

## Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council Draft Minutes – February 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

Les Beech, Ken Crichton, George Davidson, 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

Matthew Guest

#### Nominated

#### Fife Councillors

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

#### Apologies

Richard Douglas, Jude Innes, Tom D'Ardenne, Laura Wilson, Dennis Macdonald, Keith McCartney, Maggie Stracey

### St Andrews Young Citizen of the Year Award 2006

Mr Macgregor awarded the Quaich, cheques and certificates to the recipients of this year's awards, recognising their valuable contributions to St Andrews.

1. **James Haldane**, aged 16 years, awarded **Young St Andrews Citizen of the Year** for his service to his school, St Leonards School, and to the community of St Andrews.
2. Julie Mitchell Brown, aged 18 years from Madras College was *highly commended* for her service to her school and to the community of St Andrews.
3. Sam Room, aged 17 years was *Commended* for his sporting efforts in sailing, and work as a sailing instructor youngsters in the sailing club
4. Ellen Henretty, aged 15 years was *Commended* for her charity work at Madras College, and her help in sporting activities
5. Sai-Yua Li, aged 16 years was *Commended* for charitable work and other activities as a pupil of St Leonards School.
6. Peter Sen Yuan Yang, aged 16 years was *Commended* for his efforts in others at his school, as well as charitable and other activities as a pupil of St Leonards School
7. Daniel Beech, Michael Dumycz, David Johnstone, John Robertson and Siobhan Taylor from Madras College Dept of Special Education were *Commended* for their Business Enterprise, raising money for charity by selling Fair Trade goods to fellow pupils, and their work with Hope Park Church in creating a commemorative garden.

### 2. Minutes of December 2006 Meeting

5.1.6. Mr Beech felt that the references to parking meters should be referred to as ticket machines.

**Accepted as accurate.**

### 3. Presentations

#### 3.1. Sgt Graham Kinman

Sgt Kinman was present to respond to questions from Community Councillors. He mentioned that the custody figures for St Andrews had been brought up as a query at a previous Community Council meeting. The process for custodies and collation of custody figures has changed with anyone held in custody being taken now either to Cupar or Glenrothes. Mr Crichton confirmed that Mr Peterson had asked about the figures and how they were collated. Facts and figures on who is going where are still being collated, but he didn't think that it posed a problem in relation to the policing of the town. He didn't have any hard and fast figures relating to custody of local offenders, at this time.

#### 3.2. St Andrews World Heritage Site Steering Committee

Mrs Elizabeth Williams, Chair of the Steering Committee made a presentation in relation to the campaign to achieve World Heritage status for St. Andrews.

She explained that the remit of the committee was to look into the feasibility of promoting St Andrews as a UNESCO World Heritage site.

She emphasised that the Committee is not political, with its six-committee members being appointed at a Public Meeting, not elected. She acknowledged that Ted Brocklebank MSP had been the driving force behind the campaign to raise interest in the proposal; He had passed a resolution in the Scottish Parliament last summer. He had received considerable cross-party support, and he had set up a couple of Public Meetings to further the idea, but had then stepped back, to let the local committee pursue the idea independently.

She also emphasised that contrary to the belief of some local people and the press, they are not St Andrews World Class. She apologised for inflicting yet another committee on St Andrews. However, she viewed it as a committee with a difference. The committee needed the active support of as many local organisations as possible, to realistically prove the viability of the proposal. Her aim in coming to the meeting was to convince the Community Council to give its support to the committee, and its aims and objectives.

The idea was to get international recognition for St Andrews. She then explained the aspects of St Andrews, which could be viewed as selling points in any application. She acknowledged that there were many medieval towns around Europe, but St Andrews had a unique combination of features. These features included, ecclesiastical, historical and university importance juxtaposed to a site of historical sporting activity. The university and golfing aspects are also of contemporary importance as well as of historical importance. She felt that these aspects should be emphasised in any application, with possibly the sporting aspect being promoted, given the proximity of the 2012 Olympics.

The application is a long and complicated affair, with no guarantee of success. There are several other Scottish sites competing to be put forward, including the Forth Rail Bridge, the Macintosh Trail in Glasgow and Arbroath Abbey.

The Local Authority she said had to demonstrate a serious commitment to the idea, She'd written to the Fife Council, and had received a reply from Stewart Nicol, Strategic Manager who had written a supportive letter. She felt that it was important for the Council to understand the consequences of supporting the idea. The Council would have to work with the town to develop a management plan, to preserve the World Heritage aspects and enhance them. That is a very specific level of commitment from the Council. She acknowledged that a lot of the factors are in the local plan, but not always very well observed. She thought that this might help achieve a holistic approach to town management in contrast to the current piece-meal approach to repairs and other problems. She felt there would be a coherent plan, referring to the Edinburgh, Old and New Town's management plan for its World Heritage Status as an example.

A significant part of any World Heritage Site Trust was the drawing up of the Management Plan, followed by an Action Plan, which monitored how the management points are being pursued. The consequence for not following the management plan would be the withdrawal of World Heritage status. Factors like landscape settings have to be taken into account, such as the views into and out of the historic centres. Preservation of such landscapes being the remit of bodies such as the Greenbelt Forum and the Community Council. Another factor was the need for communities to achieve a mix and balance in the World Heritage Site buildings, and given the problem with HMOs in the town, she thought that was a significant factor. The fact that there had to be an overall strategy for the town was something local people should welcome. She felt that it was a project, which should appeal to Community Councillors. She thought that the whole initiative should have started with Community Councillors, so she invited the Community Council to think very carefully about its involvement. So far they've asked the Links Trust and University.

