

# Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

## Provisional Minutes – 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2009

### For Approval

*(Copies of Agendas and Minutes of the Community Council are held at Fife Council's Local Office, St Mary's Place and the Town Library, Church Square. Those from late 1997 on are on line at <http://www.standrewscc.net/>)*

### 0 Resignation of Mr Larry Reed

Dr Goudie announced the resignation of Mr Larry Reed. He mentioned the valuable contribution made by Mr Reed in his time on the Community Council, chairing the Recreation Committee, running the 200 Club, dealing with licensing applications and acting as Vice Chair of the Community Council. Dr Goudie thanked members for emailing to offer their services in an attempt to plug the large gap left by Mr Reed's resignation. Mr Reed has however indicated that he will remain involved in the events organised by Mr Crichton, namely the Ceilidh and Old Folks Party.

Dr Goudie asked that the thanks for all his work and best wishes of the Community Council for the future be minuted. This was unanimously agreed.

### 1. Attendance

#### Community Councillors

Ken Crichton, Ken Fraser, Patrick Marks, Ian Goudie, Marysia Denyer, Henry Paul, Carol Ashworth, Marysia Denyer, Penny Uprichard, Ronnie Murphy, Kyffin Roberts, Catherine Rowe, Ray Pead, Derek Skelhon

#### Students' Association Representatives

Holly West

#### Nominated

Jude Innes

#### Fife Councillors

Frances Melville, Bill Sangster, Robin Waterston, Dorothea Morrison

#### Apologies

Dave Finlay, Judith Harding, Fiona Kingston, Izzy Corbin

### 2. Minutes of October 2009 Meeting

3.1. Cllr Melville flagged up a change in wording with respect to her comment in Anne Williams's presentation about a Report by officials. She asked that the wording "previous" be included to make clear the report wasn't current.

4.1.2. Miss Uprichard asked that the word "opinion" be inserted before "driving a coach and horses". This was accepted

Dr Goudie confirmed that the minutes were accepted as a true and correct record of the meeting.

## **3. Presentations**

### **3.1. Auditing and Monitoring for Local Organisations with special reference to St Andrews World Class and its successor organisation, St Andrews Partnership.**

Mr Buchanan gave a presentation. His talk related primarily to the organisations referred to in the title of his talk. In his introductory remarks he was quite sceptical that the changes were more than superficial, a matter of fresh presentation rather than any significant view in his view in the content of the aims of the organisation. He hoped that the Community Councillor who had volunteered to become a director of the new organisation would approach the business with a degree of circumspection, but making a constructive contribution.

The general ideas in his handout could be equally advanced within the partnership, the Council or otherwise. He recognised that World Class focus was in upgrading private sector skills, which he felt was laudable enough, however shortcomings in Public Sector agencies may in his view have been overlooked. The physical state of St Andrews, so important for tourism was a public sector responsibility, both for capital investment and maintenance in his view. He felt that there had been deterioration in this area in the past 15 years.

His primary idea was the creation of a capability in St Andrews for complaints handling, audit and monitoring of performance, which could be applicable to individual organisations or programmes or St Andrews stakeholders overall. He thought that such an organisation could produce an annual report, presented at a public meeting. He felt that it could have an immediate role in writing a report on the late St Andrews World Class from its mission statement to its achievements and failings and its legacy. He viewed such a report as essential if the new Partnership was to learn from past mistakes. He felt that the production of such a report could be a very reasonable pre-condition for continuing support of the successor Partnership. He felt that the Community Council could have some leverage in the area of his proposal as indeed could other members of the new Partnership.

He hoped that the Community Council could advance the idea and brief the CC representative on the partnership accordingly. Openness, transparency, propriety and inclusiveness he added were some of the buzzwords of the age. He felt that these needed to be given expression everywhere, so that recruitment and finance in particular could be beyond reproach. Performance standards mattered even more when funds were tight in his view. He hoped that the Partnership could evolve to be more than just another Quango and make a real difference in St Andrews. He thanked the meeting for the opportunity to make his address.

