie Murphy, Catherine Rowe, Meg Platt, Ken Crichton

2. Minutes of November 2011 Meeting

Cllr Sangster corrected the name of the fountain as the Whyte-Melville Fountain

4.2.7. Cllr Sangster reported that the graffiti had been removed from the toilet area as far as he had been lead to believe.

5.3. Dr Goudie reminded the secretary that Mr Yarr should be Dr Yarr.

3. Presentations

3.1. Presentation by Robbie Blyth on Water Quality East and West Sands

Mr Blyth introduced himself as the Beaches and Coast Officer for Fife Council responsible for management of the amenity beaches and other land under Fife Council account. He hoped to give the meeting an idea of the problems and challenges in the St Andrews area.

Mr Blyth explained that the Blue Flag status for beaches was awarded annually and that there were 32 criteria that the Local Authority and local community had to fulfil to get a beach designated. One of the most important criteria requiring to be fulfilled was the water quality. Both the West and east sands are designated bathing beaches so are sampled from May to September each year. Water quality is designated in three grades, top, middle and fail. This year the West Sands was only able to reach the middle grade. To be designated for the blue flag a beach has to reach the top standard in all criteria. Due to the way the beaches are marked it won't be possible to put them forward next year for Blue flag awards as there needs to be at least a year in which they meet the top standard.

Mr Blyth explained that some of the problem had been the fact that last summer was the wettest in a long time and this had resulted in more run off from agricultural land than normal thus contaminating the beaches.

Mr Roberts asked Mr Blyth for clarification on comments he'd heard in the media about the St Andrews Beaches being in a poor condition. Mr Blyth explained that the Marine Conservation Society had a different set of criteria when judging beaches for their Good Beach Guide, which included litter on beaches. He acknowledged that this could be confusing and it was important that there should be good communication between local authorities and groups like MCS. He also defended the litter clearing record for the beaches, but acknowledged that it had been difficult due to the wet weather. He added that there had been huge improvements over the past few decades in the water quality.

Mrs Ashworth asked about the signing for dog walking on the beaches. She felt that these were not very obvious. Mr Blyth felt that the signs were quite obvious but acknowledged that it was difficult to find a happy medium as some people might complain if a sign was in their view too big. He also added that there was actually no way to stop dog walkers using beaches, as there were no byelaws to stop them. To deal with the matter he'd tried to zone the beaches for different user purposes, including dog walkers. The issue was however a fraught one as he had complaints from beach users who objected to dogs on beaches as well as dog walkers. He was looking at the possibility of introducing byelaws but added that this was a long process. At the present time he was trying to get dog walkers not to take their dogs on to the beaches during the blue flag period.

Dr Goudie queried whether SEPA had wondered whether the problem might be partly due to Scottish Water not taking sufficient action in relation to infrastructure problems. In his reply Mr Blyth said that the evidence from SEPA was that the problem was diffuse pollution due to run off from the land. He acknowledged however that in Scotland the water treatment infrastructure was only set to deliver the middle figure. This would normally be acceptable in a good summer. Fife Council had written to Scottish Water and SEPA and the guidance received back related to diffuse pollution.

Dr Goudie also asked how long the beach was out of the game for in relation to a Blue Flag Award being re-established? Mr Blyth said that the beach would not be able to regain its status for a year. If there is a good reading next year St Andrews might be able to regain its status, but he added that changes in legislation in 2014 would mean that the status of a beach would be assessed on the average of four years readings. If there were a failure it would take over four years to regain the blue flag status.

Ms Uprichard queried the representation on the West Sands Liaison Group feeling that it excluded local residents of the town. Mr Blyth replying said that all local elected members attended that meeting and he thought that they were the local community representatives at that meeting. He thought that public feelings and views were well represented at the West Sands Liaison meeting.

3.2. Madras New Build, No Rebuild – Brian Thomson

Mr Thomson explained that the group was made up of representatives from both Madras College and its feeder Primary Schools. Mr Thomson himself was the third generation in his family to attend Madras College. The Campaign had started after the collapse of the negotiations between the University and Fife Council. At a subsequent meeting in Madras he and others realised that Fife Council were single mindedly going down the refurbishment route, despite assurances from the Director of Education that there would be an open and transparent scoping exercise in relation to a possible new site for the planned new school. Their campaign had started after this meeting. The group has felt that the consultation exercise undertaken by the Council was deeply flawed. There was a feeling that it wasn't open and transparent and that the scoring exercise was also flawed, which it was felt didn't stand up to any scrutiny.

The group collected over 2000 signatures, which have been presented to the Fife Councillors Chapman and Waterston from the Education Committee. He wanted to know why a refurbishment was deemed best now for Madras after the years of talk of needing a new build. He cited the new builds at Auchmuty and Dunfermline and wondered why they were more worth new builds than Madras?

His group had detailed seven reasons why it was felt that Kilrymont wouldn't be suitable. One reason was the flawed nature of the scoring exercise; secondly there are restrictions on the Kilrymont site because of the existing footprint. He detailed a number of the difficulties inherent in the use of the existing footprint and the way that this would affect the nature of the extended building. Another issue he noted was cost risk, which centred around not knowing what unexpected costs there might be when going into an existing building and taking it apart. He cited the example of the amount of asbestos in the existing building as such an unknown factor. There was also the value for money aspect. He commented that Fife Council would have to spend money retaining some of the features of the existing building, which had merited it is listed status instead of spending on the new build side of the project. The size of the site itself is another factor. The Kilrymont site is only 15 ½ acres, so trying to fit everything in, including playing fields didn't work very well he felt. The location of Madras was another problem being at the end of a narrow

residential road, with what would be an increased amount of bus transport as 70% of the school population lived outwith St Andrews and had to be bussed.

The biggest issue for the group was the huge level of disruption for pupils in what would be at least a two-year period of refurbishment programme. The options to accommodate pupils either on the Kilrymont Playing Fields or at South Street were he thought both fraught with problems for pupils and staff, as well as the town centre if the South Street site was used for the whole school roll. He also commented on the effect on the Community use Centre at Kilrymont, which would be virtually closed during the refurbishment.

Mr Thomson went on to look at the alternatives to refurbishment. One option was to have a new build at Kilrymont if the existing building could be demolished, but the group eventually rejected this as an option. Another option would be to use Station Park, an idea proposed by a group including former rector Lindsay Matheson. The Station Park site was bigger at 24 acres, so it was felt that there would be the room to fit in a school. He acknowledged that the site could have planning difficulties but he felt that with political will it might be achievable. A third option which has suddenly appeared is Pipeland Farm, land owned by the Muir Group who had been made aware that Fife Council was looking at options and had discussed the possibility with an official from Fife Council. The land he claimed had been offered to the Council at District Valuers rate, but the possibility of this site was not mentioned at the subsequent Public Meeting. It was claimed at the Public Meeting that there was no other site, apart from Kilrymont and Station Park.

In summing up Mr Thomson asked that Fife Council turn down the proposal to refurbish Kilrymont later in the week. He also wanted Fife Council to instruct a full, transparent and rigorous appraisal of all the potential sites for a new school. He added that if the decision of the Council was to go ahead with the Kilrymont Refurbishment it would be subject to a statutory consultation, but the Council would still be able to go ahead even if there was majority public opposition to the plans. He concluded by saying that a new build would be what children and the community deserve. He thought that there was huge public opposition to a refurbishment and that other sites would be deliverable and should be appraised. To do anything less would be a failure of the democratic process. He asked if the Community Council would endorse the Groups' view and make the Council aware of it.

Mr Primmer agreed with Mr Thomson's views and added that he'd attended the Public Meeting at Madras and felt that the Council was trying to force a particular option upon the community and that there should be a full and transparent process of site selection.

Dr Goudie agreed about the size of the Station Park site, but wondered if the Group had had any advice as to why the western end of the site was more suitable than the eastern end. Mr Thomson replied that this was based on the advice of the Council architect, but he was open in his own mind about the location if Station Park was chosen. The Council architect had suggested that the western end was less intrusive of the view of the R & A when visitors were driving into St Andrews. Dr Goudie thought that the western end would maximise public opposition.