She saw the application for World Heritage Site Status, as the most hopeful antidote to outside authorities trying to force their plans on the town. The Council will have to be on the town's side, to oppose inappropriate development proposals. She viewed the application as an enabling opportunity to let St Andrews take back some control of its future. She viewed Edinburgh as a very good example of a successful World Heritage Site. Edinburgh gives out money to fund conservation work as grants and loans. Mrs Williams also mentioned the funding issues for use in maintaining a World Heritage Site. She felt that funding could be attracted for a number of official sources as well as private. Historic Scotland being one of the bodies assisting and Edinburgh Council and the local branch have Scottish Enterprise as well as private money. She thought that a mix of funds was important and didn't personally feel it was right to totally depend upon money from public bodies.

Mr Macgregor thanked Mrs Williams for her cogently argued presentation and invited questions from the Community and Regional Councillors. He added that the idea of more local control is very dear to his heart.

Cllr Liston asked if all of St Andrews is to be included or only the centre and the Golf Links? She cited Hutchison Court as an example. Mrs Williams replied that they hadn't got round to discussing boundaries. The Historic Centre and the Links she felt were obvious boundaries, but the extent would have to be discussed, and eventually decided when the proposal is put up for consideration. She compared the idea to deciding the Green Belt boundaries. An application would have to give a good case for appropriate boundaries within the terms of the criteria.

Mr Guest asked Mrs Williams if the Committee had thought about asking the Students Union to participate. She acknowledged that this hadn't been considered, but she would be happy to have student representation.

Mr Lindsay whilst acknowledging the contribution of Mr Brocklebank in setting up the debate, was pleased to hear that he'd stepped back from direct involvement. He felt that such clear political involvement had hindered the progress of the debate. He wasn't entirely convinced that the case for World Heritage status had been sufficient to convince him. He was concerned that it sounded like a way of setting St Andrews in aspic or amber. He didn't want to see St Andrews preserved in an unchanging way as a tourist time warp, feeling that it is a living community. However despite his scepticism, he still believed that the Community Council should be involved. He didn't believe that other places in Scotland should be seen as competitors. He would like to see a more co-operative attitude to other places applying for the same status.

Overall the call for more local control, the suggestion that there might be money involved did resonate for Mr Lindsay with the things, which worried him about World Class. Whilst sceptical he did still feel that the Community Council should become involved.

In reply Mrs Williams said that there was no suggestion that World Heritage status would see St Andrews

set in aspic, as the UNESCO criteria recognise as fully as anybody, that you can not do that, unless there are plans to make a place a museum. She mentioned that the Edinburgh management plan talked about the need to harmonise economic prosperity, new business and new ways of thinking with the historic heritage. Business is not to be stifled but controlled. She also mentioned Vienna and Cologne as examples of how the new and the old thrive side by side.

In relation to Mr Lindsay's concern about Mrs Williams talk about other prospective sites as being competitors, she informed the meeting that only one site in Britain could be chosen each year. This inevitably brought out a bit of competitiveness. The Scottish Executive has to nominate a candidate from Scotland to forward to the Dept of Media, Work and Culture in England. The Scottish Executive's decision would be based on their assessment of the merits of each application. In that sense she said, there was competition and this extended to sites across the UK.

Dr Goudie felt that before the Community Council could participate in the application for World Heritage status they would have to know what the planning effects would be. He expressed scepticism about Fife Council's motives in supporting the idea of World Heritage status in view of their support of developers. He wondered about Mrs Williams assessment that the World Heritage status would have some real teeth in respect to controlling development, and made a comparison with the Structure Plan. He wondered which document would have predominate, if it came to St Andrews being forced to have an additional 1200 houses. He wondered how this would interact with the requirements of World Heritage status. He felt that it would be helpful if Mrs Williams could give guidance on this matter to help the Community Council come to a decision.

In reply, Mrs Williams said that World Heritage site status was internationally recognised, and any trust or foundation managing the site would be responsible to that body, while the Structure Plan related to Fife Council and Scottish Executive responsibilities. She acknowledged that she didn't know where the balance of power would lie in that equation. On paper she felt that World Heritage status had real teeth and thought that Edinburgh were finding it so. She felt that she could see Community Council concern.

Mr Macgregor in summing up suggested that the feeling of the meeting was generally supportive. Mr Lindsay suggested sending an observer, to keep Community Council informed, as to how World Heritage are making their case. He felt that World Heritage had to make their case to the townsfolk, not just the Community Council. He hoped that the concerns that he and Dr Goudie had expressed could be addressed. Mr Crichton proposed sending a full representative. When asked if he would support a full representative, Mr Lindsay acknowledged that he wouldn't expect an observer to be uninvolved, and it was more a matter of terminology rather than a lack of action. Mrs Williams reminded the Community Council that the application would fall if there was a clear lack of support from significant local organisations, such as the Community Council. Mr Crichton thought that the talk about a time warp was a red herring, quoting his experience of living in a village of conservation interest, which still maintained a lively local community. Mrs Williams suggested that Edinburgh was a good example demonstrating that World Heritage status didn't keep appropriate change from taking place. Mr Macgregor was supportive of Mr Crichton's proposal, reminding Community Council that a representative didn't have to agree with every direction proposed by the World Heritage committee. Ms Uprichard seconded the proposal.

Dr Goudie asked to speak against sending a representative. He reminded Community Council that in the past year it had set out in great detail the route it hoped the town would take in the future in terms of housing, the re-establishment of a rail link and many other issues. If membership of WH would enable these goals to be achieved he would felt we should be supportive. However he added without knowing in detail what World Heritage status would achieve he felt it was difficult, as the details of any proposal, such as in planning proposals could be crucial in helping to know if support could be given. Mr Marks cited his experience in visiting a number of World Heritage sites both large and small around Europe. He suggested that one only had to look at how they'd fared, to determine the benefit or otherwise of World Heritage status. He suggested that conservation and appropriate development could work in tandem according to the needs of a town, and felt that the implication of preservation in aspic, demonstrated a lack of understanding of how the system worked.

