

# Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

## Provisional Minutes – February 2010

### 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

Dave Finlay, Ken Fraser, Patrick Marks, Ian Goudie, Marysia Denyer, Judith Harding, Derek Skelhon, Andy Primmer, Kyffin Roberts, Ronnie Murphy, Penny Uprichard, Catherine Rowe, Izzy Corbin

### Students' Association Representatives

### Nominated

### Co-Opted

### Fife Councillors

Robin Waterston, Dorothea Morrison

### Apologies

Bill Sangster, Frances Melville, Jill Hardie, Carol Ashworth, Holly West, Ray Pead, Jude Innes

## 2. Minutes of January 2010 Meeting

3.2. Page 4 – Para beginning, "Mr Roberts", second line, the wording "and was not keen on items 5,6 and 7" to be replaced with "and found items 5, 6 and 7 unacceptable".

3.2. Page – 3 – Para beginning "Mr Howden then commented", line 7 beginning, "Cllr Morrison". Cllr Morrison felt that the wording, "even at around £28 it was very good value" should be deleted as she hadn't mentioned the cost – to be replaced with, "Cllr Morrison felt that it was good value".

Mr Marks appreciated the pre-meeting comments sent in by members to amend minutes.

## 3. Presentations

### 3.1. Madras College by Mr A Paul and Mr J McLaughlin

Mr Paul thanked the Community Council for the invitation to give an update and introduced himself as Fife Council's Asset Manager. He introduced Mr McLaughlin as a Senior Education Manager with a special responsibility for Madras College.

He started by putting the Madras project in context, as one of six Fife Council school projects, which are part of "Building Fife's Future" programme. Two projects are currently in flight, while the Madras College replacement project business case is to be put to Committee in April.

He said that he was conscious of the recent Community Council concerns expressed in its newsletter, in relation to a replacement Madras College. He felt that the best way to address the meeting was to reply to these concerns on a point-by-point basis.

He started by giving some recent background history to the project. A report had been taken to Education Children's Services Committee in August 2009. What that report did was consider a range of options for the location of Madras. Having worked through the options, they recommended to the Committee, three options, which were worthy of further consideration. One was the rebuilding of Kilrymont, a second for the purposes of comparison was the status quo and the third was an unidentified site within St Andrews

West area, possibly to be developed in conjunction with the University. They provided the Committee with an update in November, explaining the progress they had made to date with the University. That report looked at the benefits of joint investment and provision of accommodation. In December 2009 Mr Paul took a report to the Finance Committee, which set out the principles of a joint venture with the University. A memorandum of understanding had been set out between the University and Fife Council. These reports were approved and Mr Paul; and his colleagues are now working on producing a business case for the new Madras.

Mr McLaughlin started by talking about the almost unique nature of the educational provision at Madras College in a Scottish context. It is one of the last split site schools in Scotland. Because of the catchment area, a very large number of children come to the heart of St Andrews by bus during term time. There are major transport issues in relation to the need for teachers to move between buildings. Another aspect, which makes Madras special, is its proximity to St Andrews University. He felt that there was an opportunity to make something of this proximity of school and university. He thought that something unique could be done for Scottish education, by that he meant the provision of a learning campus for a whole range of activities and not concentrate solely on 11- 18 education in the standard way, as provided by other Secondary Schools in Fife. He said that the discussions they'd had with the University had been in terms of co-location. He added that from the discussions, more and more combinations had emerged which would mutually benefit both parties and could benefit Scottish Education generally. