

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Draft Minutes – July 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, Marysia Denyer, Dave Finlay, Ken Fraser, Ian Goudie, Judith Harding, Stuart Holdsworth, Patrick Marks, Joe Peterson, James Potton, Laurence Reed, Zoe Smith, Carole Tricker, Nan Taylor, Maggie Stracey.

Students' Association Representatives

Tom D'Ardenne, Steve Savage.

Nominated

Jude Innes

Fife Councillors

Frances Melville, Dorothea Morrison, Bill Sangster, Robin Waterston

Apologies

Ben McLeod, Carole Tricker, Elise Methven, Dennis Macdonald.

2. Minutes of May 2007 Meeting

The minutes were accepted as correct.

3. Presentations

3.1. Sergeant Davies, Fife Police

Sgt Davies was present to answer questions from Community Councillors. No questions were asked.

3.2. Loches Alliance

Mrs Virginia Fowler, Chair of the Loches Alliance described her presentation as an opportunity to touch base with the Community Council, who she said had been very supportive of the Loches Alliance. Last year was the 10th anniversary. She wanted to let the Community Council know what they had been doing, and future plans to help the Loches Alliance continue successfully in the future. Recently St Leonards School had exchanged with the Lycee Alfred de Vigny, a local state secondary school in Loches. St Salvator's Choir had also visited Loches and had given concerts in the Collegiate Church and other local towns. In September there is the visit from Loches. On a different tack, the chef from the Dolls House, Carol Sullivan will be going over in September and will work in a local 2 star Michelin restaurant and there will be a similar reciprocal visit from the chefs of the Loches restaurant.

There was an official Loches committee visit in May, during which they visit local attractions and met the French Minister of Culture and Heritage.

Mrs Fowler feels they would like to get more young people interested in participating in the exchange. In Loches accommodation is not a problem, but accommodation is a problem for French exchange students coming to St Andrews. Mrs Fowler would like to see more local sports clubs, schools and families becoming involved, as this might help open up more accommodation if families offer to host French students. She recognised the problems, but the committee is approaching local schools to try and revive interest.

They can help towards the cost of a couple of group exchanges as they are able to access European funding for cultural exchanges.

3.3. Green Belt Update – Ms Penny Uprichard

Ms Uprichard gave the Community Council an update and an historical summary on this major local issue.

She reminded the meeting that as early as 1994/5 St Andrews was considered to be at its landscape capacity and this was before the St Andrews Bay Hotel was approved by Fife Council. In his 1996 St Andrews Landscape Assessment, Tyldesley said 'Green Belt control is clearly required for the landscape...around St Andrews, one of the most historic towns in Scotland and one with a particularly distinctive appearance and relationship with its surrounding landscape.'

The Scottish Executive considered the need for a Green Belt before the 2002 Structure Plan was approved. Fife Council was not supportive of the Green Belt, with Mr Rae, then Head of Planning saying that there were policies in place to protect the town. However, the Scottish Executive did include in the Structure Plan a Policy for a Green Belt 'to preserve the existing landscape setting' and 'to encircle the town', Policy SS8. Sir Menzies Campbell and others requested Fife Council to set the boundaries, through an alteration to the 1996 Local Plan. Fife Council refused. Mr Sinclair, then Chief Executive, and Mr Rae did say that development proposals would be premature to the setting of boundaries. That statement has not been borne out.

In recent years St. Andrews has had considerable development. Not surprisingly, Ms Uprichard commented that Fife Councillors no longer know how to assess 'prospective Green Belt' when faced with planning recommendations for approval which appear to ignore the landscape assessments of Tyldesley and Grant.

The finalised Draft Structure Plan has been with Scottish Ministers for nearly a year. If the recent request from Fife Council to carry out a housing review is approved, it may be at least nine months – possibly more – before we get a decision. The Finalised Draft Local Plan thus moves even further away; it may be four or five years before it is approved.

We believe that local authorities have a responsibility to keep up to date development plans. The Scottish Executive is also committed to Community Engagement, and there were a number of responses from St Andrews to the recent PAN on this subject. Green Belt is an example of the community clearly expressing a wish, which is being ignored by Fife Council.

SPP1 refers, in paras. 41-43, to Supplementary Guidance being useful where 'There is a need for an urgent policy response to an emerging issue...' The issue is not emerging, but the matter is urgent.