Mrs McAnaw wondered if the Group got a feeling of the public view on a site when they were gathering the petition signatures in the town. Mr Thomson said that there had been public opposition to a refurbishment but a split in views about a new build at Kilrymont or Station Park.

Miss Uprichard made a point about the Muir Group proposal, reminding the meeting about the history of the land which the Muir Group owned and had wanted to develop. She was concerned that any school proposal might come with a renewed attempt to have housing. Mr Thomson replied that in his understanding the site might include some land for commercial purposes between the school site and the hospital, but there was no talk about housing otherwise in the way the proposal was presented as the proposal as it stood would leave little ground for housing. He thought that the Muir Group recognising the low chance of getting housing built was seeking to get a financial return on its investment.

Miss Uprichard also wondered about the possibility of a school at the Bridgehead and continued use of the Madras South Street site. Mr Thomson replied that the Council claimed that the full curriculum couldn't be delivered in two smaller schools and there was also a limited budget for the school development, which might not be adequate if split between two sites for a range of reasons.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville

4.1.1. SEPA Licence

A licence has been granted to start work in the management of the Kinnesburn

4.1.2. Pends Traffic Problems

There has been a meeting to look at traffic problems in the Pends and it is hoped that a decision to satisfy everyone can be reached.

4.2. Bill Sangster

4.2.1. Kinnesburn

Cllr Sangster informed the meeting that it was hoped that the work would be finished by the 9th December.

4.2.2. Crail's Lane Closure

This street will be closed again from 14th November to 2nd December to mend the wall, which had been vandalised.

4.2.3. Whyte-Melville Fountain Update

Cllr Sangster reported that the fountain has the equipment to make it functional already in place and he hoped that the Pilgrim Foundation would fund the work to make the fountain functional.

4.2.4. North Street

Cllr Sangster reported that North Street should be open again by the 14th November

4.2.5. Grange Road Closure

There will be a temporary closure of Grange Road because of work in relation to a telecommunications mast on the 18th November for the day.

4.2.6. Town Hall Shop Rental

The shop premises below the Burgh Chambers has now been let and the rental will go into the Common Good Fund.

4.2.7. St Andrews Essential Roadwork

Cllr Sangster explained that the road works taking place around the town were all essential ones, but they would stop between 1st December and starting again in January, finishing by April 2012.

4.2.8. Lamond Drive Bus Shelter

The bus shelter close to the Pipeland Road junction is to get its hardstanding repaired.

4.2.9. North Street Bus Shelter – near Marine Place

Fife Council is trying to find funding for a bus shelter at this location.

4.2.10. Loches Visit

Cllr Sangster showed the meeting a medal he had received while on a recent visit to Loches.

4.2.11. Ladebraes Inspection

The Councillors and Fiona Mitchell will walk through the Ladebraes after the next Locality Meeting to note areas of concern and potential action.

4.2.12. Scooniehill Road – Repairs

Mrs Denyer asked Cllr Sangster when Scooniehill Road would be getting repaired. Cllr Sangster acknowledged that it wouldn't be until the next financial year, as it hadn't been budgeted for in the current financial year.

4.2.13. Kinnessburn Path Reinstatement

Mr Greenwell asked Cllr Sangster if the pathways on the north side of the burn would be reinstated after the current work on the stream was completed? Cllr Sangster thought that this should happen but agreed to keep an eye on the work to ensure it wasn't overlooked when the main project was completed.

4.2.14. Leaf Clearance

Dr Goudie drew Cllr Sangster's attention to the perennial problem of the accumulation of fallen leaves causing potential hazard in areas and wondered what the situation was with Council workers being available to keep on top of this problem in St Andrews. Cllr Sangster in reply said that the Council would struggle to cope with leaf clearance. He made the meeting aware that there were a couple of workers with barrows patrolling the town centre area to try and keep it clean, but he acknowledged that it would take a lot of man power to keep on top of the leaf fall problem.

