

## Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council Draft Minutes – January 2007

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

Ken Crichton, George Davidson, Richard Douglas, Ken Fraser, Ian Goudie, Stuart Holdsworth, Chris Lesurf, Pete Lindsay, Ben McLeod, Donald Macgregor, Patrick Marks, Joseph Peterson, Nan Taylor, Carole Tricker, Penny Uprichard.

#### Students' Association Representatives

none

#### Nominated

none

#### Fife Councillors

Jane Ann Liston, Bill Sangster, Sheila Black, Frances Melville.

#### Apologies

Jude Innes, Dennis Macdonald, Maggie Stracey.

### 2. Minutes of December 2006 Meeting

#### 6.3.1 Common Good Fund

"email out for comments and then write back to Fife Council"

should read

"email out to the Community Councils for their information and to Fife Council"

#### 7.1.4. Senior Citizens Tea Party

"Friday 13th December"

should read

"Tuesday 19th December"

### 2. Minutes of November 2006 Meeting

Should have read

"The APRS support the 3rd Party Right of Appeal"

#### 1. Attendance

Mr Sangster noted that he actually was absent but had been put down in the minutes as present and absent, whereas Cllr Melville had been present but noted as absent.

**Accepted as accurate.**

### 3. Presentations

#### 3.1. Update on St Andrews Fair Trade Town Campaign

Alice Curteis gave an update on the Fair Trade Town Campaign. She reminded the Community Council that she had introduced the Campaign in April 2004. Since then she said, the Community Council had been consistently supportive of the Campaign. She hoped to show how the Campaign would continue to benefit St Andrews in the coming year, as well as giving a review of the past year. She thanked the Community Council for the cheque of £50 which will go towards covering publicity for Fair Trade Fortnight, and the production of certificates for each of the shops and cafes selling Fair Trade products. The grant will help to pay for the certificates to be distributed free, though a request for a voluntary contribution of £1 or £2 may be asked for a laminated certificate where appropriate. Mrs Curteis also confirmed that the Fair Trade Campaign didn't charge shops for displaying the Fair Trade logo despite a rumour of a charge. The Fair Trade Foundation doesn't make any money from such a charge either.

Mrs Curteis went on to describe what had been achieved in the past year, with help from the Community Council. She reminded the Council that Fife Council had put up road signs at each of the four main approaches to the town, partially funded by a donation from the Community Council to the Fair Trade Campaign. She felt that these signs would help to raise awareness as the signs are luminous in the dark to motorists driving into town. All of the work done by the group, has the aim of raising awareness and encouraging consumers to buy it and retailers to sell it. All the members of the St Andrews B&B Association and the Hotel Association have been contacted to see if they sell or use Fair Trade beverages. Many of these businesses are now in the Directory.

Another activity was a stall in the pedestrianised area by the library, where they handed out 500 samples of Fair Trade coffee with an attached leaflet listing local shops and cafes selling such products.

Most recently an art competition was held with local primary schools participating. Collages were constructed of fair trade products, with an exhibition being held in Holy Trinity Church hall during the recent St Andrews Week.

In 2007 plans include a major exhibition in Fair Trade Fortnight in conjunction with the Scottish Co-op at the Byre Theatre in March. The work of the Glasgow artist, Jan Nimmo will be on display and she will also give a film screening and talk, which will be about the banana workers in Costa Rica and Ecuador who are the subject of her work. Members of the Community Council are to be invited to the opening event. Jan's work is also on display in the Grill House.

Mrs Curteis finished with a few comments about how being a Fair Trade town could benefit St Andrews. Visit Scotland approached the Fair Trade group, and have included this designation in their literature promoting St Andrews. This could be of economic benefit to local businesses. She also felt that many local people felt good about living in or near a Fair Trade town and appreciated the greater availability of such products. She also felt that this was only one of a raft of issues, which have been driving consumers to push producers, to become more ethical and environmentally sustainable in their production. She added finally that the Scottish Executive is trying to make Scotland a Fair Trade nation.

### **3.2. HMOs**

Mr Michael Buchanan, a resident of Hope Street, gave a presentation about HMOs and concerns about their proliferation and impact upon residents. He cited as an example an incident in Hope Street over the xmas period when a smoke alarm rang for three days with no one attending to it. The number of residents outwith term time in Hope Street, can be as few as 5 and not more than 10. He felt that the incident mentioned was typical of many streets where HMOs dominated, turning streets into literal ghost towns outwith term time. He said that the authorities had abandoned their only policy because of a legal judgement which had gone against them. He'd given a similar talk a few years ago, but felt that the situation had considerably worsened, with a literally defeatist attitude by the responsible authorities. He feels that St Andrews could become a student ghetto which could discourage tourists. He expressed disappointment that a competent authority is unable to deliver something better. He felt that it would seem sensible if they invested some of the licence fees in policing this sector. He hoped that this issue would be a major issue in both Council and Scottish Parliament elections.