Dr Goudie acknowledged that several CCs had had similar concerns about the accountability of World Class/ St Andrews Partnership and whether it would to some extent usurp the role of the elected councils. He wasn't certain however to whom Mr Buchanan would see his auditing body as being accountable to and he was conscious that the answers one might get would depend upon who did the audit. Mr Buchanan replied that if one took the model of a regular PLC, who might have an audit committee of their Board of Directors, excluding the executive directors or an external agency that could produce an audit if given an appropriate brief. He cited an example of a bank of computer screens in the Gateway, which he thought appeared little used and whose presence was little advertised. He thought that it wasn't unreasonable to ask how much the screens cost and the way in which it was done, given that it was possibly public money. He viewed this as a misallocation of public funds. Dr Goudie acknowledged the decision of the Community Council to participate in the St Andrews Partnership, despite some division of opinion on the matter. Dr Goudie also recognised the importance in keeping an eye on how public money was spent.

## **4. Fife Councillors**

### **4.1. Frances Melville**

#### **4.1.1. Town Hall Flag**

Cllr Melville reported that she was still trying to get someone to put up a new flag. She wasn't certain about the reason for the delay.

#### **4.1.2. Water Connection Problems – Burgh Chambers**

Cllr Melville reported some water connection problems in the Burgh Chambers. She hoped that this would be rectified by Remembrance Sunday.

#### **4.1.3. Parking Plan Consultation**

This consultation on the next phase has been moved to 18/1/10 and will last until 19/03/10

#### **4.1.4. A Board Report**

Following last month's presentation by Anne Williams and the problems faced by the visually impaired and other pavement users, Cllr Melville reported that the previous report had come to Committee. The Committee had decided to ask officials to look at various options to manage the problem and report back early in the New Year.

#### **4.1.5. Taxi Issue – Learmonth Place**

Mr Paul asked for an update on this problem and whether the Community Council could do anything to assist. Cllr Melville replied that there was little that could be done at present and there would be a Hearing in February. Cllr Melville agreed to check if there was anything more the Community Council could do. She acknowledged the problems and the way the system could be manipulated by applicants to delay any decision.

#### **4.1.6. Query re Changes in Scottish Planning Policy**

Dr Goudie asked if Fife Council had any response to the announcement on 30<sup>th</sup> September by the Scottish Government about likely changes to the Scottish Planning Policy which seemed very far reaching on the environmental front, highlighting that climate change mitigation and adaptation should be taken into account in all planning decisions. These included the planning roles in reducing the need to travel and its role in delivering on the commitments to climate change. Planning will need to work alongside the other policy sectors to achieve the targets set in the Climate Change Act, not least the 42% reduction in emissions by 2020. Dr Goudie felt that these were very dramatic margins to try to achieve. He cited the example of the potential benefits if a Bridgehead School was built of a significant reduction in transport and emissions. He wondered if Fife Council was seriously looking at what the Government was proposing.

### **4.2. Bill Sangster**

#### **4.2.1. COSMOS Centre AGM**

Cllr Sangster announced that the AGM would be on 9<sup>th</sup> November 7-9 pm.

#### **4.2.2. East Sands – Fife Sports and Leisure Trust –Refurbishment Work**

Cllr Sangster announced that the Fitness gym would be closed between 07/12/09 and 04/01/10 for major refurbishment costing £85000.

#### **4.2.3. Local Flooding**

Cllr Sangster described the problems caused by recent flooding at the Kinnesburn. Fife Council is to look at sympathetic management of aspects of the stream, which aggravated flooding risk. but wasn't certain how SEPA would view it. Mr Marks commented upon the flooding he'd observed. Cllr Sangster added that other drainage covers had blown off due to the flooding. Mr Crichton commented upon the experiences of the recent flooding by a neighbour. He suggested a possible solution to reduce the flooding from surface water run off. Cllr Sangster suggested that Mr Crichton should email the appropriate official with the suggestion. In a reply to a question from Miss Uprichard, Cllr Sangster described some of the work by the Police and other agencies during the flooding and heavy rain.