Cllr Black asked Mrs Williams what costs might be involved in an application. Mrs Williams said that the main cost would be in appointing someone to draw up a management plan. She felt that money would in some way be made available. Ms Uprichard felt that one could find plenty of data about World Heritage sites from any local library and Mrs Williams mentioned that members could look at a web site on the Net to get much more idea of the subject.

Mr Lindsay whilst sharing Dr Goudie's doubts, still felt we should be involved. Mr Macgregor asked for his proposal to be put to the vote. Ms Uprichard seconded Mr Macgregor's proposal. Dr Goudie indicated that he was otherwise minded. Mr Holdsworth seconded him. Dr Goudie spoke to his motion saying that he wasn't opposed for all time to joining the committee; he wanted to know what the implications were for the town. Dr Goudie indicated that he and Mr Lindsay had done extensive web searches some time ago, to try and determine the implications for the town, with respect to planning and other areas of concern, but hadn't been able he claimed to find anything which clarified their concerns. He felt that he needed more hard facts, than had been stated so far, to convince him of the value, and then he thought that the Community Council could in 2 to 3 months discuss the matter in a more authoritative way. Mrs Williams suggested that Dr Goudie start by looking at the annual report from Edinburgh and then obtain copies of the management plans of other Scottish World Heritage sites to see how it operated.

The vote for Dr Goudie's amendment was taken first. It received 2 votes. The substantive motion was then taken and received 12 votes, a clear margin. There were no abstentions. Mr Macgregor asked for a volunteer to join the committee. Mr Lindsay suggested that perhaps the best person to join might be one of the Councillors who had shown some scepticism, Dr Goudie or Mr Holdsworth. Mr Holdsworth agreed to join the committee.

Mr Macgregor thanked Mr Holdsworth for agreeing to join the committee and thanked Mrs Williams for her presentation.

### 3.3. Ladebraes – Core Path Plan

Mr David Middleton made a presentation on the Fife Council proposal to turn the Ladebraes into a core path. He briefly reminded the meeting that the Ladebraes had been set up as a walking route about 120 years ago. The attempt to turn it initially into a multi-user path, and now the proposal to designate it a core path with a range of users able to access it has raised the concerns of residents of the area. He lives on the Ladebraes and openly acknowledged that he is also a cyclist. He claimed that the Ladebraes had been set up with walkers in mind, with its bends and hidden vistas, as walkers he felt weren't as keen on straight paths. He claimed that it wasn't designed for cycling or horses. He credited the previous Town Councils for having passed bye-laws to prohibit cycling and horse riding, because of the recognition that it was a tranquil area and also potentially dangerous to pedestrians if cyclists and horses were allowed. He refuted claims by Fife Council and others that there had never been any reports of accidents between cyclists and walkers. He claimed that in the multi-user path consultation 6 walkers had reported accidents or near misses with cyclists. Accidents on cycle paths are not recorded by the police. The Scottish Executive has stated in advice that cycle path accidents are unrecorded, as the police only records accidents on roads. He concluded that the information regarding accidents from Fife Council is incorrect. He noted that there is no speed limit on bicycles on cycle paths.

He understood that the Community Council was to consider its response to the core plan consultation. There had been an exercise by Fife Council in which they looked at the views of people in town on the core path proposals. He was concerned that despite an overwhelming view from people in the town supporting pedestrian use, Fife Council were still proposing to publish the core path plan in which cyclists would still be able to use such routes. He said that an exercise by Fife Council to sound out opinion about cycling in the Ladebraes, had 50 people opposed to cycling, 4 in favour and 20 who didn't mention it as they were more concerned about other paths such as Lumbo Den.

Mr Middleton then made a plea to the Community Council, in relation to their responsibilities as a democratically elected body, and as people who are concerned about the interests of the town, to support the concerns of local people about this matter. He thought that the Community Council should be a group of people looking after the interests of the town, and not producing policies that are not based on the democratic process. Mr Middleton indicated

Mr Macgregor thanked Mr Middleton and asked for questions or further comments. Dr Goudie indicated that he had planned to bring up the results of the Planning Committee discussion on the Core Paths, later in the meeting. He had a three-page list of responses in respect of the core path proposals. Mr Bill Gray, also a resident of the Ladebraes, talked about his concern that civilian safety was not being seriously considered. He'd had near misses himself, and was concerned for the safety of elderly people from the Gibson, and mothers with small children amongst other vulnerable groups, from speeding cyclists. He commented that Sustrans had allegedly contributed £10,000 to the consultation process. He was also suspicious of the funding being offered by the Scottish Executive to fund cycle path development, feeling that it was too easy for organisations to feel that they deserved a slice of the pie. He felt that the Community Council had to face up to the safety of people, whatever economic reasons are put forward.

Dr Goudie made an initial reply to Mr Middleton. He wanted to correct one point of fact in Mr Middleton's presentation. Core Paths he said were classified according to the type of use, of which there were four types, pedestrian, cycling, wheel chairs/push chairs and horse riding. The Ladebraes has been provisionally classified for everything but horse access. He also felt that any change in designation of use, might not have a major effect upon the nature of use, as since the abolition of the byelaws ten years ago cycling is now legal. Dr Goudie couldn't see serious cyclists wanting to use the route, because its very nature makes it slower than a road route.