The Green Belt proposed in the Local Plan would not give adequate protection. It excludes St Andrews Bay. Craigtoun, the Old Course Hotel, and the Links Trust Courses have been included in Green Belt, with special dispensations to ignore its constraints. Mr Presswood of Development Services explained to Community Council, about 18 months ago, that this was to prevent any difficulty if these organisations want to build hotels, maintenance sheds etc alongside the golf courses.

A number of comments have been made by Fife Council which have apparently been intended to remove protection from St Andrews. There were many objections about the Green Belt in the Draft Structure Plan. To all of them the reply was 'It was never intended to be continuous'. In a Glenrothes committee, Mr Winter did admit 'his department had got it wrong,.'

There were also objections about the St Andrews Strategic Study (1994-1998) – the only document which expresses the wishes of the people of St Andrews. The reply in this case was that it was only intended to inform the 2002 Structure Plan. But the Study says 'And other future policy documents'. Two of its conclusions were that St Andrews was at its landscape capacity, and that a Green Belt was needed to contain the spread of the town.

When the Links Trust lodged an application for a seventh golf course, the Planning Report said 'Gold courses are acceptable in Green Belt'. It also said, 'Gold courses are reversible' – which should have been 'Golf courses are in perpetuity'.

There was a recent application for an hotel and timeshares in Grange House, in prospective Green Belt. The Planning Report said, under Conclusion and Reasons for approving departure, that it would provide tourist and economic benefits to the area. But in Green Belt 'tourist and economic benefits' are not acceptable as reasons for approval.

The Alison Grant Landscape Capacity Assessment was required by the 2002 Structure Plan and commissioned by Fife Council. It has been mainly ignored; it concludes that there is little scope for further development around St Andrews. Fife Council has been reluctant to allow access to this report until forced to by a request under the Freedom of Information act. Grange House is in an area where Alison Grant concludes that 'development is inappropriate because of its potential impact on the landscape character, scenic quality or visual attributes of St Andrews and its setting'. Despite concerns, Grange House was approved with only relatively minor concessions from the developer.

The site for the Hospital is partly in Green Belt. Despite strenuous efforts objectors have been unable to get an assurance that access to the east of the site, to the land owned by the Muir Group, will be ruled out. Since 1994, when the Group lodged an application for 371 acres before the Local Plan Inquiry, and subsequently withdrew it – after substantial local opposition – it has been known that they hope to build up to 1,000 houses on the southern hillside.

If the Muir Group's development happened this would undoubtedly be the end of St Andrews as a small historic town in its green bowl. But the end may come in other ways – by the death of a thousand cuts, as at the moment. Green Belt strictly enforced, is the only thing that might save it for the moment from the ambitions of the Council and developers. There is a history of some of the more recent major developments, such as St Andrews Bay and the Old Course Hotel running up substantial debts and losses, and other speculative developments failing to live up to the promotional hype, affecting local businesses financially.

SNH in its objection to the Green Belt Policy in the Draft Local Plan said, 'A Green Belt policy should identify that no development is permissible except in specified circumstances. The example set in the draft local plan reverses this principle, stating the circumstances in the which development will be allowed. It is SNH's view that this policy will lead Fife Council and others having to demonstrate why development in the Green Belt will not be allowed, rather than placing the onus on developers to demonstrate why development should be allowed.

And 'SNH believes that the Green Belt policy should be decided prior to the allocation of new housing proposals. The alternative is that Fife Council risks undermining the integrity of the Green Belt. These developments are also likely to be contrary to the stated justification for the policy, e.g. it allows development that may irreversibly damage the 'setting, character of the historic core'.

SNH goes on to query why areas have been excluded and left white on the perimeter of St Andrews in a Local Plan map, and asks for clarification on the full extent of the Green Belt

Dr Goudie commented that he'd raised the problem of operating on a local Plan which is so out of date and that the prospects for getting an up to date one appear to be poor. He couldn't see any great merit in tinkering with a flawed structure plan which would not satisfy either the Community Council or the Scottish Executive. He was concerned that the new City Regions set up would come in before there was any

satisfactory resolution of the Structure Plan. This could then further delay the process of firming up the Green Belt, by which time there might be very little worth saving. He thought that the idea of including a Green Belt proposal in an amendment to the current Local Plan was a good idea, given the delays which would otherwise put matters back several years.