4.2.15. Grit Bin Query

Mrs Ashworth asked Cllr Sangster if there was a chance of further grit bins in her area. Cllr Sangster said that it would be unlikely this winter as there were a lot of broken bins needing replacing and there was a long waiting list for bins.

4.3. Robin Waterston

4.3.1. Street Cleaning Report

Cllr Waterston commented on a report received by Councillors at North East Fife Area Committee and a photograph, which had been circulated at the meeting depicting a day's litter, collected outwith official bins by the Council staff in the West Area. The haul amounted to 27 lorry loads of mixed waste and leaves.

4.3.2. Old landfill Site at West Sands

Cllr Waterston is on the West Sands Management Plan Committee. He mentioned that the committee were tackling the issue of the old landfill site at the far end of the West Sands, which has become breached exposing some of the landfill from 1950/60s. Site investigations will take place and the basic plan will be to move some of the exposed material and create a new dune system. If no hazardous materials are discovered while investigating the site this plan should proceed. He also commented on the successful work done by the Swilken Burn end to stabilise a dune damaged by storms.

4.3.4. St Andrews Community Forum

Cllr. Waterston informed the meeting that he had been at a meeting of the new St Andrews Community Forum organised by members of the Students Association. He felt that it had been a very useful meeting. An issue, which had been discussed, was the way to control bicycles, particularly those that had been abandoned or parked inappropriately. A strategy involving the use of bike tags is to be set up to try and reduce the problem. The tags could be issued to local residents in affected areas to put on bikes as a way to show some disapproval, although they won't have any legal force.

4.3.5. Green Gym at East Sands

Cllr Waterston brought up the subject of Green Gyms, which had been mentioned at an earlier meeting. He had some illustrations of the types of equipment, which could be used and mentioned that the local Councillors had recently attended a meeting with local Council staff to discuss the idea further. It would be located close to the current Children's play area at the East Sands and would be set up to encourage adults to use them for fitness purposes. The estimated cost to buy and install the equipment could be around £40000. Cllr Waterston said that there were various possible funding sources but added that Fife Councillors couldn't apply to make such a purchase. He thought that this might be a possible project for the Community Council in which the CC would work with the Fife Councillors and local officers to put

together the funding packages and applications. He said that some money might be available from the local area budget and the Common Good Fund but the requests for funding from other sources would have to come from another body, hence his suggestion to the Community Council.

Mr Roberts agreed that it might be an appropriate project for the Community Council but there would have to be a decision as to which committee might be best to lead the project.

4.4. Dorothea Morrison

4.4.1. Advice from SEPA

Cllr Morrison had spoken to one of the staff from SEPA at the recent meeting about the Kinnessburn. The discussion had centred on the fact that the East Sands was a popular area for surfers and swimmers. The staff member from SEPA suggested that members of the public should perhaps avoid using the sea in the area after heavy rainfall. This was because of the diffuse pollution, which could have been carried down the Kinnessburn to St Andrews Bay, in case it had ill effects on users, though she felt that it was a fairly small chance.

4.4.2. Castle Sands

Councillors have requested an update from officials about the state of the road above the Castle Sands and will hear about it at the local meeting in December.

4.4.3. Winter Gritting

Councillors will also be getting an update in December on the winter gritting situation. She added that should the need arise the Council will be putting square sacks of salt at strategic locations for residents to use if they don't have a bin.

4.4.4. Ladebraes Inspection Walk

Cllrs. Melville and Morrison and Ian Barbour have arranged a walk later in the week on Thursday to look at the Ladebraes. (Cllr Sangster's walk will be the day before!)

4.4.5. Scooniehill Road Repairs

Cllr Morrison reported that repairs could either be at the Easter or summer holidays, but Councillors were pushing for the earlier date.