He quoted the Community Council's stance on cycling in the Ladebraes, "Whilst recognising our divergent views on this matter, the Community Council has for many years taken the stance that the Ladebraes should not be restricted to walkers alone. A submission drawn up in 1995 by the Community Council's Cycle Path Sub-Committee to the then Transportation Study on St Andrews read as follows 'The question of cycling on the Ladebraes has been a source of contention in the town for many years, and a vociferous minority has strongly opposed the use of the Ladebraes for cyclists. Approached rationally, it is clear that fatal accidents are far less likely when cyclists and pedestrians mix, than when as is the present state of affairs when cyclists are forced to use roads. Elderly opponents who cite their own cycling habits in their youth, usually look very significant increase in the average speed of traffic in recent years'.

The submission then went on to note that this view was being endorsed by the 18th Report 'Transport and the Environment' of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution. This report had observed that the Transport Research Laboratory in its report, 'Cycling in Pedestrian Areas' published in 1993 had found 'no real factors that justify exclusion of cyclists from pedestrian areas'. It indicated that cycling could be more widely permitted without detriment to pedestrians. It anticipated in 1995 that the planned use of Viaduct Walk by cyclists might serve to establish the acceptability or otherwise of the practice of joint pedestrian/cycle use in the context of St Andrews. The validity of the Viaduct case has not diminished over the years. We are aware of any problems in the shared use of Viaduct Walk. The logic of the argument in general remains irrefutable. Mixing pedestrians and cyclists is less likely to result in fatalities than mixing cars and cyclists. Traffic levels have increased further over the last decade, and yet there is a greater need to provide safe access to the town centre, by means other than private cars. This required for residents in general and for children in particular, not only to avoid further exacerbation of the problems of the town centre, but also to assist in attempts to combat global warming. Nevertheless whilst remaining firm on the general principle, we would wish attempts to be made where possible to address the concerns of the local residents.

Our primary aim is to provide off-road cycle access to the town centre from the western suburbs of the town. The section east of Largo Road is not crucial for this purpose, and we therefore suggest restrictions to walking and push chair/wheel chair use for Path 232 on the Fife Council list. We also recognise that with a small amount of investment, the use of the Ladebraes west of Maynard Road, could be avoided by provision of a cycle path on the southern side of the Kinnesburn.

Mr Macgregor sought clarification on Dr Goudie's comments about support for exclusion of cycling in the section of the Ladebraes where Mr Middleton and Mr Gray live. Dr Goudie confirmed that it was the Planning Committee's recommendation, that cycling not be allowed on the section east of Largo Road to Queen's Terrace. Mr Lindsay backed the general thrust of Dr Goudie's comments. As a regular cyclist he wasn't keen to use the Ladebraes, because it was too slow, due to pedestrian use and its winding nature. However he did support the use by children and cyclists unsure about road cycling. He asked what effect banning cycling in the Ladebraes would have? He felt that excluding cyclists would only result in little or no safety provision put into the Ladebraes, as cyclists would probably continue to use it anyway. He felt that asking for a ban was flying in the face of reality.

Mr Middleton began his response, by replying to Mr Lindsay's comments. He felt that the lapsing of the byelaws was regrettable and couldn't be certain if it was due to incompetence or had been deliberate. He felt that there was a difference between accepting the status quo as it stands just now, where some people, whether it's a good idea or not are determined to cycle along the Ladebraes, and creating a core path, which includes cycling, which is an absolute invitation and encouragement for people to cycle along there. The route is already in the pamphlets and maps produced by Fife Council. He feels that it would be very unwise for the council to go down that route.

He then queried the accuracy of Dr Goudie's statements in relation to accidents and the statistics. He said that there are specifications laid down for cycle tracks, which make statements about 60 yards visibility to give safe allowance for a bicycle to stop and also certain widths for shared use paths. He felt that Viaduct Walk was an entirely set up being a straight path with visibility from one end to the other, and separate routes for cyclists and pedestrians. He felt that these standards were not possible in the Ladebraes, due to the nature of the terrain. Any attempt to alter to required standards for safe joint use would require major landscape changes in some areas. The surface of the route is also variable, and potentially as risky as being on road if wet, frozen or irregular. He cited Government research, which had looked at such routes and identified such hazards.

Ms Uprichard supported Mr Middleton's concerns and pointed out that dividing the route in places would leave very narrow paths for either pedestrians or walkers. She supported the idea of the Ladebraes being only a walking route, which would be possible under core path plans. Mr Beech asked that if the path was gifted 120 years ago for the town's use, surely everyone, including cyclists and horse riders could use it? He agreed with Mr Lindsay's observation that just by saying it isn't a route for cyclists, won't stop some cyclists still using it. He added that one could see clearly illegal cycling on the paths in South Street every day, so banning it in the Ladebraes wouldn't in his view, have any effect either.

Cllr Black informed the meeting that for years, the local councillors have been trying to find funds to maintain the path in the Ladebraes. To date, Fife Council hasn't managed to allocate or find funds to do a proper job of regular maintenance. The Core Path matter has now opened up the possibility of real funding to maintain the path, and keep it maintained to a high standard. She felt that this fact should be taken into consideration when making a decision about the use of the path. Ms Uprichard asked if there could be a vote on the type of access to be allowed on the Ladebraes. Mr Macgregor suggested a vote after the customary interval, during which time councillors would have time to study Dr Goudie's core path recommendations.

Mr Macgregor following the interval reminded Community Council that in order to allow Mr Middleton to answer more of Dr Goudie's questions, Standing Orders would have to be suspended. Normally presentations were confined to 6 minutes, but he'd allowed both to go considerably beyond this normal limit due to their nature. Mr Lindsay proposed suspending Standing Orders. There was no dissent.