Mr Crichton mentioned the problem of the threat to the Southern hillside in relation to the hospital plans. These had originally contained an access to the Southern Hillside, but the Community Council had objected and the East Area Committee had removed the access road from the plans. Mr Crichton was still concerned that this could still remain a threat. Ms Uprichard confirmed that this had been the case, but she felt that without a more clear cut planning decision the threat will still remain.

Dr Goudie asked whether Fife Councillors had any comment on the possible instatement of the Greenbelt ahead of the Local Plan revision. Cllr Melville felt that this was a very difficult question given the impending reappraisal of the Structure Plan with the Local Plan being in abeyance. The Scottish Executive also have to approval a reappraisal. Cllr Melville thought that there was nothing to stop anyone writing to ask because of the delay and to remind them about amending the old Structure Plan.

Mr Fraser concluded the discussion by noting that Ms Uprichard had asked if the Community Council could write to the Scottish Executive to ask for the Green Belt to be brought in, despite the hiatus in the Structure and Local Plans. Mr Fraser asked if writing such a letter would be acceptable to the Community Council. Mr Crichton proposed writing and Mr Holdsworth seconded the proposal.

Letter to be written to the Scottish Executive about the Green Belt

3.3. Presentation on the new St Andrews Hospital Project by Professor Sam Taylor

Mr Martin Dibley who is on the Project Team, and who is on Anstruther Community Council was also in attendance.

Our function this evening is to assist the Community Council in coming to an informed decision on the hospital proposal. Our primary job is to assist the NHS in completing the project in ways that safeguard public interest. We do that by ensuring that public concerns are fully understood by the Project, but also by ensuring that the information reaching the public is accurate and that any misinformation is disposed off quickly and harmlessly. We are a two way information channel, and we are watchdogs or honest brokers. We have inevitably had to earn the confidence of the NHS board and team but without losing public confidence.

It hasn't always been easy. Serious concerns like the N-S alignment have however been disposed of, and the public told of the changes at the earliest moment. This then allowed the Council to remove conditions that were no longer relevant. There have been meeting with many local organisations and individuals, and also a special public presentation of the plans at the Byre Theatre. At none has there been any evidence of public concern over the architectural, clinical or landscaping design of the hospital. What you have is a landmark development, a major clinical facility that will make life considerably easier for medical staff and patients, especially for renal and cancer patients. Day surgery is set to expand and the new hospital is equipped to handle this. There will also be desperately needed NHS dental facilities. The building has abundant natural light and ventilation, in-house catering and a therapeutic garden directly accessible from the hospital and palliative ward. There are planted courtyards visible from everywhere within the complex. There is patient privacy and immediate access as you arrive at the accident unit, to a pharmacy and to the main entrance to the reception area for GPs, diagnostic units and hospital. Every unit is carefully situated to offer what they call adjacencies.

I would expect the Community Council to arrive at its own view, but they would be hard put to find serious fault.

The situation is less reassuring when we turn to access. This is not the fault of the NHS or Project Board. The Project Board has done all in its power to ensure access to buses and taxis outside the main doors and a bus stop on the main road with footpath access. It has redesigned the roundabout to give direct access to the hospital and to improve safety factors on the main road. It has provided 180 parking places. This is the maximum permissible under NHS guidelines for the size of facility. We have submitted a 'Green Plan' for management of staff travel and to encourage staff and patients to use healthier and sustainable transport. What is missing however, is the public transport infrastructure to back up these proposals and that is the responsibility of Fife Council, not the NHS.

Current bus services are a hotch potch and will require major changes in routing and timing of buses, including the creation of a direct town – hospital link or there will be a public outcry within weeks of the new facility opening. At the very least we need a thorough review of bus services in St Andrews to ensure direct access to the new hospital.

Fife Transportation said as much in their services report of January 2005. I quote: 'The current level of service is not regarded as adequate to provide the frequency and direct links to make this an attractive option. It is recommended that a dedicated hospital shuttle between the town centre and the hospital. Elderly and disabled access provision would also be required.'