4.4.6. Market Street Work and Effect Upon Shops

Mrs McAnaw asked if there would be any form of recompense for the businesses in Market Street who have had to go through a prolonged period of disruption with the road renewal etc. Cllr Morrison said that from past experience in a similar situation in South Street there was very little that could be done to compensate businesses, though she added that she thought that those businesses in South Street had weathered the difficult period. Cllr Sangster thought that there might be some form of grand opening following the completion of the work to act as a gesture towards the difficulties faced by the businesses. Cllr Melville added that businesses could make a claim to the Council Assessor, and sympathised with their difficulties, feeling that there should be some Government recognition of the difficulties and compensate in some way.

4.4.7. Traffic problems due to Road works

Miss Uprichard commented on the severe traffic problems due to the closure of North Street and the need to divert traffic towards Hope Park roundabout, which resulted in gridlock at times. Miss Uprichard felt that there had been inadequate signing for some of the diversions and queried the use of the traffic wardens to try and manage the problems. Cllr. Sangster commented that due to the nature of St Andrews it was difficult to avoid severe disruption and reminded Miss Uprichard that there were only 2 traffic wardens in the town.

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Madras College

Cllr Waterston was given the floor to make some comments in relation to the situation before the main discussion began, as he would have to absent himself from that discussion due to his role in the Education Committee.

Cllr Waterston acknowledged that the issue was so important but also complicated and difficult as it was close to the heart both of Councillors and members of the public, parents and children. He acknowledged that some compromises would have to be made but he wouldn't sanction any compromise on the educational aspect of the development.

Cllr Waterston agreed that the scoring exercise was a flawed process, with what was being displayed at the meeting was only half of what businesses used as a cost benefit analysis. The cost had not been clear and the benefits had been displayed in a rather confused way. He didn't feel that the Education Committee would be guided primarily by the scorings. He added that the refurbishment had always been the Council's fallback position since 2009 and claimed that other schools had been successfully refurbished across Scotland and the UK.

He said that the transitional arrangements would be less disruptive than originally feared in relation to the use of South Street. He acknowledged that it would be difficult for a year and a half and testing of the everyone's patience, but he didn't believe it would harm pupils' education.

Mr O'Hare wondered if this week's decision would be the final one or might there be a delay and a need for further consultation? Cllr Waterston replied that if the Education Committee decided to chose a preferred site on Thursday that would trigger a statutory consultative process. He added that the outcome of the consultation would not be binding upon the Council but acknowledged that it would be difficult for the Council to proceed in the face of major opposition to their choice. If a preferred site was chosen and of the consultation process was complete by the 1st March it would go to the Education Committee for formal ratification. If the process weren't completed before the May elections the next administration would have to finalise the decision.

Miss Uprichard hoped that any consultation report and education report on the new proposals for Madras would be publically available well before March. She'd previously tried and failed to get the equivalent reports for the Langlands Site. She viewed the availability of such reports as a commitment to transparency by Fife Council. Cllr Waterston agreed that in principle that would be desirable to have public access to the reports, but couldn't promise because of the tight time frame to the Education Committee meeting at the beginning of March 2012.

Mrs McAnaw had asked at the last meeting in Madras about research into the potential effect on Children's education of a period of disruption and had received the impression that no work had been done on that subject, which she found surprising. Cllr Waterston replied that John McLoughlin to whom Mrs McAnaw was referring had indicated that he'd try to find out what research had been done, but he'd acknowledged to Cllr Waterston that it was very difficult to assess the impact of a temporary period of such disruption on educational attainment. Mr McLoughlin had further informed Cllr Waterston that he couldn't find any evidence and that Head Teachers in schools similarly affected hadn't reported any significant or adverse effect on attainment levels.

Mrs Harding wondered about the value of a wider range of consultation as she'd attended a meeting at which only around 40 parents were present. She thought that there should also be an opportunity for local residents with an interest to be informed and added that a wider range of publicity might help to generate more response to the consultation process. Cllr Waterston acknowledged that this was something the Community Council might wish to recommend, however he thought that there was a real problem to the issue of consultation in a formal way on complex issues such as a major planning process. He thought that one of the issues would be what information and how much information it would be possible to get to help the public understand more in relation to things like the planning issues in areas like Station Park. He added that it was difficult to have a big meeting on such a major issue in which there were ranges of options with their own complexities. He concluded by once again suggesting that the Community Council could try to press for wider consultation in some way.