Mr Middleton thought that the main outstanding question was the legal status of the Ladebraes at the present time. He cited the Land Reform Act, which allows access by foot, cycle or horse on any land in certain categories. One of these categories is land developed for a specific recreational purpose. Fife Council during the previous multi-user path consultation said to people that there wasn't much point in them objecting anyway, because the Ladebraes was already a multi-user path because of the Land Reform Act. Mr Middleton thought that Fife Council had misinformed themselves, as in his view the Ladebraes had been set up for a specific recreational purpose, walking.

He felt that as a consequence of the Land Reform Act one could no more take a bicycle or a horse through the Ladebraes, than one could take these means of transport across the 1st Green of the Old Course. He believed that Fife Council's way of responding to this obstacle, was to designate the Ladebraes a core path, as a result of which under the first part of that legislation, its protection disappears. So if a decision was taken by Fife Council after consultation to designate the Ladebraes a core path, they could then encourage cycling. He felt that this was a critical point. He also disputed Dr Goudie's claim about a "vociferous minority" by showing the "weight" of letters objecting to the "weight" of letters supporting the idea of cycling in the Ladebraes. He finally asked, if the Community Council had a responsibility to respond to the needs of the people of St Andrews, or to promote ideas, which are their own, which have no basis in democracy.

Dr Goudie in response stated that he'd be very happy to have a full referendum on the people of St Andrews, as he felt that it was clear that there were substantial numbers of cyclists in the Western part of St Andrews whom he felt would support the proposal. He added that cycling "off-road" was vastly safer than cycling "on-road". He cited a recent near miss, which his wife had experienced with a 4x4, which hadn't indicated correctly its intentions. Fortunately it was able to stop in time. He felt that the outcome had it been different would have been a lot more serious, than an incident between a cyclist and pedestrian on the Ladebraes.

On the question of the statistics, Dr Goudie said he'd had a debate with Mr Middleton a year ago. He admitted that the Scottish Executive statistics appear poorly founded, because they include off – road accidents, such as those sustained by mountain bikers coming down mountains. Setting aside such statistics he felt that it was still clear that the numbers of cyclists killed by vehicles, greatly outnumbered any deaths caused by cyclists on pedestrians.

Mr Macgregor asked Ms Uprichard if she still wished to have a vote on the issue. Ms Uprichard proposed that the submission as made in Dr Goudie's document should be changed to exclude support for cycling in the Ladebraes. Mrs Taylor seconded the proposal. Dr Goudie proposed that the submission as made in his document should stand. Mrs Tricker seconded him. Ms Uprichard's motion was defeated by 9 votes to 5 with one abstention.

## **4. Fife Councillors**

### **4.1. Frances Melville**

#### **4.1.1. Largo Road/Scottish Water**

Cllr Melville was also speaking for Cllr Black on this topic, as the latter had to leave for another meeting. Cllr Black she said had been working hard on this matter. Cllr Melville had written to Dr Harvey of Scottish Water. His response had indicated that Scottish Water had finished their side of the repairs, leaving it up to Fife Council to complete road repairs, after which the lights should be down quite soon. Despite the eventual completion of the work, she was dismayed at the blame being shuttled between Scottish Water and Fife Council.

She felt that neither organisation had come out of the event looking good. She was almost certain that this was bound to happen again, as lessons she felt had not been learnt about better communication. Cllr Melville also mentioned the similar flooding problems at Lawhead Roads East and West, and Buchanan Gardens. She added that the poor state of repair of the Lawhead Road area should be sorted in the coming year by Fife Council.

#### **4.1.2. Meeting with Ken Greer, Head of Education**

Following a letter from Cllrs Melville and Sangster, Mr Greer has offered a meeting with St Andrews Councillors and those from Tay Bridge Head on the issue of future school developments. Cllr Melville will keep the Community Council posted on the subject.

#### **4.1.3. Meeting with Steven Magee, St Andrews University**

Mr Magee has offered to set up a further meeting to discuss the various locals concerns, such as HMOs. Cllr Melville hoped they'd find a way forward. Mr Macgregor referred the meeting to Appendix on the Town/Gown Liaison Meeting.

#### **4.1.4. Lighting/Paving in Hepburn Gardens**

Dr Goudie commented that Cllr Melville should be congratulated on getting the problems with the lighting/paving at the end of Hepburn Gardens sorted out. The existence of a path all the way and lighting was a great improvement. Cllr Melville acknowledged the thanks, but added that there had been a slight hiccup as the Council had forgotten to consult a resident about a streetlight being installed outside his house. He had to be placated, before the work could be finished.

#### **4.1.5. Recycling Centre Pedestrian Access**

Mr Holdsworth asked about the lack of access by pavement to this centre, and what plans there were to get a pavement built. He felt that the lack of a pavement was dangerous for pedestrians. Cllr Melville acknowledged that this was a need, and was an issue she would need to chase up. She felt that the initial settling down period for the new centre would identify various things needing to be done, of which a pavement for pedestrians was one.

#### **4.1.6. Departure Hearing for 2nd Grange Application**

Cllr Melville reported that she'd been asked to find a date for a departure hearing for this application.

#### **4.1.7. Departure Hearing for Fairmont Hotel Application**

Cllr Melville has also been asked to find a date for a departure hearing for the application for the development proposals at this hotel.

### **4.2. Sheila Black**

Mrs Black had, had to leave early to go to another meeting. The protracted time taken for the presentations had delayed Councillors' reports.

### **4.3. Cllr Sangster**

#### **4.3.1. Martyr's Monument – Repair Needs**

Mr Sangster reported that Fife Council are still investigating ownership, and responsibility for the maintenance. He believes that Fife Council may have discovered that it has responsibility, as the area may be Common Good Fund land. See also 4.3.7 last CC minutes.