#### **4.2.4. Girls on the Move Extravaganza – Madras Kilrymont**

Cllr Sangster described this event, which had taken place at Madras Kilrymont. Organisations participating included Young Scot, Community Police, Fife Council Detached Youth Team, Active Schools, North East Fife Expedition Group etc. There will be a similar event for the boys soon.

#### **4.2.5. Public Access Problems- Kinnesburn.**

Mr Crichton described access problems along the Kinnesburn at the back of the hospital towards the St Leonards site. He also talked about getting trees near the development site listed/counted to try and give them greater protection and also to allow sanctions to be taken against the developer as appropriate. Cllr Sangster acknowledged that the Council could try to undertake such a task.

#### **4.2.6. Missing Seat – Abbey Walk**

Mr Crichton reported damage to a seat on the way up Abbey Walk. Cllr Sangster agreed to look at the problem.

#### **4.2.7. Pavement Problem – Ladyhead Bookshop**

Miss Rowe asked if there was any progress in getting the pavement repaired. Cllr Sangster replied that the problem had been reported and will be on a repair chitty waiting to be done with some other work.

#### **4.2.8. Viaduct Walk/ Lawhead School Pedestrian Entrance – Problem with leaves**

Dr Goudie mentioned the problem of leaves in the above locations. His wife had contacted officials on the matter and had been informed that they'd only be cleared when the trees had shed all their leaves. Cllr Sangster acknowledged the problem as a regular one at this time of year.

#### **4.2.9. Incidents in Murray Place**

Mr Pead reported that there had been a number of incidents in Murray Place at night, people were trying to gain entry through the rear entrance of Ogsdens, but to do this they had to clamber over/through adjacent gardens and walls. Cllr Sangster acknowledged that he'd had some emails on the matter and was going to speak to the manager at Ogston's to see if he was aware of the matter. Cllr Sangster Councillor Sangster advised to call the Police on the non-emergency telephone No. and then ask for the Night Time Noise Team.

#### **4.2.10. Noise at Criterion Bar**

Miss Rowe had been told by someone living close to the Criterion Bar of the noise levels at night, which was affecting their sleep. Cllr Sangster advised Miss Rowe to give them the police control number, so that the Noise Team could be contacted.

#### **4.2.11. Loches Representatives Visit**

13 of a delegation are to visit St Andrews along with the Mayor and two Deputy Mayors during the St Andrews Festival Week. Dr Goudie asked if it would cause problems for the Civic Reception. Cllr Sangster noted that the Mayor usually liked to give a speech at the reception. Mr Crichton commented that a similar request had been made last year by the Mayor to make a speech, but this had been refused on the basis that he was just another guest. Mr Crichton added that if he set a precedent with letting a guest make a speech, it would be difficult to stop other guests asking to do so. Cllr Sangster reminded the meeting that it was the decision of the Community Council 12 years ago to go for cultural links. Dr Goudie felt that the request ought to be considered perhaps drawing a distinction between the main representative of foreign guests and local guests.

### **4.3. Robin Waterston**

#### **4.3.1. St Andrews Partnership**

Cllr Waterston and Cllr Morrison have been appointed as Fife Council representatives on the Partnership. He commented that he was reasonably optimistic that the Partnership would be something new. He felt that it was unfortunate that St Andrews World Class was called what it was called and that it had a very poor reputation for a number of things. He felt that it was important to think of the new body as something fresh and accountable. He felt that the directors would strive to ensure accountability. Four more directors are due to be appointed following an advertisement in the local press and Cllr Waterston hoped that this would ensure that the Partnership was not just a collection of interest groups. He hoped that the Partnership would become an accepted part of St Andrews, and added that lots of towns and cities had similar setups.

#### **4.3.2. Local Plan**

Cllr Waterston reminded the meeting about the Local Plan, and a day's exhibition of the Plan on the 13<sup>th</sup> November in the Supper Room of the Town Hall. He hoped to get the close time extended to 20.00 from 19.00

### **4.3.3. Balancing the Books**

There is to be a consultation on the 2010 Budget for Fife Council at the Town Hall on the 20<sup>th</sup> November between 15.00 and 19.00. Cllr Waterston acknowledged that the budget would be extremely hard to set, given all the financial problems being experienced by Government.