The University is also now pressing for improved public transport to free up their car parks, get cars off streets and persuade staff and students to leave cars at home. They are to lobby Fife Council and other bodies for an improved transport structure in St Andrews and Fife. Cllr Elizabeth Riches has advised me that any review should take into account transport inside and outside St Andrews.

The minimum changes needed are a direct small-bus shuttle service with low load platform, a re-routing of the coastal service (95) to pass the hospital and possibly making the 91 a two way service to eliminate the present need for those east of the Largo Road to travel into town and out again.

The hospital is admittedly one of many public transport problems affecting all who work and study here, shop or visit the town. However what the hospital does is to focus attention on the wider infrastructure problem. The need for changes to accommodate the new hospital comes at the same time as the university is pressing for changes and all of us find it harder to access town by car and park.

There are many different reasons for a major review of the N.E.Fife and St Andrews transport infrastructure. These directly concern the Council not the hospital. Since Fife Transportation has accepted the existence of a problem, we may appear to be pushing at an open door. But never under-estimate the ability of officials to back off and reverse their advice or to attempt to pass the buck to the NHS. We need a St Andrews solution in the context of a wider Fife solution for the whole community and not least for the new hospital. I believe I am correct in stating that all four Fife Councillors back this.

My direct request to the Community Council is to consider how best they can advance this major Transport review in tendering advice to Fife Council on the new hospital.

A question and answer section followed. Mr Crichton started with a query about the 180 maximum car parking spaces. Mr Dibley confirmed that 180 has been decreed from a national level to be the maximum parking spaces allowed at this time proportionate to the size of the hospital and other factors.

Cllr Melville suggested that the Community Council could write expressing concern about the limitation on parking. She suggested possibly writing to Gordon McClellan, Head of Transportation, Keith Winter, Development Services and speaking to the local lead officer, Mr Chris Smith.

She also confirmed that the main Planning Committee did consider the roundabout application which it accepted.

With regard to the transport review she suggested that the Community Council should write to the Head of Transportation with copies to Cllr John Beer, Chair of the Central Planning Committee and Cllr Andrew Arbuckle, Chair of the North East Fife Area Planning Committee.

Professor Taylor also commented that the parking limits might also be part of the green agenda as a deliberate way to encourage staff and users to use more sustainable methods of transport. Cllr Melville while understanding the desire to green transport methods within Fife Council and at Scottish Executive level still felt that there had to be recognition that particularly for emergencies the car was often the only way to get to the hospital.

Professor Taylor welcomed any further representation on the matter. Cllr Sangster thought that given the size and layout of the site there should be space for additional parking in the future. Mr Dibley while acknowledging this fact, commented that the Project committee had been clearly in-formed that 180 remains the maximum allowed. He believes that 180 is inadequate.

Professor Taylor informed the meeting that there is provision for future expansion of up to 30%, without any disruption of the working of the hospital.

Mr Peterson asked about car parking charges. It was confirmed that the parking will be free, as it is in all hospitals in Fife hospitals.

Dr Goudie said that while Professor Taylor had made some useful points, particularly in relation to transportation, he said that he didn't agree with some of the points made in his presentation and felt that these required further discussion given the long history of the Community Council campaigning for a new hospital on the St Leonards Field site.

Mr Fraser recognised that there were major issues unaddressed in the presentation, particularly the possible use of the hospital as a "stalking horse" for other development in the area. He sought Community Council views on how best to proceed given that much of the agenda for tonight's meeting might get squeezed for lack of time. Mrs Taylor suggested bringing it back to the following month's meeting. Dr Goudie while recognising the problem, felt that this remained an issue with huge implications for the town. Balancing the need for the hospital without further delays with an attempt to safeguard the area from other inappropriate development was he acknowledged very difficult and required more discussion. He reminded the meeting of the 8 week timescale before the hospital application goes before the Planning Committee.

Dr Goudie proposed briefly outlining the history of the campaign for a new hospital. The Community Council has been involved since 1994, often working closely with the local NHS Board, but since 2003 when the Health Board decided not to proceed with the St Leonards Field site, the NHS Board withdrew the invite to the Community Council to work on the hospital proposals.