#### **4.3.2. New Pedestrian Crossing – North Street**

The new crossing beside the Castle Tavern is almost complete. Cllr Sangster hoped that it would be working in the coming week.

#### **4.3.3. Pedestrian Crossing Upgrade – South Street**

The Pedestrian Crossing beside the Post Office is being upgraded, with new lights being installed.

#### **4.3.4. St Mary's Place Refurbishment/Upgrade**

Cllr Sangster reported that the work to refurbish and upgrade this area has started, and will go on for several weeks.

#### **4.3.5. Police Community Consultation – 31-01-07**

Cllr Sangster had attended this public consultation, as mentioned in last month's CC minutes. As Mr Fraser had also attended for the Community Council he would let him report back on that meeting.

#### **4.3.6. Town Sign Repair**

Cllr Sangster reported that this sign which had been ripped from the wall, has been repaired and is to be put back in situ.

#### **4.3.7. Dummy Ticket Machine Display**

Mrs Taylor reminded Cllr Sangster that he'd talked about dummy ticket machines being placed around the town, to help the public decide if they were acceptable. Mrs Taylor had been speaking to Peter Milne. He'd informed her that 4 such dummy machines were to be placed in Market Street, but only for the benefit of elected members. She wondered why Market Street had been chosen, as she felt that it was already very busy, and they would be less obvious than in other areas such as North Street or South Street. She felt that we really needed 38 models to give a full perspective of their impact. She reminded the meeting of a past consultation meeting about the introduction of the parking tickets. At that meeting they were informed that the contract had already been signed and the tickets printed, so the consultation was a bit of a farce. She asked the Councillors if they could be absolutely certain that this wouldn't happen about the proposed ticket machines.

Mr Sangster thanked Mrs Taylor, and admitted that he'd not been informed of the forthcoming display of dummy machines. He felt that Cllr Melville would be best placed to answer. Cllr Melville expressed surprise that the 4 machines were only for the local members benefit. She thought that it might be more appropriate for a site visit for all committee members, and more machines on display than currently planned at various locations so that more members of the public can have an opportunity to see them. She also felt that they should be left in situ for a couple of days to ensure a fuller exposure to public inspection. She added that she'd raise the matter at the next Local Office meeting this week. She also acknowledged that she remembered the meeting about the vouchers and how local members had been equally shocked at the announcement. She was determined not to let a similar situation occur again.

### **4.4. Cllr Liston**

#### **4.4.1. St Andrews to Glasgow Bus Service Query**

Cllr Liston had followed up on a query from the last Community Council meeting about a bus service, where passengers had to change in Dunfermline. She had received a reply from Transportation. Stagecoach had changed buses, because of peak time passenger demand connected to Adam Smith College and Waid Academy. The bus change in Dunfermline in the morning is the earliest that the company can manage to change passengers to the new low flowing express coaches. Stagecoach will however review this matter.

#### **4.4.2. Leuchars Railway Station Road Improvements**

Cllr Liston has hopes that the condition of the road in front of the station will be remedied soon. It is now a priority one for work.

#### **4.4.3. Scottish Water Meeting**

Cllr Liston had attended this meeting, as had local Residents Associations and Fife Council. There was a general feeling that the meeting had been quite successful, with Scottish Water being quite amenable to take on board concerns. There is also a potential issue about who deals with water problems, depending upon their source. Apparently if it's a culvert, it's the responsibility of Fife Council, but if its sewage pipes it is Scottish Water.

## **5. Planning Committee**

### **5.1. Minutes – 15-01-07**

#### **5.1.1. Parking Meters**

An objection was sent to Fife Council in relation to the proposal to replace vouchers with ticket machines, following a further meeting on 22.01.07.

#### **5.1.2. Physical Sciences Building, North Haugh**

Ms Uprichard had enquired and had been told that the material being used for ducting was a dark PVC. She thought that it could go back to the next Planning Meeting.

### **5.2. Possible Move of Planning Department to Glenrothes**

Ms Uprichard expressed concern about a report on the press about Fife Council planning to have only one Planning Committee in Glenrothes. Ms Uprichard was supported by Cllr Melville, who said that she would strongly oppose any such move. She would fight any move to have just one planning committee, believing that it would take away the ability of local people to feel involved in the process.

### **5.3. Query about new planning objections timescale.**

Dr Goudie raised the issue of changes to planning, and the new experimental rule about responding within seven days, for certain types of planning applications. He was concerned that this might necessitate the Planning Committee meeting weekly, which in his view would be too much. Ms Uprichard is to write to Mr Birrell for clarification, feeling that his explanation of the changes is not at all clear. She also wanted to add on to her letter concerns about another planning matter. Ms Uprichard added that it used to be possible to see objections in Cupar. She was concerned that with certain legislative changes, it might be more difficult to objectively assess the nature of support for a major planning application, if they

couldn't see the names and address of objectors. It was agreed that Ms Uprichard could add this to the letter about the timescale issue.

#### **5.4. Core Paths Submission**

Dr Goudie asked if the Council was happy for the document as a whole to be submitted, following the earlier discussion on the Ladebraes aspect of the core paths. Ms Uprichard wanted clarification, as the first request for a submission was initially made nearly a year ago. She wondered if the Council had approached Dr Goudie, and had told him that he could submit it in relation to the first round of consultation, or did it relate to the second round, which is to start in March? Dr Goudie confirmed that the original request came about a year ago, but because of other major planning matters, such as the structure plan it wasn't regarded as being as important at that time. Dr Goudie then thought that the deadline had been missed, but had been emailed by Alison Irvine in December asking if we still wished to make a response on it. Mr Macgregor moved that the paper be submitted, seconded by Mr Lindsay. Mr Guest following a comment by Mr Crichton informed the meeting that as the Student Association might have a different view on some subjects, University staff who weren't students couldn't speak on their behalf.