### **4.3.3. Flooding**

He had witnessed the worst of the local flooding. He acknowledged the difficulty in working out the best solution to reducing the risk, but recognised the need to try and get a solution as a matter of urgency. He commented that the weather was a 1:100 years event, but that such events were becoming more common.

Mrs Denyer commented on the folly of building in a flood plain.

Cllr Waterston acknowledged the need to learn from these events and plan more effectively in future. He acknowledged the need to have better contact arrangements, with more staff possibly being required when such events were predicted to occur to answer to emergency calls. He mentioned the inadequacies of the Victorian Drainage system and its inability to cope with extreme events. Broken field drains in fields above Lamberton Place were also an issue, which needed to be addressed with local farmers and their management of this system. He acknowledged the need to look at both the long term and the immediate issues.

Dr Goudie commented on the fact that recently installed drainage tanks were failing to cope with such events. Cllr Waterston thought that the broken fields drains above the tanks didn't help, putting extra pressure on the tanks by increasing water flow into the tanks. The farmer had also ploughed against the contour lines, despite advice not to do so.

Mr Pead acknowledged the need for action on such a situation. He felt that it would be nice to know that something could be done to assist householders. Cllr Waterston acknowledged this and reminded the meeting that the Councillor still had to fight to get the area prioritised when funding was being allocated. He reminded the meeting of the Fife and Scotland wide aspects of the problem. NE Fife had to compete with the rest of Fife for such funding.

Mr Skelhon commented that the sewer down Largo Road hadn't been upgraded to cope with all the extra building at the top end of Largo Road. He said that the local roads were getting flooded even in times of normal rainfall. He was critical of the way plans could be passed without thought to the knock on effects, from the disruption to the natural flow of water to the concreting of so much land.

### **4.3.4. Market Street Drains**

Miss Rowe reported a smell coming from the drains in Market Street. She had heard that this might be due to a restaurant/take away putting material down the drains, which it shouldn't. Cllr Waterston reminded the meeting about the campaign last year by Scottish Water to stop consumers, be they businesses or private households putting material down the drains, particularly cooking oils, which might block them or cause pollution.

### **4.3.5. Harbour Area Application for Flats**

Miss Uprichard asked if the applicants for this application could revert to the previous application? The applicants had been successful in their first application, but had put in an altered application, which had been rejected. Cllr Waterston didn't think the applicants would, but acknowledged that they could appeal.

## **4.4. Dorothea Morrison –**

### **4.4.1. Flooding Issues**

Cllr Morrison related her experiences in connection with the recent flooding. She expressed her disappointment at the police reaction to some of her concerns. She agreed with Cllr Waterston's assessment that the berms in the Kinnessburn were ineffectual due to the scale of the flooding and would have been even if they'd been cleared. She also commented upon the problems of poor field drain maintenance by some farmers and the broader issue of building on a flood plain. She added that Councillors needed to look at the issues brought about by increased episodes of flooding and extreme weather, and how these might be best tackled in future.

#### 4.4.2. Cycle Track around St Andrews

In relation to the earlier discussion about the problem with the right of way along the Kinnessburn behind the Knightsbridge development, Cllr Morrison indicated that this area had been included as part of a possible round St Andrews cycle route. The developer Knightsbridge had apparently previously promised to improve the right of way to allow it to be used for pedestrian/cycle access. Cllr Morrison voiced her concern if it appeared that Knightsbridge wasn't keeping to this promise. Dr Goudie asked if the right of way had been firmly established. Cllr Morrison confirmed that in her understanding it was a right of way and the Preservation Trust had identified it as a part of a potential pedestrian/cycle route round the town.

#### 4.4.3. St Andrews Partnership

Cllr Morrison felt that the Partnership was acutely conscious of previous criticism and the poor reputation of St Andrews World Class in the public mind. She announced that the launch of the Partnership would be the 26<sup>th</sup> November with interested parties encouraged to register their interest before the event.