Mr Lindsay asked what would happen to students if HMOs were suppressed or removed now. Mr Buchanan said that he wasn't against HMOs, but said that it had been suggested by others that the amount of such properties might exceed the need of students. He felt that it was absurd that there were 4000 beds in such properties, but only 3700 students. He was concerned about such a situation in a small town, such as St Andrews and wondered why a cap couldn't be put on numbers of HMOs.

Dr Goudie noted that the Strategic Agreement between Fife Council and St Andrews University had been passed. He wondered if any Councillors knew whether this included anything on housing students on campus as far as possible. He felt that this was an important point which should be addressed as a matter of urgency given the increase in the number of students. Cllr Melville acknowledged that this matter is an area of concern for her. She said that in Fife the issue is further complicated because both planning approval and licensing are separately decided, while in other Local Authorities both areas have been brought together.

Sheriffs who deal with licensing, have argued that any restrictions need to be on the development side. She said that despite flagging up concerns to Development Services the Head of Development Services had decided that no action needed to be taken, so Fife is now trying to draft a policy, after it has become obvious that there is a problem with the increase in student numbers. So far the draft policy proposals have not met with members approval, so members of the East Area Development Committee have been asked to put in their views, and these have been put together in a briefing paper. She is hoping to have a meeting some time in January to discuss the briefing paper, with a view to answering the questions posed by the background papers, and the proposed policy paper to establish where the Council now goes with possible policy.

Cllr Melville had real concerns however that whatever they decided would cause a real rift between tenants of HMOs and local residents. She would ideally like to get a consensus between residents and students. She also felt that new build had exacerbated the problems. Mr Macgregor asked Cllr Melville whether she thought that the imminence of Council Elections could hold up policy development. Cllr Melville didn't think that this would be the case as the HMO policy had to go with the Draft Local Plan, even though the latter is being affected by the Structure Plan delay. Mr Lindsay noted that while a lot of the concerns were emphasising the HMOs occupied by students, there are a lot occupied by non students who could also be affected by any policy development. He felt that Fife Council had to be careful in this respect. Mr Macgregor thought that members would agree that there needed to be a policy which went some way to meeting the needs of both parts of the community.

Cllr Liston thought that student representatives should be given the chance to air their views and wondered if it they could do it at the next meeting. Cllr Sangster said that at the forthcoming meeting they would invite students and other relevant representatives to attend to make their views known so that hopefully a satisfactory compromise solution could be worked out. Mr Buchanan said that a recent Courier report had talked about affordable student accommodation, which he felt was muddying the waters, as affordable usually referred to accommodation for first time buyers not students. He felt that a group of students, would usually be a more attractive proposition financially to buyers of properties in terms of the return on their investment. Mr Lindsay commented that affordable rented property was also as important as affordable housing to buy.

## **4. Fife Councillors**

### **4.1. Frances Melville**

#### **4.1.1. Recycling Centre**

Cllr Melville noted the opening of the recycling centre and hoped that everybody would benefit from this facility. Mr Holdsworth welcomed the opening of the new Recycling Centre, however he felt that it appeared it appeared to be overstaffed at present with up to six staff eager to help the public. Cllr Melville thought that it reflected a settling in period and staffing would be reviewed after a short while. Mr Macgregor also added that there is no sign at the junction to the centre making people aware of the route into it. Additionally there are no road markings, causing a potential hazard at the junction with the new housing beside the site. Mr Lindsay thought that the centre might be busier come the summer thus possibly necessitating more staff.

#### **4.1.2. Pilot Scheme for the Determination of Planning Applications**

Cllr Melville was pleased to note the letter from Jim Birrell in the agenda, and reminded Community Council that it is a statutory consultee. It is therefore exempt from some of the changes in relation to objections to minor applications

#### **4.1.3. Madras College Valuation**

The valuation published by Fife Council has been revised, and is down from £13 to £9 million based on the Primary School figures. She is disappointed with the paper on the future of Madras, and felt that it was only the criticism by the HMI that forced the Council's hand on acknowledging the urgent need for a solution, something which local people have known about for years. Mr Macgregor brought the omission of the idea of a Bridge Head school to Cllr Melville's attention.

Cllr Melville acknowledged that omission and added that in her mind it didn't take a genius to do the maths, and see that having schools of around 800 at Madras and at the Bridgehead was an obvious way to resolve the problems as well as taking pressure of Bell Baxter. Mr Lindsay asked what exactly is affected by this valuation discrepancy? Had it any reflection on the Langlands/Greyfriars affair. Is it a systematic under or over valuation that has been going on, and does it reflect on a more widespread problem in Fife. Cllr Melville acknowledged that it did beg the question as to what has been going on with such valuations.

#### **4.1.4. New Park Development**

Cllr Melville reported on news she'd received about an attempt by the developers of the New Park School site to allegedly begin some preparatory work. Local residents of Hepburn Gardens had noticed work starting in the form of fencing being erected. There had been rumours that the contractors were planning to begin demolition on the following Wednesday. Cllr Melville had alerted Jim Birrell and his staff who were to be contacting the developer to see what might be going on.

#### **4.1.5. Community Council Election Date**

Cllr Melville asked if Community Council had asked for the usual dispensation regarding variation of the election date. Mr Macgregor replied that this hadn't been discussed to date but would be discussed.

#### **4.1.6. Meeting – Councillors/University**

Cllr Melville reported that elected members had had a meeting with the University, the first for a while. They had been asked by Steven Magee to have the meeting and Cllr Melville hoped there would be more.

#### **4.1.7. Town/Gown Liaison Committee**

Mr Magee had also expressed surprise that more of the Councillors weren't involved in this committee, and hoped that more would attend. Mr Macgregor reminded Cllr Sangster was already a member.

#### **4.1.8. Ottakar's Appeal**

Cllr Melville following a question from Mr Crichton expressed her pleasure in reporting that Ottakars had lost their appeal for retrospective planning permission, and must now remove the air conditioning unit which has caused so much grief to neighbours.

### **4.2. Sheila Black**

#### **4.2.1. Madras College Development Proposals**

Cllr Black that she'd spoken to the Rector, Mr Matheson earlier in the day to get his views on the proposals for the future of Madras College. She felt the meeting had been very helpful, even if he had not been able to be explicit. Cllr Black thought that Fife Council needed to look more carefully at the needs of the area. She thought that there had to be serious consideration of a new school at the bridgehead and the impact it would have on plans for redevelopment of Madras College.

#### **4.2.2. Largo Road Flooding**

Cllr Black reported that officials are to be meeting with Scottish Water later this week to try and sort out this protracted problem. Mrs Tricker reported that she had been approached by several people affected by flooding in St Andrews. One resident of Lawhead Road East found the attitude of Scottish Water staff very unhelpful when approached about the reported leak in the area ongoing leak in that area. Mr Sangster reported that he'd reported that leak to transportation as well. Mrs Tricker also reported on flooding from a man hole cover near Canongate School which had been a problem for some time. Cllr Black suggested that Mrs Tricker keep in touch with Kate Hughes at the Local Office on these matters. Ms Lesurf commented on a similar problem with flooding in the Shields Avenue/St Nicholas Street area and the way it had been handled. Mr Peterson in defence of Scottish Water, said that he'd reported a leak by a Zebra Crossing on Lamond Drive. This had been repaired on the 28th December when they'd said it would be done. He didn't feel it was all bad news.

#### **4.2.3. Lamp Standards**

Dr Goudie said he'd received an email about the replacement of the lamp standards in the Largo Road

area and the time taken to do the job. Cllr Black replied that they should have finished, but there had been a delay as the workmen had been taken to do jobs elsewhere.

### **4.3. Bill Sangster**

#### **4.3.1. Scores Railings**

He had received a report that work will start soon, hopefully February. Contracts have been sent out and materials ordered.

#### **4.3.2. St Mary's Place Improvements**

Scottish Enterprise Fife are the body behind these improvements which will take about four months. They were due to start the work today, but work will start nearer the end of January. A one way system going west to east will operate. There will be more trees and cycle racks installed as part of the improvements.

#### **4.3.3. Strategic Agreement between Fife Council and St Andrews University**

Mr Sangster reported that the Councillors were invited along to a meeting on this agreement recently. He also mentioned the meeting previously mentioned by Cllr Melville which he thought might be quarterly.

#### **4.3.4. Seasonal Park & Ride Trial**

This took place on Saturdays up to xmas using the 92 bus. Use had been disappointing with an average of 12 passengers. He thought that more advertising prior to the start date would have been helpful. Mr Lindsay suggested that the Park and Ride availability should be extended to days beyond Saturdays, when he thought that the town would be just as busy. He felt that starting the Saturday Park and Ride at the beginning of December was not of great value. Cllr Sangster agreed and added that better advertising might help as well.

#### **4.3.5. New Bus Shelters**

There are new Bus Shelters to be installed with two in Bridge Street and one in South Street in the following month. New sites have had to be found due to the narrowness of pavements. He had warned officials that the shelter should not intrude upon the Greyfriars site.

#### **4.3.6. Madras College Valuation**

Cllr Sangster felt that there ought to be an independent valuer. He supported the idea of a new Bridgehead School, before deciding about Madras. Mr Peterson thought that the controversial valuation related to both sites if vacant and the school moved. He cautioned the meeting on the education debate as to where the information was coming from and for what reason. Mr Macgregor replied that Fife Council had themselves admitted the valuation was incorrect and had amended it, so he didn't see the need for caution. Mr Peterson acknowledged that Fife had corrected the valuation, but had never said what the valuation was for.