Dr Goudie expressed strongly that despite Fife Council's insistence on the removal of the road access to the southern hillside in the original plans, he felt that the car park layout would make any development of the area much easier, claiming that it would be easy to put a road through the planned car parking area. He didn't agree with Professor Taylor that these fears were groundless, and argued that there could be ways found in future to open up the southern hillside, unless a clear planning condition to prevent such access could be added to the current proposals. He felt that such a device would not hold up the hospital plans. He felt that it was perfectly possible to have planned a hospital on the site, which would preclude further development, but he felt that NHS officials had ignored local concerns on this matter.

Dr Goudie made a plea for the Community Council to make a substantial response on the matter, given the possible implications for the southern hillside and the long history of the battle to defend the area from inappropriate development. He felt that there must be a way to ensure that the hospital plan was not going to be a route in for the Muir Group, or other developers whom he knew could throw substantial resources at any attempt to promote their own proposals. He appealed to the meeting to consider the views of future generations if the hillside was developed and it was seen that the Community Council had not tried hard enough to protect the landscape of the town.

Mrs Taylor reminded the meeting that despite the talk about the hillside, the hospital does have outline planning permission and that any objection to the plans would only be possible on planning grounds. She informed the meeting that the application is a reserved matter in which there certain conditions have to be met to achieve approval. She felt that we should think about the question for longer and not vote tonight.

Professor Taylor in his reply refuted allegations of misinformation, and felt that he had remained honest and honourable in his work on the project. He commented that he like others is not in favour of

development east of the site and he has also tried to persuade Fife Council to move the industrial site elsewhere, a possibility which Fife Council may consider. He felt that the case presented by Dr Goudie was predicated on the Trojan horse theory. He has always told interested groups that the NHS has nothing to do with other development proposals for the area and has not made any concessions with respect to access which might allow development. The NHS he reminded the meeting owned the site and had made provision only for roads relating to the services on the site and that the only legal access through the site otherwise was for the farmer at Pipeland Farm. He reminded the meeting that there would be massive financial penalties if the project was delayed substantially. He said that he totally appreciated concerns about the possibility of other development, but felt that it was inappropriate to delay the hospital proposal to achieve the aim of preventing southern hillside development.

Mr Fraser suggested that the planning committee should discuss what they might want to write to Fife Council on the matter, and come back to the next meeting with the proposed submission for discussion. He also thought that having a plan to view would aid the discussion.

Planning Committee requested to bring back a proposed letter on the hospital plans to the next meeting for discussion and approval.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Dorothea Morrison

4.1.1. Multi-Member Ward

Cllr Morrison felt that the new multi-member ward is beginning to work well. She feels that despite any political differences she and her colleagues are working together where relevant on local ward issues.

4.1.2. Civic Pride

Cllr Morrison had brought up this issue during her election campaign. She hoped that the Community Council would look at this issue. She cited issues of vandalism by local young people in areas like the former New Park School and local public toilets. She had noted that centres such as the Cosmos were under utilised and wondered if there might be a way to attract young people back to more constructive pursuits instead of indulging in drunken, vandalistic behaviour. Mr Holdsworth commented that those causing more of the vandalism were in their 20s. He felt that the vast majority of young people were responsible citizens.

4.1.3. Public Toilets

Cllr Morrison as well as mentioning the vandalism affecting public toilets, was being inundated about the lack of toilets particularly on a Sunday. The toilets at the bus station are not open on a Sunday. The Ladies toilets at the harbour are closed due to tree damage and the Gents are closed due to vandalism. Mr Finlay asked why the toilets at the harbour were closed at mid day on a Sunday in the middle of summer. Cllr Morrison commented on the tree damage at the ladies toilet, but felt that this wasn't an excuse not to open and that there should be funding to fix any problem. Cllr Sangster commented on problems with a broken sky light in the toilets at the harbour. Mr Holdsworth commented on a stench at the Bus Station toilets

4.1.4. World Class

Cllr Morrison informed the meeting that she is representing the local councillors on this organisation. She outlined her views on the potential benefits which the organisation could bring to the town. She feels that World Class could help St. Andrews come up to a standard, which would make it fitter to become a world heritage site.