## 5. Planning Committee

### 5.1. Local Plan

Miss Uprichard related her attempts to persuade Fife Council to recognise the importance of providing the Community Council with a full copy of the Local Plan and related material, given the imminent start of the period of public consultation. She made the meeting aware of the huge quantity of material, which has been produced. In her correspondence with Fife Council she expressed her dissatisfaction with the methods available to the average member of the public in accessing the material. This included downloading from the Fife website, paying a large sum for a hard copy or going to the library and downloading pages to be photocopied at 10p a page. She suggested that more copies of the local plan in hard copy should be made available to other relevant local bodies, to allow for easier access of the material to more members of the public. She also felt that it was unreasonable for local people to have to drive to Cupar to access a report relating to the responses to the Structure Plan, which she felt were relevant to the upcoming Local Plan consultation. Without easier access to material, which was relevant, she thought that the response to the consultation could be poor. She had written to Fife Council on the matter of the Structure Plan responses. Dr Goudie thanked Miss Uprichard for her work in this matter. He commented on the way that consultations always seem to have to be at Xmas.

Mr Paul agreed that it was very difficult to look at the Local Plan on the Internet, but a friend had shown him how to access all the sections on the Internet. He was happy to forward details of access to anyone interested. He had also printed off copies of the St Andrews section for interested parties. Finally he wondered whether the Community Council were going to put on an exhibition on the Local Plan? He suggested the use of the Victory Memorial Hall to mount an exhibition over St Andrews weekend, with members of the Planning Committee volunteering to man the event and answer questions. He felt that there would be better public participation if people could see boards, whereas he doubted the same level of public response to a mainly web based consultation. He wondered about the possibility of borrowing the material to be used at the short consultation on the 13<sup>th</sup> November, which was to take place in the Supper Room of the Town Hall.

Miss Uprichard thought that the proposal was a good one, but reminded the meeting that the 13<sup>th</sup> November presentation would allow members of the public to question Fife Council officials. She also talked about the idea of a Community Council newsletter and mentioned that the Preservation Trust would be issuing a newsletter. She felt that it was important that members of the public didn't rush to comment before they had the most important facts to hand in an easily digestible form.

Mr Paul also suggested that the Preservation Trust and the Greenbelt Forum could be asked to join in his proposed exhibition and display their material, even if it had a different emphasis to the Community Council. He also felt that the Community Council shouldn't be telling people what to think, but should be facilitating understanding what the debate is, so that people could make informed comments. Dr Goudie replied that Mr Paul's initiative in circulating the St Andrews part of the document was helpful. He recognised that the manner in which the information was presented needed some consideration. Mr Paul felt that something needed to be done soon given the time scale of the consultation. He felt that a decision needed to be made before too much time was lost. He wanted to know how things would be progressed.

Dr Goudie felt that it was inevitable that the decision by the Community Council on the Local Plan had to be reached, first of all by detailed discussion, then drafting of a letter and then full agreement of the Council on the letter, which he acknowledged was bound to be a lengthy procedure. He wondered about seeing whether it would be possible to get Fife Council officials to agree to let the Community Council take

a decision at its January meeting. If not, then he acknowledged that there might need to be a special meeting to take a decision, if the response proved contentious.

In relation to encouraging a public response, he felt that a newsletter was needed, but didn't think that it would be possible to get anything out before the latter end of the month. The notion of using the Victory Memorial Hall was then discussed. Dr Goudie hoped that it might be possible to use official materials, in conjunction with some views from the Community Council appended. Mr Murphy related his past experience in a similar exercise in his area in 2005. He and some friends leafleted the area and managed to get a good response to a meeting at which members of the public were able to express their opinions and find out more about the issue. He reminded the meeting that the Community Council should be listening to the public. He felt that the idea of the Exhibition was very important as a way of allowing the Community Council show what was being proposed and what areas the Community Council had concerns about.