#### **4.3.7. Common Good Land**

Cllr Sangster said he'll be making enquires regarding the ownership of the land in the Bruce Embankment/ Martyr's Monument area. He'd heard reports that it was all Common Good Land. Fife Council may indeed own the Martyr's Monument, in which case he said that Fife Council would have responsibility to repairing the monument, which is in poor condition. Indeed he thought that it might require railings around it to stop parts falling off on to members of the public. He thought that the Pilgrim Foundation may be prepared to put in money for repair of the Martyr's Monument.

#### **4.3.8. Winter Services Maintenance Depot**

Cllr Sangster had recently visited this depot which deals with maintaining the roads in wintery weather. The equipment he reported to be in very good order and well maintained.

#### **4.3.9. Recycling at Morrisons Supermarket**

Cllr Sangster reported that the facilities at Morrisons had been reduced. This was at the request of Morrison's and was not a Fife Council decision.

#### **4.3.10. St Andrews Parking Plan**

Cllr Sangster distributed papers relating to the Parking Plan. He commented that proposals would put St Andrews in the Guinness Book of Records as the biggest paying car park in Britain. He asked the meeting to note that no where in the proposals is there a mention of the fact that St Andrews is a University town with several thousand students and staff. St Andrews is being put into the same category as Glenrothes and Dunfermline. He hoped that the proposals could be overcome in the public consultation exercise. Mr Macgregor reminded Cllr Sangster that this would be discussed under another part of the agenda – 8.3.

#### **4.3.11. St Andrews Town Sign**

The town sign had been vandalised once again. Cllr Sangster had arranged for it to be taken in for repair at his workshop. He has requested that a light be installed in its vicinity.

#### **4.3.12. Kinburn Flooding and Maintenance**

Cllr Sangster commented that there was slow progress on repairs. SEPA had produced a report which Fife Council had said they were waiting for. Cllr Sangster had received a copy of the report, and gave Fife Council a copy. He added that it was Fife Council's duty to keep the Kinnessburn clear, but nothing more had taken place, despite SEPA being willing to assist with clearance, particularly if there were banking repairs to be done.

### **4.4. Jane Ann Liston**

#### 4.4.1. Leuchars Railway Station

Cllr Liston reported on the poor condition of the road beside the station, comparing it to the Grand Canal in Venice, due to the amount of water lying in large holes. She also reported that there will eventually be work undertaken by Fife Council as part of a larger work programme which will include extending the car park.

#### 4.4.2. Madras College

Cllr Liston also supported the need for two 800 pupil schools, with one at the Bridgehead. She felt that the situation was frustrating. Fife Council appeared not to be in any rush to do anything, despite the need for a new school at the Bridgehead having been around for many years. On balance she didn't feel that major decisions should be rushed. However she would have expected other major short term needs, such as an external toilet block to be pushed through with greater priority, unless a new school was to be built within the next few years. However at a recent Childrens' Services Committee, work on an external toilet block was noted as still over a financial year away. In conclusion, she felt that new schools in St Andrews and the Bridgehead were required, as she didn't feel that South Street would be big enough to meet even a reduced pupil population and resources required. Kilrymont she believed was not up to the needs of 21st century education either. Mr Marks agreed with Cllr Liston's comments and commented on what he'd experienced as a parent of children at the school, namely the poor state of the facilities from the swimming pool to the paucity of computers.

#### 4.4.3. Morrisons – Removal of Recycling Facilities

Cllr Liston felt that the removal of the recycling facilities at Morrisons wasn't totally unexpected, once the new Recycling Centre was opened. Mr Macgregor informed her that he had a press release from the Recycling Officer to say that pedestrian access is allowed. Cllr Liston welcomed this news, which she had not personally heard.

#### 4.4.4. University of St Andrews Transport Forum

Cllr Liston reported that there might now be an opportunity to get a Councillor on this forum. Previously she had been informed by Fife Council officers that it was only for officers of Fife Council.

#### 4.4.5. Scottish Water Meeting

Cllr Liston commented that she'd been involved in getting this meeting set up. She felt that it was a considerable achievement to get Scottish Water to a meeting. Representatives of the local Residents Association would also be attending the meeting. She hoped that the stalemate could be broken and some solution found, given the considerable time this problem had been going on.

### 5. Planning Committee

#### 5.1. Minutes

##### 5.1.1. New Park School

Ms Uprichard said that 52 flats have been planned for this site. There could be a delay in any work as a further survey of bats is to be undertaken by SNH as there is a bat roost in the grounds. This survey is planned for May 2007. Ms Uprichard felt that the Scottish Executive are unlikely to grant the developer the go ahead at this stage because of the request for the second survey. So the debate about the development could go on for some time. Ms Uprichard also commented on the premature attempt by the developers to do demolition work on some of the site. This, fortunately had been thwarted by alert local residents. A second objection has been submitted by the Planning Committee of the Community Council.