4.1.5. Drainage/Flooding Problems

Cllr Morrison is hoping to pursue the problems of the flooding which has been seriously affecting local people. She noted that the drains were a major part of the problem which she hopes to tackle with her colleagues. Mrs Denyer commented on the flooding problems in the Scooniehill area and how these had been ineffectually tackled by Fife Council staff in local residents opinion. Cllr Melville gave more information about attempts to deal with some aspects of the problems in the Scooniehill and Kilrymont areas. Cllr Melville has asked NHS owners of the site above Scooniehill to tackle the issue.

4.1.6. Parking Meters

Cllr Morrison commented on this issue. She was hoping to visit Harrogate where a successful disc system is in operation. Mr Holdsworth informed her that this parking system has stopped in the central area. Mr Peterson commented that local people weren't averse to parking meters, but the design was the problem. He'd taken photos in London of what might be a more acceptable design. He agreed to show the councillors the pictures so that they could approach Fife Council officials with the details.

4.1.7. H.M.O. Policy

Cllr Morrison feels that St Andrews needs an HMO policy and is to be having meetings on this important issue.

4.2. Robin Waterston

4.2.1. Flooding/Drainage Problems

Cllr Waterston said that they were looking at short and long term solutions to this serious local problem. There is to be a meeting with Scottish Water later this week on the inadequacies of local drainage.

4.2.2. Training

Cllr Waterston is still undergoing training, but is also trying to tackle issues raised by constituents.

4.2.3. Meeting Procedures for Questions from Community Council to Fife Councillors

Cllr Waterston commented on the new multi-member ward set up and how this meant a different way of working as they all covered the same area. He felt that the current Community Council meeting procedure for asking questions of the Councillors should be revised to take into account the changes. He proposed that questions to the Fife Councillors should take place after they had given their presentations as many of the topics raised might involve more than one councillor thus leading to cross talk if the present system was maintained. Mr Fraser asked for views from Community Councillors on this proposal. Mr Holdsworth indicated that he wasn't happy with the way the multi-member set up was working and still preferred to ask questions of an individual councillor. Mr Fraser felt that the matter needed more thought as a procedural matter and was anxious not to prolong the discussion as the meeting was running behind schedule.

To be discussed again by Community Council

4.3. Bill Sangster

4.3.1. Commemorative Plaques for Visitors

Cllr Sangster reminded the meeting that around 10 years ago special wooden plaques had been given out to official visitors entertained by the Community Council etc. He wondered about restarting the idea. Mr Fraser suggested that the General Purposes Committee could perhaps discuss the idea at its next meeting.

To be raised at next General Purposes Meeting

4.3.2. Sea Cadets

Cllr Sangster distributed leaflets relating to the new Sea Cadets branch recently set up in the town.

4.3.3. Loches Photos

Cllr Sangster reminded the meeting that photos of the Loches visit were on the stairs for anyone wanting to look at them after the meeting.

4.3.4. Parking Meters

Councillors have been at meetings with the university staff. The university is trying to help ease the parking problems around the town. They are trying to come in line with other universities with respect to parking.

4.3.5. Flooding Problems

Fife Council are looking at putting CCTV cameras down the drains to see where the blockages are taking place .

4.3.6. East Sands Leisure Centre Committee

This committee has been restarted following an intervention by Cllr Sangster

4.3.7. Bandstand Concerts

Cllr Sangster commented on the success of a recent concert which had seen a large audience listen to a group of over 50 musicians.

4.3.8. St Andrews in Bloom

Cllr Sangster thanked this group on the excellent displays in the town. Mr Peterson thanked Cllr Sangster for his comments and also announced that the Beautiful Scotland in Bloom inspection is to take place on 31st July. The Recreation Committee will also be doing its garden inspection soon as well.

4.3.9. Queens Terrace – Parking

Mr Holdsworth asked Cllr Sangster whether it might be possible to put a yellow line at the top of the slope to reduce access problems due to parking obstructing the access and causing a hazard. Cllr Sangster agreed to look into the problem, but advised that double yellow lines are not as easy to get put down quickly.

4.3.10. HMOs

Cllr Sangster commented that the HMO situation is being discussed with the university and other interested parties. He felt that it was an ongoing situation and not easy to resolve to everyone's satisfaction.

4.3.11. Vandalism Problems

Cllr Sangster hoped that the Sea Cadets might contribute a little towards giving local young people an outlet for their energies. He also thought that the Cosmos could do more within its remit. Mr Peterson suggested that the Cupar Drop-in centre for young people could be looked at for ideas.