Cllr Waterston acknowledged the importance of the next couple of months. He agreed that as many people as possible should be encouraged to put in their thoughts in a way that would be heard. He didn't however feel that obtaining more hard copies was the way forward. He felt that there were two parts of the Plan, which were important, one was the part, which specifically affected St Andrews, and the policies, which were common to North East Fife. He also felt that the more recent work by Alison Grant was important in terms of the landscape analysis. He offered to get more copies printed out for CC members as requested. He felt that it was possible to navigate through the Web to find the necessary pages, with help if necessary from staff at the Library and local office. The thing, which he added was likely to complicate some of the discussion and responses, was the status of the Structure Plan. He reminded the meeting that the Structure Plan was approved, but the legal challenge currently ongoing would not be heard until sometime in 2010. He acknowledged that if the challenge was successful and the Structure Plan was returned to Fife Council for amendment, which could impact upon the St Andrews and East Fife Local Plan. He added that while the Structure Plan is still extant, responses to the Local Plan, which ignored the Structure Plan, would be ignored. He felt that responses could have two parts, one might relate to the concern about the number of houses, however if the legal challenge was not successful, the comments regarding a different number of houses would be ignored. He thought that if responses were to be valid and useful, they should say more about the actual choices and options in relation to St Andrews.

Ms Uprichard in reply commented that she didn't see the Local Landscape Designation Review in the Local Plan material for consultation. She also noted the absence of the considerable number of objections from the public and various organisations. Cllr Waterston acknowledged that he'd understood that it was to be consulted upon at this stage, but officials have advised him that it is the outlook that is to be consulted upon, which is the actual designation of the candidate SLA's in the Local Plan. He felt that the content of the Review was important, but that there were relatively small numbers of pages relating to St Andrews. Ms Uprichard in reply commented that in her assessment the Local Plan and the Tay Plan were on a collision course, especially if the Structure Plan challenge was successful, as the Local Plan was due to be approved in 2011 and the Tay Plan possibly later the same year. If Fife had to rethink aspects of the Structure Plan, she thought that the Tay Plan would take over as she couldn't see Fife Council getting the Structure Plan through due processes before the Tay Plan took over. She felt that it was difficult to see how far the Local Plan process could go, especially if the legal challenge to the Structure Plan was successful. Miss Uprichard wondered if the credit crunch had been taken into account, as it would make the possibility of 1000+ houses less viable.

Dr Goudie emphasised the need to currently look at what the Community Council needed to do in the short term. He acknowledged that there was some support for Mr Paul's suggestion of an exhibition. He was however uncertain about the possibility of co-operating with the Preservation Trust and Green Belt Forum on the idea, as there had been difficulties over the summer in getting mutual agreement. He felt that it was a controversial idea and welcomed views on it from the meeting. Mr Paul felt that debate should be facilitated even if we didn't like what the other organisations might say. He felt that he wanted to listen to what others had to say, be it Fife Council or the Green Belt Forum. He thought that the Community Council should be encouraging people to come in and ask questions. They should be then encouraged to write to Fife Council with their concerns. Dr Goudie felt that the Planning Committee should approve displayed materials. He also noted that there was general approval of Mr Paul's suggestion. Mr Paul nominated Mr Murphy to organise the exhibition. Dr Goudie wondered if there was sufficient manpower to run the event? Mr Paul reminded the meeting that those who volunteered to help run the Photo Exhibition when it was to be in the Victory Memorial Hall, would presumably still be available to assist, and he felt that if there was the odd hour in which no one was available, that wouldn't be a major concern. Dr Goudie wasn't certain if the same Community Councillors willing to oversee the Photo/ Art Exhibition would be willing to answer questions on the intricacies of planning matters. Mr Paul felt that as Community Councillors we should engage with the community.

Mr Murphy thought that the Community Councillors manning the Exhibition would do their best to answer questions, with a chance to leave questions, which could be followed up later. Mr Murphy saw as the object of the exercise to get as many people as possible to express their opinion to the Council.

Dr Goudie concluded that the Community Council had agreed on the general principle of attempting to set up the exhibition, with a remit back to the Planning Committee to proceed with the details. Mr Paul said that it might be possible to see what was available on the 13<sup>th</sup> November from the Council display.