### **6. Matters Arising**

#### **6.1. Seminar on University Towns**

Mr Macgregor suggested that this matter be left to the following meeting due to time constraints. The secretary, Mr Marks later reminded the meeting that a decision would have to be made, as the Conference organiser was asking for a definite idea of participation by the beginning of March, so that the final agenda could be confirmed. St Andrews University are not able to attend, but have indicated to Mr Marks via the Principal that they would be happy to liaise with a representative to give their views on the theme of the conference.

**Decision to send a Rep to be made by before March Meeting**

#### **6.2. St Andrews Parking Plan**

An email from Mr Milne in Appendix E was the subject of discussion. This gave some further clarification about the process of consultation and was giving an offer to come and talk. Ms Uprichard supported the idea of inviting Mr Milne to a meeting. It was agreed to invite Mr Milne to the March meeting. There was no dissent.

**The secretary to email Mr Milne to invite him to the Community Council meeting in March.**

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

##### **6.3.1. Town and Gown Liaison Group**

Mr Macgregor reported on this meeting, at which the attendance was less than usual, due to the absence of the student reps and others. See Appendix B of February agenda. Items such as the HMO issue were discussed. Mr Lindsay thought that the Student Association had Sabbatical officers, who would be free from study leave to attend meetings such as the Community Council, so the absence of the student representatives from such meetings surprised him. He wondered why there had been a paucity of student reps at various meetings including Community Council. Mr Guest informed the meeting that Tom D'Ardenne was abroad on business and Ms Laura Wilson was attending another meeting this evening. Mr Guest confessed he was unaware why his colleagues were not present at the January meeting, but would try to find out. Mr Macgregor reinforced the need to have regular attendance of a student representative at the Community Council meeting.

##### **6.3.2. Pilgrim Foundation**

Mr Macgregor explained his ex-officio role in this organisation and the good work they do in the town. The Pilgrim Foundation had wondered if the CC might be prepared to host a small reception in the Council Chamber for the winners of the two golf packages, one in the third week in April, the other in the first week of July as noted in Appendix C of the agenda. Mr Crichton asked about numbers to be invited. Mr Macgregor thought it would be a small number, probably half a dozen. Mr Lindsay was uneasy about the idea although he saw the benefits. He wasn't certain about the appropriateness of the Community Council being "wheeled out" for the benefit of the winners. He asked if the Community Council could take a month to think about it. Mr Macgregor agreed to defer a decision on the request until the next meeting.

**Decision deferred until March meeting**

##### **6.3.3. St Andrews Day Holiday Campaign – Final Report**

This report from Mr McCartney unable to attend the meeting was noted. It was agreed that the secretary would write a letter as suggested by Mr McCartney congratulating Mr Canavan on his achievement.

**Secretary to write to Mr Canavan**

#### **6.4. Report on Consultation Meeting with Fife Police @ Burgh Chambers – 31/01/07**

Mr Crichton attended the meeting. Mr Crichton felt that the meeting had been fairly innocuous, with the police dealing with the usual complaints. They also reported that they were putting more police on the beat, to have a bigger and more obvious presence in the town.

#### **6.5. St Andrews World Class – Report on meeting with Patrick Laughlin – 17/01/07**

Mr Macgregor attended this meeting with other Community Councillors. Ms Uprichard asked for a point of clarification in relation to last month's papers, about the possibility of World Class running the town or words along those lines. It had also been mentioned, she said that there would be the advantage, that Fife Council; Fife Enterprise etc were already on World Class. She felt that these organizations, as well as others on World Class, such as the University and Tourist Board were all unaccountable so couldn't see how they could represent the town. Mr Macgregor asked Ms Uprichard, if she was asking him to account

for the remarks he'd made to the press, which he didn't feel were a matter for the meeting.

Mr Macgregor was happy however to explain his view. He didn't think that anybody should take over or run the town, as he wasn't in favour of that. He did however feel that all bodies with an interest in the town should be pushing in the same direction. It seemed to him personally that World Class because of its structure did have the involvement of both businesses and organizations such as the Pilgrim Foundation or Preservation Trust. He felt that now that World Class has had its report, that we should be encouraging it to come up with acceptable ways to promote its ideas through democratic channels. He emphasized again, that he was not in favour of World Class representing the town, however he was in favour of any organization, which was trying to get everyone to move the same way. He felt that on balance we should give them a chance and see if they respond to the report's recommendations as to how they should behave in the future. He added that if they responded positively he felt that they should be supported, if they didn't then the Community Council shouldn't support them, which was why he didn't feel it appropriate to make any recommendations at this meeting.

Ms Uprichard quoted then from comments made by Patrick Laughlin, made at a previous Community Council meeting, that World Class would evolve eventually into something completely different, much more along the lines of an organization which manages the town, and locally financed to look after the affairs of the town. Ms Uprichard then quoted Mr Lindsay from a previous minute, as expressing concerns to Mr Laughlin about this scenario of an unelected body running the town etc. Dr Goudie hoped that we would disassociate ourselves from some aspects of the report as they have emerged since that meeting. He felt that the misleading picture of the town as divided and parochial, as conveyed by the media should be refuted. He also felt that Patrick Laughlin would not be happy with some of the reporting, as he recognizes the need to work positively with other organizations in the town. However he didn't think that World Class's global view was any better than that of the Community Council and that they didn't have a detailed knowledge of the local situation, hence the tone of some of their comments. He felt that it was unfortunate that Mr Macgregor has been misquoted in the press. However he agreed with his view that any organization was entitled to come forward with suggestions, as to how the town might move forward, but we had to be careful of organizations, which had substantial sums of money behind them as this didn't entitle them to ride roughshod over local opinion and he hoped they wouldn't do so.