##### 5.1.2. Fairmont Hotel

The application for the further residential accommodation has been resurrected. The actual application has still to be submitted, but a spokesperson for the hotel has tried to claim that any development will be built with an emphasis on a minimum impact on the environment.

##### 5.1.3. Grange House

The developers having had their first application turned down have put in a second application which has gone to appeal. A Public Enquiry is to be held and Ms Uprichard will give evidence against the development proposals.

##### 5.1.4. Parking Meters

Ms Uprichard explained that Fife Council had announced the timing for objections in a confusing way. The initial application was put on the net in the middle of December citing 14 days to object, then on 22nd December it was advertised in the St Andrews Citizen with 21 days to object. Additionally because of the public holidays it has been given an extra 14 days. The period in which to object or comment ends on the 26th January. It relates only to the 38 meters proposed for the centre of town. Ms Uprichard said that anyone objecting should concentrate on these 38 meters as the other matter about extending parking charges is to be dealt with as a separate issue. She felt that there were a number of concerns about the proposals. One was the proposal to reduce town centre parking to one hour. Residents will be able to park from 6pm to 8am. Outwith this Ms Uprichard wondered where residents would park.

Academic staff not living in St Andrews would or could be similarly affected, as the university offers little parking. She also wondered why Transportation Services had only considered one option for a replacement to the voucher parking. She felt that meters should be a last resort and that 6 foot high meters would be detrimental to the visual landscape of the town centre. The proposed increase in new housing would also be a pressure on the available parking, as would Visit Scotland's proposals to try and increase visitor numbers by 50% in the next 10 years. She felt that a small town with a medieval street plan could not cope. She had also seen statistics which showed that visitor numbers had actually reduced

in recent years. She encouraged as many people as possible to object to these proposals and circulated some literature on the issue.

### **5.1.5. Parking Plan – Appendix E**

Mr Macgregor raised the letter from Mr Peter Milne who was asking for an informal meeting to assess how we can progress the debate on the parking plan. Mr Macgregor sought Community Council's advice on to respond, such as whether we should meet Mr Milne or not. Ms Uprichard wondered about Mr Milne's reasons in seeking a meeting, and commented that the plans for the extension of parking hadn't been published. She also added that the comment in Mr Milne's letter about standards for community engagement were puzzling, as the PAN on this subject had been sent back to the Scottish Executive for rewriting.

Mr Lindsay wondered whether the mention of standards for Community Engagement harked back to the seminar he'd recently attended. Mr Lindsay saw some benefit in an informal meeting with Mr Milne properly recorded. Ms Uprichard was a bit concerned about the wording, and how the consultation might rate compared with more formal consultations. Mr Macgregor replied that he agreed with Mr Lindsay and felt that if we didn't meet him how would we know what he's planning, so he couldn't see the benefit of simply saying no to him. Mr Lindsay added that there is pressure on the Councils to involve the Community Groups more including Community Councils. He couldn't see that meeting Peter Milne would do any harm.

Dr Goudie said that he couldn't remember a Fife Council consultation where they didn't have a pretty firm idea of what they wanted, so he wasn't certain that we should become involved in selling the proposals as they currently stand. Mr Macgregor said that we should tell Mr Milne that we don't wish to be used in this way. He didn't imagine that many local people were in favour of the plans for parking meters as they stand. Mr Peterson felt that this was an opportunity to meet Peter Milne and present him with our proposals, and that we shouldn't dismiss the opportunity. Mr Macgregor replied that the meeting hadn't rejected the idea and that people were allowed to express an opinion before coming to a decision.

Mr Lindsay reminded the meeting that we have People's Panels breathing down our necks, and if we don't become involved with such meetings we could be cut out of more in the future. Ms Uprichard felt that it was naïve of us to expect that we could present our desires to Mr Milne and all will be solved. She felt that any report of the meeting could misrepresent our actual position. Mr Macgregor proposed that the Community Council should meet Peter Milne. Mr Lindsay seconded the proposal. This was approved without dissent.

Mrs Kate Hughes thought that Mr Milne wanted to have the meeting about the consultation process, not about the actual parking proposals. Mr Lindsay thought that Mr Milne might still be prepared to hear the views of the Community Councillors on the subject of parking. Mr Marks raised the point that Mr Milne has asked for late afternoon meetings which might not suit members still in jobs. Mr Macgregor thought that Mr Milne would have to be prepared to meet at our convenience. Dr Goudie thought that we should make sure that the consultation is sufficiently wide ranging. Ms Uprichard wondered if the Community Council would be prepared to remit to the Planning Committee the decision on the issue of parking meters. Mr Macgregor asked if the Community Council if it would be willing to do so.