## **5.2. Planning Committee Report – see minutes for meetings report**

No comments

## **6. Matters Arising**

### **6.1. Election of New Councillors – Update**

Mr Marks informed the meeting that Mr Primmer was the only candidate to date. Miss Uprichard asked if Mr Primmer could speak to the meeting on his background. Mr Primmer gave a brief resume of his personal/professional and family background, as well as his reason for wanting to stand for the Community Council. Dr Goudie proposed that Mr Primmer be co-opted to the Council. This proposal was met with unanimous approval.

### **6.2. Art and Photography Exhibition – Update**

Mr Paul explained that following concerns expressed by the Photographic Club about disabled access, he'd thought to contact the Byre Theatre and they'd been more than happy to host the Exhibition for free. Some of the local schools have agreed to try and put in exhibits. There will be a reception on the 25<sup>th</sup> November between 6 and 7.

### **6.3. Report from Arms Convenor**

Held in camera

### **6.4. Climate Challenge Fund – update**

Mr Murphy reported that there had been 4 tenders for the cycle project. Because one of the tenders was quite high, but was also potentially the best tender – SUSTRANS, the application for this project will be put forward at the final funding round in February 2010.

With respect to the Renewable Energy Tenders, two firms had sent in details and this application will go ahead for the next funding round in November.

Mr Murphy thanked Roddy Yarr for the work he'd put into preparing the tenders.

The Energy Insulation Project, which is the biggest potential project will hopefully go ahead for the February 2010 funding round.

He also mentioned an ENLEN Meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> November at the Gateway.

### **6.5. Civic Reception**

Mr Paul reported that he'd got 60 names, but was still happy to take other names as there would be a number who would not be able to attend. The Reception would take place 4.30 – 5.30 pm, then out to the Beating of the Retreat. The Catering has been sorted. Kate Hughes has funded the bulk of the costs with the Community Council contributing £150. Dr Goudie wondered about the possibility of a different venue in future years as he was conscious that the restriction on numbers could see worthy recipients left out. Mr Paul agreed that this could be a consideration in future years.



## **6.6. Reports from Representatives**

### **6.6.1. RAF Leuchars Community Forum**

Mr Fraser reported a couple of points from this meeting. Cllr Brett was still campaigning for an extension of the Leuchars Station car park. If this was possible St Andrews Community Council would be invited to any meeting on the proposal as a stakeholder.

Cllr Brett also mentioned that a substantial sum was to be made available for improvements to the Eden Estuary.

### **6.7. A.O.C.B.**

#### **6.7. Xmas Lights**

Jude Innes reported on behalf of Kate Hughes. The switching on of the Xmas lights would be a smaller affair and just in Church Square. There would be mulled apple juice, ginger bread, mince pies etc. The lights are to be switched on at 5pm. The lights would be in South Street, Bell Street, Church Street and Church Square, but not Market Street. Dr Goudie asked about finances. Ms Innes said that any donation would be gratefully received to allow an extension of the areas lit. Dr Goudie acknowledged that the Community Council wouldn't be able to make a donation this year because of financial circumstances.

## **7. Committee Reports**

### **7.1 Recreation Committee**

Mr Paul outlined the responsibilities of the Recreation Committee. Kyffin Roberts agreed to take on the role of Convenor. Mr Pead put in a plea for advance planning of events to allow for budgeting.