4.4. Frances Melville

4.4.1. Flooding Problems

Cllr Melville contributed to the discussion about the flooding problems. She had spoken to residents and had seen the mess despite attempts to divert the worst of the flooding with sandbags. She had spoken with various of the landowners, including Morrisons who are building the hospital. Morrisons visited the in response to councillors requests to try and look at short and long term measures to alleviate the problem. She had suggested that the NHS put emergency contact numbers on a board so that local residents could contact someone during heavy rain and report possible flooding at an early stage. She had also suggested better public communication between the NHS and local residents.

Mr Peterson commented on the flooding at the Pipeland area. The farmer in the area had dug a ditch running from east to west, but it was dealing with the run off at the end of the ditches that was the problem. He suggested that a new facility to handle the excess water was urgently needed and that the Ladebraes burn required better management to prevent build up of waste materials.

4.4.2. Co-operative Working

Cllr Melville emphasised the way in which the four councillors were working together on major issues, as well as developing their own special interests and dealing with constituents concerns. They keep in email and other contact to co-ordinate their responses where necessary.

4.4.3. Parking Meters

The Councillors are to have a meeting with officials and Historic Scotland with respect to parking meters. She will report back on the outcome at the next meeting. She would be interested to show the officials the meters photographed by Mr Peterson in London.

4.4.4. World Pairs

At the reception for this event, Cllr Melville commented that the golfers and other visitors at this event were thrilled to be in St Andrews. They viewed the town as being just the right size and would see major building on the outskirts as a detraction from the character of the town.

4.4.5. Canongate and Greyfriars 20 mph zones

Cllr Melville reported that these are going out to consultation again due to delays in the original process. She added after a query from Mr Crichton that the Scottish executive are keen to look at making more residential streets 20 mph zones with only major through routes still at 30 mph.

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Planning Reports

Mrs Taylor confirmed that the minutes of recent meetings were for the record only.

5.2. Bus Shelter at Greyfriars, South Street

Cllr Sangster reported that he'd taken officials to view the site of the proposed bus shelter, and had made it clear that locating it in front of the historic ruins was not appropriate for tourist reasons. He'd suggested a suitable alternative location to place the shelter.

6. Matters Arising

6.1. St Andrews Post Office Closure/Transfer – update

The secretary explained the position with regard to this item. Correspondence has taken place between the Community Council and the Post Office. The secretary stated his willingness to continue any correspondence on this issue. Mr Fraser suggested that the meeting delegate any future correspondence to himself and the secretary.

Secretary and Chair to deal with any future correspondence deemed necessary in relation to this matter.

7. From Committees

7.2. General Purposes Committee

7.2.1. Date of Community Council Election

Mr Fraser reported on the GP discussion on this matter. He reported that the electoral roll is published at the beginning of December. There was some uncertainty about the eligibility of students to stand as candidates. This was discussed and the conclusion reached appeared to be that either being on the electoral roll at the time of election or resident for one year qualified any student candidates. Mr Fraser acknowledged that there would never be a perfect time to ensure that all students interested might be eligible.

Secretary to write to Fife Council to confirm our desire for the Community Council election to take place in December 2007.

7.2.2. Election of New Members

Mr Fraser had had a phone call from one of the unsuccessful candidates who expressed dissatisfaction about the election process. Mr Fraser asked for the opinion of Community Council members about procedures that might ensure fair choice of new members. The unsuccessful candidate had queried whether there should have been other ways to ensure that the Community Council knew candidates before voting, such as an interview. Mrs Denyer commented that interviews might be suitable for some but not all candidates. Mr Marks noted that the main Community Council election did not have an expectation that there would be more than a short candidate statement, which would be published in the local press. He thought that the unsuccessful candidate should be encouraged to try again in the election later this year.

7.3. 200 Club

7.3.1. 200 Club Draw

1st: 121. Mrs J. Pirie, 2nd: 112 Mr H. Wilson, 3rd: No.2. Mrs C Tricker

Mr Fraser, Chairman asked the meeting if they wished to finish at 21.30, despite a number of agenda items still being outstanding. There was support for a 21.30 finish with unfinished

business to be carried over to the August meeting.