Mr O'Hare commented on the level of opposition from parents towards the idea of a refurb of Kilrymont and added that even if a cost benefit analysis went in favour of the refurb there would still be ongoing tensions between the parents and Council. Many parents would still feel that the Council had pushed through its own agenda for redevelopment and ignored the strength of support for a new build.

In his reply Cllr Waterston said that the feelings of those who signed the petition for a new school build had to be acknowledged. He did however have some reservations about accepting that the result of a petition which was essentially asking parents those signing to say if they wanted a new school or an old

school with a bit of a makeover and a bit added on. He wasn't certain that this constituted serious consultation. He did however agree that the process of the cost benefit analysis wasn't well done. He didn't see any evidence in the petition that there were a large number of parents who didn't take the view that anything was better than a rebuild.

Mrs Corbin commented on the fact that the University Library had been refurbished and it had worked well. She had also had comments from parents who were happy to have Madras remain at Kilrymont. She also reminded the meeting that the site at Station Park was a designated open space.

Mr Roberts commented that the issue of the proposed Madras replacement had been a controversial issue, at one time causing some division within the Planning Committee when the Langlands site was still to the fore. It had been agreed at that time that a statement on the proposals would only be made when the exact site was known. He acknowledged that there was now a feeling that the Community Council should make a comment to the public on where it stands. Mr Roberts quoted then from a letter composed by Mr Paul, "The Community Council urges the Education Committee to delay the decision on the solution for the new Madras until a proper evaluation of all the options and meaningful consultation has been carried out". Mr Roberts asked if the Community Council was in agreement and if so he would email the statement to Councillors. Dr Goudie suggested that the press should be given a copy as well. The statement was agreed without dissent and will be emailed to Fife Councillors and the press. Dr Goudie felt that the Community Council would have to come to a decision about its preference on the two other sites mentioned by Mr Thomson. Dr Goudie was not convinced that there would be a strong objection to a possible development at Station Park, but thought that given there was greater historical opposition by the town and Community Council to development on the southern hillside.

5.2. Kenly Wind Turbines

Mr Greenwell reported that the Kenly Farm Wind Turbine proposal had caused considerable debate within the Planning Committee, but was eventually minded to object to the applications although they were outwith the St Andrews area. However when it became obvious that there were a considerable number of objections locally to the proposal, it was decided that there was no need to object.

Mr O'Hare later queried whether the Community Council was ratifying the Planning Committee's objection to the wind turbines? He was informed that the CC had made no objection to the keenly Wind turbine proposals. Mr Scott also commented on the Kenly Wind turbine proposals asking whether the University could explain the rationale behind the project to the CC when the proposals did come up for further discussion. He added that the University couldn't be viewed as a developer in the normal meaning of the word in this case as this plan was integral to the future of the University helping to reduce energy costs and the carbon footprint of the University. Mr Roberts thought that it was quite a reasonable request, though the CC hadn't reached the stage of expressing a view.

5.3. Planning Committee Delegated Powers Issue

However Mr. Greenwell continued it raised two issues. One issue was the Committee's request to Community Council to reaffirm that the Planning Committee had delegated authority and the second was under what conditions should something be classed as contentious and brought back to the main Community Council? He didn't want to follow through with the issue but would bring it back the following month to discuss.

Dr Goudie felt that the decision making process was quite clear and was mentioned on the Community Council website. In general terms the decisions of the Planning Committee would be brought back to the full Community Council for ratification unless because of time scale limitations a decision had to be made more rapidly. He added that the only reason historically for the powers of the Planning Committee related to the time constraints

Mr O'Hare thought that in the spirit of democracy major decisions in Planning should be brought back to the main body of the Community Council, particularly if the issues might be contentious.

Mr Roberts replied that there were very few contentious planning matters except for matters like HMOs, which needed to be brought back and he reminded the meeting of the time constraints on planning for making comment on applications.