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

#### **7.3. 200 Club**

Mrs Judith Harding has agreed to take on the role of 200 Club Convenor

200 Club winners this month are Patrick Marks, Zoe Smith and D R Watson

#### **7.4. Health, Education and Welfare Committee**

Mr Paul reported that while there had not been a meeting under the specific banner of HEW, there had been two meetings about education. Mr Paul also commented upon the need to record the sub meetings and put the minutes into the agenda. He noted that there were no records of these meetings. Dr Goudie in his reply acknowledged the lack of minutes and also the shortness of the notice for the second meeting in relation to the announcement about the proposed Madras College site. He also commented on a suggestion by Mr Marks that the statement agreed at the second of the meetings should be put on the web. However he felt that this had been overtaken to some extent by the University's announcement on the previous Tuesday that the site that they wanted was Langlands "B" at the top of the raised beach. This didn't come as a surprise to Dr Goudie and members of the Planning Committee. Dr Goudie explained the rationale behind the decision to issue a statement. He expressed surprise that Mr Paul had viewed the decision as undemocratic. Mr Paul replied that he felt that such an important decision should have been confirmed in full CC meeting. He had no objections to holding sub meetings to clarify CC position but he felt that the position should be presented to everyone, with the meeting minuted, so that there would be no illusion at a later date about what was voted for. He commented that our difficulty with the Arms had come about because a small group, not the full Community Council, had made a decision. Dr Goudie felt that the recent meetings had been more positive than Mr Paul claimed with more than half the Community Council at one of the meetings, though he acknowledged the short notice for the second meeting. He felt that the meetings were able to gather together varying views. Mr Paul said he didn't disagree with the gist of Dr Goudie's comments, but still felt that it was important to take a vote on such a major issue at full Council. He felt that at the moment an objection couldn't be put up with confidence, as the views of all the Community Council members on the merits of the site preferred by the University weren't known.

Dr Goudie explained that at the first meeting, it had been agreed that the least contentious of the sites was the lower one at the North Haugh, basically because it conformed with the view of the Madras parents and

it wasn't Kilrymont. He went on to explain the balancing act, which the Community Council had to make, given this latter view and the views of many St Andrews residents concerned about the threat of a western development. He added that as always in planning matters, views to some extent were driven by a deadline, which he had thought was worth meeting in order to be able to get a statement to the press ahead of Tuesday's meeting. He reminded the meeting that it would also be some time before there was an actual planning application for a new school, and at such times the Planning Committee usually brought such a major submission before the full Council. Mr Paul commented that from his understanding there would indeed now be a delay, and that the decision wouldn't be made at the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, but would be put back for a few months. Dr Goudie didn't feel that this meant that the school issue could be put on the back burner, but would remain part of the issues to be addressed in the local plan consultation. Mr Primmer thought that Fife Council would still try to progress plans for the school, and go for planning permission within the next few months. Mr Paul reminded the meeting that when he talked about parents, it included parents with children at the feeder Primary Schools. He acknowledged that for children already at Madras there was little likelihood they'd move to the new school. Dr Goudie expressed his concern at the extent to which parent and public opinion was being manipulated on this matter. He had concerns about the way the University seemed to be trying to "sell" the benefits of Langlands "B" site. Miss Uprichard reminded the meeting that there were still three sites and matters would be decided through the local plan consultation. She couldn't understand how the school site could be separated from the local plan even with the University giving one particular site its blessing.

## **8. New Business**

### **8.1. Scottish Government Consultation - Education Legislation**

For information

### **8.2. Balancing the Books - Have Your Say! - Fife Council Consultation**

For information

### **8.3. ASCC National Conference 14/11/09**

For information. Mr Marks and Mrs Ashworth will attend.

### **8.4. SUSCOD Project Launch – 18/11/09 at Scores Hotel**

For information

### **8.5. BT Phone Kiosk Adoption**

For information

### **8.6. Community Consultation – Fife Housing Partnership – Local Housing Strategy for Fife**

Two consultation meetings on the 26<sup>th</sup> November in the Lower College Hall between 2-4 and 7-9.

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

### **9.1. Chair**

Dr Goudie reported on the resignation of Mr Larry Reed and the need to fill his post of Vice Chairman. This matter to be left to the December meeting.

### **9.2. Treasurer**

#### **9.2.1. Treasurer's Report**

Our financial position remains challenging and my 5 recommendations remain as stated in my previous reports, but would like to stress that if we wish to support similar events throughout 2010, then fundraising measures need to be planned early in the New Year.

We also, at present, have no means by which to replenish the Millennium Fund which should stand at £3,666.00p.

## **9.3 Secretary**

### **9.3.1. Correspondence – see appendix**

Mr Marks mentioned the receipt of a letter asking for a renewal of the subscription to the Association for the Preservation of Rural Scotland (APRS).

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

No AOCB.

The meeting then continued in camera with a report from the Arms Convenor, Mr Paul.