Mr Lindsay expressed his doubts, which Ms Uprichard felt were not accurate. Mr Lindsay withdrew his comment but still expressed his view that 38 parking meters were not as much a problem in his eyes as the several thousand cars that park in St Andrews. He'd seen similar types of meters in various parts of Britain and felt that they weren't as obtrusive as one might think. He did have concerns about the idea of putting them on the edge of the pavements as opposed to beside buildings. He hoped that the Planning Committee would comment on this aspect of the plan. He felt that parking meters still had a part to play in the management of the worsening traffic situation in St Andrews. Mr Sangster said he'd been speaking to Peter Milne earlier in the day and the latter has proposed to situate a dummy parking meter in town so that local people can see for themselves what they might look like.

With respect to Phase 2 of the Parking Proposals there will be a 2-3 month period of consultation as normal. The start of the consultation has been slightly delayed, but there are no specific dates for the start of the consultation. Mr Peterson expressed his view that the meters in his view are large and unsightly and doesn't think that it's appropriate to have them at the edge of the pavement. He commented upon the relatively unobtrusive nature of parking meters in Dundee. He feels that these meters represent a retrograde step. Mr Holdsworth disagreed with Mr Peterson's views, having seen the same type of meters on Great Western Road, Glasgow. He didn't view them as unsightly. He added that if one is put in town it will allow a more objective assessment of the impact on the immediate environment.

Ms Lesurf mentioned that similar meters are used in Durham, a similar small university town like St Andrews. She felt that we should see them before making up our minds. Ms Uprichard felt that it was typical of Transportation Services that the idea of meters had been considered, with no evidence that other alternatives had been seriously considered. She reminded the meeting about the disc alternative which she thought should be considered.

### **5.1.6. Core Paths**

Dr Goudie raised this matter. The detailed discussion will take place at the next Planning Committee meeting of the 20 – 30 paths in and around St Andrews. Comments have to be in by the end of January.

## **6. Matters Arising**

### **6.1. Recycling Centre Opening**

Already covered in earlier business.

### **6.2. Seminar on University Towns**

Bo Larsson's latest email was discussed. Mr Macgregor asked if anyone on the Community Council might

be interested in making a contribution and attending the conference. Mr Lindsay suggested that we ask first if anyone might be interested in going and then argue about what they might say afterwards. Ms Uprichard suggested that a written contribution could be sent. Mr Douglas felt that it would be foolish not to contribute, but personally he would not have the time to attend. Mr Macgregor wondered if it might be an idea to ask the University about the nature of its contribution, and perhaps get their representative to deliver the view from the Community Council.

Mr Lindsay asked if we could be kept informed as to the details of the conference, with at least the possibility of sending a written contribution. As always if anyone can make it over to deliver a paper it would look better. He wondered about keeping a watching brief on the matter. Mr Macgregor suggested leaving any further decision to the February meeting, in mean time asking the university and Bo Larsson for more information to help us make a decision.

### **6.3. Reports from Representatives**

#### **6.3.1. Cities and Their Regions Conference**

Mr Fraser reported and made two comments. He thought that the Planning Committee might want to keep an eye on what form of consultation Fife Council was going to be proposing under the new system in which there is apparently some discretion on their part about what consultation they do make. Secondly it struck him in relation to talk about sustainable development that if seriously taken up by Fife Council as an objective might change the aims of planning which he felt could be far reaching.

## **7. Committee Reports**

### **7.1. Recreation**

#### **7.1.1. St Andrews Young Citizen of the Year Award**

This award has been delayed until February as Mr Peterson was unable to contact some of the nominees as he has not had addresses from the nominating bodies.

#### **7.1.2. Hogmanay Ceilidh**

Mr Peterson thanked Ken Crichton for a very successful Hogmanay Ceilidh. Mr Crichton also gave a brief report on the event, to ensure that if someone else had to take over the organisation they might be aware of some of the logistics. There were 172 paying guests, and with staff around 200 in total attending. The Community Council made £150-£300, St Andrews Church made about £200, St Andrews in Bloom about £300 and the Masonic Lodge made over £300. In total over £1150 was raised. He also reported that the Community Council now has 4 vacuum flasks and enough tea and coffee to supply all the Community Council events in the foreseeable future.

#### **7.1.3. Senior Citizens Party**

Mr Macgregor took the opportunity to thank Mr Crichton and Mr Peterson for organising with the Student Association this event.

#### **7.1.4. St Andrews in Bloom**

Janice Macdonald has asked for written confirmation, as to whether the insurance held by the Community Council when St Andrews in Bloom came under the aegis of the Community Council, remains valid for the newly formed St Andrews in Bloom as an autonomous body. Cllr Sangster thought that it should be covered by the current insurance which is through Fife Council.

### **7.2. General Purposes Committee**

No meeting.

### **7.3. 200 Club Report and Draw**

Mr Lindsay announced that the 200 Club had made some awards. There had also been a request to contribute towards the Xmas lights in the town. It was agreed that this should be referred back to the full Community Council for consideration. Mr Macgregor proposed a £200 contribution, as had been suggested by Mrs Rendle. This was seconded by Mr Holdsworth. There was no dissent. Mr Peterson asked about a rumour that Fife Council had been heavily involved in funding the Xmas Lights in Dunfermline and Kirkcaldy. Cllr Sangster acknowledged that the merchants were checking this out, as they'd also heard that this might have occurred.