An exchange of views in relation to the subject then took place between Ms Uprichard and Mr Lindsay. Mr Peterson eventually intervened to say, that he felt that the matter had been taken far enough, and that in his view it wasn't appropriate to discuss it further in the way it had been conducted. He felt that it was time to move on. Mr Macgregor agreed, and brought the discussion to a conclusion.

Mr Macgregor explained to Mr Crichton that the meeting had been recorded by Mr Lindsay, as it was a meeting of the Community Council, albeit a special one with a specific purpose. This was standard practice as practiced in the main Community Council meeting, to ensure better accuracy in recording statements made by Councillors, or members of the public contributing to the meeting. Ms Uprichard asked about the possibility of hearing the recording. Mr Macgregor ruled that the matter be left and that the meeting move on to other business. The matter could be discussed privately later if necessary.

## **6.6. Notification of Public Consultation Exercise – Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance Wind Energy and Renewable Technologies other than Wind Energy – Date to be confirmed**

For information only. The date for the consultation is still to be confirmed.

## **6.7. Waterwatch Scotland – Report of North East Fife Panel Public Meeting**

Mrs Tricker reported on her attendance. There had been a very good turn out, with representatives from a lot of Community Councils across Fife and a lot of Councillors, as well as an MSP. Scottish Water were she said, slated by everyone in attendance for their record in dealing with complaints. Regional Councillors also commented upon Scottish Water's poor record in making good the roads they'd dug up. She had managed to mention the local St Andrews problems, and had got a reply in which Scottish Water had tried to blame it on a dispute with the Council on who had responsibility for a particular job. Waterwatch Scotland indicated that they would be prepared to take on board any further complaints. Mr Macgregor thanked Mrs Tricker for her report and attendance at the meeting.

## **6.8. Grant Procedures – Appendix K**

This item, relating to procedures, which once agreed, should be included in the Standing Orders for the Community Council, to be held over to the next month's meeting.

**Deferred to the March Meeting**

## **6.9. Any Other Matters Arising**

### **6.9.1. Community Council Election Date**

The secretary was supposed to have written to Fife Council after the January meeting to ask for Fife Council to possibly look at changing the election date to give times for students to register as electors and vote at any election. October 2007 was close to the start of the University term to allow students to register as electors.

Secretary to email Fife Council to inform of concern and need for change of date

## **7. Committee Reports**

### **7.1. Recreation**

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

Mr Macgregor presented the awards at the beginning of the meeting

**7.1.2 Bandstand Concerts 2007**

Mr Peterson informed the meeting that he will be unable to deal with the Bandstand Concerts this summer. He would like to get some volunteers to assist in this regular event.

**Volunteers required to assist at Bandstand Concerts**

**7.2. General Purposes Committee**

No report.

**7.3. 200 Club Report and Draw**

Two draws to be done next month instead of a draw this month.

**Deferred to March Meeting**

**8. New Business****8.1. East Sands Leisure Centre Advisory Group**

Mr Davidson agreed to become the Community Council representative on this group, which the late Mrs Christie had attended.

**8.2. Fair Trade Leaflets**

Mr Lindsay advised the meeting that he had printed some leaflets for the Fair Trade Group in relation to forthcoming events. The timescale for distribution had meant that a decision couldn't have waited until this meeting. The amount of leaflets printed was relatively small, costing less than £10. There were no objections to Mr Lindsay's decision to print the leaflets, which are advertising an exhibition and film show in the Byre Theatre.

**9. Reports from Office Bearers****9.1. Chair**

Mr Macgregor brought to the notice of the meeting that the Kiel/Madras Exchange is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. There will be a range of events, with the school on Kiel bringing a party of 60, including the Rector of the school, the first time a rector has visited. He would like the Community Council to assist financially towards some of the events being organised. He will put it in writing to more formally discuss at next month's Community Council meeting. Mr Crichton suggested the possibility of a reception hosted by the Community Council. Mr Macgregor thought that might be a possibility, and again suggested that it be firmed up next month.

**Decision deferred until March Meeting**

**9.2. Treasurer**

Mrs Tricker reported that the balance in the bank stands at around £28,000 – a report has been given to the secretary.

**9.3. Secretary**

As per correspondence in Appendix A.

**10. Any Other Competent Business****10.1. RAF Leuchars Liaison Committee**

Mr Macdonald had recently attended this meeting at RAF Leuchars. In the coming year the main runway at Leuchars will be getting resurfaced, so most of the Squadron based at Leuchars will be re-deployed until this work is complete. There will as a result be less noise from the base, and the secondary runway running north-east top south-west being used, will not create as much noise over St Andrews.

Mr Macdonald also pointed out that as a result some of the RAF Housing would be available. He thought that Fife Council should investigate the possibility of using this housing, even on a temporary basis.

**10.2. World Class**

Mr Macdonald informed the meeting that there would be a meeting of World Class this week. He wondered if he could convey anything from the Community Council. No specific request was given for anything to be conveyed to this meeting.

**10.3. I.C.L.C. Meeting**

Mr Holdsworth had attended this meeting. The main item of interest related to the Links Ticket. In the financial year from 2008 the price increase will not be held to inflation, but will go up a little over inflation rate.

**10.4. Request for Use of Community Council Coat of Arms by Fife Council**

A request from Amanda Ooston of Fife Council had been received by the secretary, to use the Community Council Coat of Arms for a booklet promoting facilities in Fife. Mr Lindsay proposed that this should be agreed, with Mr Macgregor seconding. This was agreed without dissent.

**Secretary to email Ms Ooston.**

**10.5. Date of Next Meeting**

Monday 5th March @ 7 pm.