Mrs Corbin noted that the University had had to go back to the drawing board with the proposal because Fife Council officials had suggested that the proposed turbines were too large. Mr Scott acknowledged the matter saying that the University had been trying for some time to engage with Fife Council officials for three years and the comment about the size of the turbines had come totally out of the blue. The university would be seeking to check the competence of the advice. He added that the configuration and size of the turbines had been chosen in consultation with the local community representatives. He said that there had been alternative possibilities for a larger number of smaller turbines or a fewer number of larger and the

latter had been the chosen option. The university has still to decide whether it will proceed with the application.

5.4. Knightsbridge Application

Mr Greenwell reported that the Planning Committee had been unanimous in putting in objections to the resubmission by Knightsbridge of their planning application for a range of reasons, which he listed to the meeting. Mr Roberts reminded the meeting that despite the need to make objections on planning grounds, the Community Council supported development on the site. One concern was the location of the affordable housing, which the committee thought looked very ghettoised instead of more evenly spread throughout the site.

5.5. Tayplan

Miss Uprichard had attended the Joint Committee in Dundee on the 25th October. She reported that there were 188 responses to the Tayplan consultation, which had metamorphosed into 50 lever arch files. These can only be seen in Dundee by appointment. In the meeting the Committee members were asked to approve a long list of documentation relating to the Tayplan and its process to be submitted to the Scottish Government by the main Tayplan official, Miss Ewing. Miss Uprichard thought that there was no sign of community engagement or democracy in the process but viewed it as a bureaucratic exercise. Some 26 lever arch files are to be sent to the Reporters Unit with no modifications made by the committee in any of the detail of the Structure and local plans contained in the overall Tayplan. Miss Uprichard added that there were 24 pages of unresolved issues, including a page of 25 unresolved issues for the St Andrews area in relation to the SLA. In all of those cases and all of the other the twenty-two sections Miss Ewing recommended they didn't warrant any change in the Strategic Development Plan. So every issue and objection was effectively being ruled out by this decision. Miss Uprichard added that she wanted to express her extreme concern to Councillors over these decisions, which will be in effect until 2032. Miss Uprichard also asked why two of the three Councillors on the equivalent Plan for South Fife and Lothian on the Tayplan Committee as well? She couldn't understand why Councillors not representing the Tayplan area were on the Tayplan Joint Committee?

Miss Uprichard concluded that the Tayplan and equivalent setups were bureaucratic in nature without any recognition of community engagement, despite the Scottish Government's insistence that there should be meaningful consultation.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. Martyrs' Monument

Mr Roberts informed the meeting that the application had gone into Fife Environmental Trust several weeks ago. A letter had suddenly arrived last week seeking more information by the 2nd November. Mr Paul and Mr Loughlin managed to supply the requested information on time and the application will be processed in due course.

6.2. StandEN Report

A joint application with Transition University of St Andrews is been prepared for submission to Climate Challenge for funding 2012-2015 and it has to be submitted by 2/12/11. This will involve one application for funding and the two projects working really closely together while both groups remaining separate entities reporting to their own boards. If the application is successful StAndEN will be looking at negotiating discount schemes for solid wall insulation, solar water heating and heat pumps for the residents of St Andrews and the surrounding areas.

StAndEN is also preparing an application for funding to continue its fuel poverty in Glenrothes. The application will be submitted to one of the fuel poverty trusts, as this work will be totally focused on the eradication of fuel poverty.

The St Andrews area has been declared a solar hotspot in Fife and ESSAC have negotiated a very competitive price for installations of Photovoltaic systems however due to the Government's announcement last Monday where the FIT tariff was reduced from 43.3p to 21p per unit has meant that the benefits of the scheme have been greatly reduced. All the literature for the scheme had to be revamped to reflect the new tariff. StAndEN will be contacting residents of St Andrews who have previously declared an interest in Solar Photovoltaic systems to make sure they are fully aware of the scheme.