Mr Lindsay and Mrs Tricker had had a meeting to discuss procedures for Community Councils Grants. They had put some thoughts down on paper and asked members to read the sheet being circulated with a view to more formal presentation at next month's meeting. He did not expect their thoughts to be accepted as the new rules, viewing them as discussion points, but hoped for other ideas or debate before finalising the procedures. To be put on the agenda for February meeting.

There are three more applications for 200 Club grants in the pipeline, all of which Mr Lindsay viewed as worthy.

Mr Lindsay announced a reduction in the amount awarded, partly due to a slight contraction in numbers of members and also with a view to having a larger prize at the end of the year. This had happened in the past. The 1st prize will now be £30.

200 Club Draw – 1st Prize £30 – No. 19 – Mr CS Alexander, 2nd prize £20 – No. 16 Mr JA Rutherford – 3rd Prize – No. 11 Mrs B Mackenzie.

## **8. New Business**

### **8.1. Consultation Meeting with the Fife Police @ Burgh Chambers – 31/01/07**

Mr Macgregor to attend, and possibly other Community Councillors.

## **8.2. St Andrews World Class**

Mr Macgregor reported on his attendance at a recent meeting of World Class at which the report from Dewar Consultants was the topic. Mr Macgregor thought that it contained some very interesting information. One interesting issue to come out was an indication, that there was a lot less spend per head by visitors and residents in St Andrews compared to Dunfermline or Kirkcaldy. This contradicted a report allegedly written by Fife Council, on the economic vitality of the town centre of St Andrews, in relation to the parking issues. Mr Sangster added that he had been unable to get hold of a copy of this Fife Council report despite asking officials.

Mr Macgregor made Community Council aware that Patrick Laughlin would like to report to the Community Council on the conclusions of this audit. Mr Macgregor felt that once Community Council had heard the details of the audit that support for World Class would be a bit more positive. He added that we might find World Class more receptive, compared to Fife Council with respect to local needs and concerns. He reiterated the possibility of inviting Patrick Laughlin along to report on the conclusions of the report. Ms Uprichard has contacted the author of the report before Xmas to ask for a copy of the report, but he had informed her that there was only one copy and that had gone to the client. So far she noted that World Class haven't publicised any of the reports conclusions. She noted Mr Macgregor's plea that the Community Council, should support World Class wholeheartedly, but couldn't see how our support could be any more wholehearted as we are already a member. She didn't believe that the Community Council would be in any way involved with the economic initiatives that World Class represented. Mr Macgregor replied that he wanted to reflect the positive atmosphere at the World Class meeting. World Class had admitted at the meeting that they had not managed to bring on board the Community Council.

The Consultant had recommended that they do so and members attending had been in favour of this need. Mr Macgregor replied that he didn't want the Community Council to be so negative, as it had been with good reason in the past, he only wanted to hear what World Class wanted to say, given that they had been told that they'd approached matters in the wrong way in the past. He felt that it would be churlish to turn down a request to have Patrick Laughlin explain the present World Class position. Mr Douglas asked how long the presentation would take, and could it be incorporated in the normal monthly meeting. Mr Macgregor had asked Patrick Laughlin, who thought that it might take too long, particularly if there lots of questions to answer. Mr Crichton brought up the definition of our status when attending. He had always understood that the Community Council sent an observer, a step below becoming a member. Mr Lindsay replied that World Class always viewed anyone attending as a member automatically. While he supported Mr Crichton's view, he also supported the Chair's suggestion that we should listen to them, now that their own consultant has made them aware of the flaws in their approach to sections of the local community, such as Community Council.

Dr Goudie expressed the view that World Class were being given an "easy ride". He didn't want to see policy development being based on poor statistics, citing the issue of public spend in the town centre. He viewed St Andrews as having a different town centre make up compared to Perth or Dundee (as examples), with more local shops in the town centre, and a lot less shops in the suburbs, where people could do daily shopping for small items. This he felt would be reflected in the statistics of shopping expenditure. He felt that the suggested alternative name St Andrews Aspirations was quite instructive, as he felt that the whole problem with St Andrews World Class is that it consisted largely of individuals who wanted to exploit the financial potential of the town, whereas in his view the aspirations of the residents of the town are quite different. He felt that bringing together these two diverging views was the problem or challenge. Mr Peterson who had attended some of the World Class meetings felt that there were too many people with a jaundiced view and that any meeting he'd attended was positive and that those attending were wanting to point St Andrews in a better direction for the future. He supported Mr Macgregor's suggestion, as he felt that to ignore World Class wouldn't stop them going ahead anyway with economic initiatives, in which we would have even less say or influence.

Mr Lindsay wondered if Mr Laughlin was aware that any meeting of the Community Council would be open to the public. Mr Macgregor agreed to remind Mr Laughlin of this fact. Ms Uprichard felt it was unfortunate that there was only one side represented, as she knew people opposed to World Class, whom she felt should be heard. Mr Macgregor asked the meeting's general view about a meeting with World Class. There was no opposition to the idea. Mr Macgregor reassured anyone suspicious of the motives of World Class that they would be able to put them to Patrick Laughlin. Mr Macgregor suggested various dates, possibly Wednesday 17th, Mon 22nd or Wednesday 24th January, late afternoon. Mr Macgregor agreed to let members know of date for meeting.

## **8.3. St Andrews Parking Plan**

Previously discussed.

## **8.4. Waterwatch Scotland**

Mrs Tricker agreed to attend

## **8.5. Notification of Public Consultation Exercise on Wind Energy**

For Information only. Mr Marks alerted members to the Film Show on the 10th February in St Andrews.

## **8.6. Eastern Division Community Newsletter**

*For information only*

## **8.7. New Pilot Scheme for the Determination of Planning Applications**

Ms Uprichard expressed her unhappiness at the timescale mentioned, feeling that 14 days would be a more suitable timescale. Mr Lindsay commented that he thought that the timescale didn't apply to statutory consultees like the Community Council. Mr Lindsay thought that Ms Uprichard should check on

the precise detail of how this pilot scheme would affect the timescale for objections.

## **8.8. Community Council Support Working Group Meeting**

Mr Lindsay thought that the main item of interest related to the date of the Community Council Elections in 2007. He felt that it was unfortunate that Fife Council had decided to go ahead with an October election. It disenfranchises the students who would wish to register locally, and vote in the Community Council election because the closing date for registration is just before they've arrived back for the new academic year.

The previous time the Community Council had made a fuss and had got the date of the election changed, but unfortunately there hadn't been sufficient interest in standing to necessitate an election. He felt that it was the principle of the matter, that the students should be able to vote if they so wished to ensure a fair election process. However, he also wondered if there was any point in separating St Andrews from other Community Council Elections as the same constraints would apply for the electoral register. He did however feel that it might be worth writing to Law and Administration and asking that all Community Council elections be moved before any firm preparations have been made for October 2007. Mr Macgregor proposed that a letter should be sent to Fife Council on this matter and Mr Lindsay seconded the proposal. Cllr Liston added that the student body should be made aware of this issue so that they could make their own representation.

## **9. Reports from Office Bearers**

### **9.1. Chair**

Mr Macgregor had received a letter from Mrs Williams, who is the Chair of the new committee looking at the possibility of St Andrews receiving World Heritage status. She was writing to ask if a representative from the Community Council would like to join the steering committee. She has also written to Fife Council, St Andrews University and the Links Trust. Mr Macgregor suggested that this item could wait until the February meeting. There was no dissent. Dr Goudie said that if committee is set up to explore the idea, fair enough. Mr Lindsay thought that it was past that stage, and the committee was the one to further the campaign. He reminded members of a Public Meeting which had been held a couple of months ago, at which the decision to set up a committee had been made, as no one had produced any contrary evidence as to the benefits.

Mr Macgregor read out the letter –

"The aim of the committee is the greater preservation of the town site of St Andrews. World Heritage status would give St Andrews the international reputation it surely deserves. We think the strength of this case rests on the unique combination of the ancient town, university with the adjoining links and on the back of this other elements which are of contemporary and historical significance. It will be important to our application to show that all interested groups in the town are supportive of our aim, and a representative committee which consists solely of six local residents. We very much hope that the St Andrews Community Council will nominate a representative, to join the committee, to help us down this very worthwhile path".

To Mr Macgregor this statement indicated that the decision had already been made to try and obtain World Heritage status. Mr Peterson thought it significant that the committee hadn't asked World Class, despite the fact that Ted Brocklebank had previously raised the issue with that body. Ms Uprichard felt that it would be worth supporting if it could provide protection for the town. It was agreed to discuss the issue in full in the February meeting.

### **9.2. Treasurer**

Mrs Tricker reported that the balance in the bank stands at £29,147.88. The amount available for grants is £19,847.47. Mr Lindsay requested a minor clarification. He said that according to the scheme for community councils, grants could still be made out of the administration grant part of the funding. He didn't feel that there was a problem with that being listed as part of the available cash. Mrs Tricker added that at the present time she was only taking money out of the general account. Mr Crichton asked about the money in the Recreation Committee fund. Mrs Tricker replied that this amounted to £81.78. Mr Lindsay also advised Community Council that the 200 Club had £5,308 in the bank at the point of the last bank statement, but that this would reduce to £4,620, once all cheques written on the fund had been presented by recipients.

### **9.3. Secretary**

As per correspondence in Appendix A.

## **10. Any Other Competent Business**

### **10.1. Date of Next Meeting**

5th February.

---