Visits are continuing in St Andrews although still at a reduced rate due staff working in St Andrews as volunteers. Referrals are still being made for cavity wall and loft insulation with another 5 been sent this month.

The Cosmos Centre was visited and contact has been made with their Landlord (The University of St Andrews) to ask them to carry out the necessary improvements to the buildings insulation. This request was not refused but they asked that we leave it with them. If nothing more is heard by the end of November StAndEN will follow up the request to the University.

Mr Roberts added that he had had a meeting with Rebecca from the Transition University group and they'd had a long chat about the latter's work. He felt that it was a relationship, which could be developed. He did feel that there was a bit of an overlap between the aims of the Transition University Group and the Community Forum and suggested to Ms Hill that she might want to speak to Rebecca on the matter.

6.4. Craigtoun

No further news on possible plans

6.5. Botanic Gardens

Cllr Waterston reported that discussions taking place are still around the formation of a Trust. He acknowledged that the speed of progress in sorting out the future was frustratingly slow, especially with the lease finishing in September next year. A Business Plan has yet to be formulated as well.

6.5. Reports from Representatives

6.6. Any Other Matters Arising

6.6.1. Whyte-Melville Fountain

Mrs Corbin put in an appeal for support for Cllr Sangster and his attempt to get the Whyte-Melville Fountain operational again. Mr Roberts queried the type of support requested. Cllr Sangster said that he was just seeking the backing of the CC in principle to his efforts. It was confirmed that the CC backed Cllr Sangster in his efforts to get the fountain functional.

7. Committee Reports

7.1 Recreation Committee

Mrs Denyer reported briefly on the Jubilee Wood event to take place on St Andrews Day and the possibility that it might have press/TV coverage.

Mrs Denyer had previously circulated her main Recreation Committee report by email.

Mrs Denyer said that she would circulate an email regarding the Art and Photographic Exhibition seeking help in setting it up and manning the event.

The St Andrews Day reception was being affected by industrial action, but there might be a possibility that the Holy Trinity Church Hall might be available.

7.2. General Purposes

Mr Roberts said that he would try to set up a GP Meeting, as there were issues to discuss.

7.3. 200 Club

1st Mrs Watson 2nd Mrs Gray 3rd Mrs Croll

7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee

Mrs Corbin reported that the committee had two new members.

8. New Business

9. Reports from Office Bearers

9.1. Chair

9.1.1. Remembrance Sunday

Mr Roberts reminded the meeting about Remembrance Sunday, which would be taking place soon. Anyone from the Community Council could attend, meeting before the Service at the church in the foyer of the Burgh Chambers.

9.1.2. Chair's Report

Mr Robert reported that he'd attended a meeting of the Hay Fleming Trust, chaired by Cllr Waterston. It was agreed that the University Library should now use the funds as it is looking after the library.

Mr Roberts also met with Rebecca of Transition University as mentioned earlier.

The Community Chairman sits on the steering committee of the St Andrews Festival. He reported that there is to be a meeting to finalise details, but it was hoped that the Festival would go ahead, albeit on a smaller scale. The Byre Theatre is now involved and may look after the management of the event.

The Civic Reception was still up in the air because of the problem with the availability of the Burgh Chambers due to industrial action taking place on the 30th November. Various options were being investigated.

The St Andrews Community Forum mentioned earlier by Cllr Waterston is to have two representatives from the Community Council these being Mrs Corbin and Mrs McAnaw. The next meeting will be the 23rd November.

9.2. Treasurers Report

The Treasurers Report was emailed out as usual and hard copies were available as required. The Treasurer was absent so questions could not be asked of the accounts.

9.3 Secretary

9.3.1. Correspondence – see appendix A.

The secretary commented that correspondence of interest was listed in the appendix of the agenda. The secretary briefly went through correspondence for the benefit of the meeting.

10. Any Other Competent Business

10.1. Scottish Pharmacist of the Year

Mrs Denyer announced that Mrs McAnaw had been given an award as Scottish Pharmacist of the Year recently at an Awards Ceremony in Glasgow. The meeting congratulated Mrs McAnaw for her achievement.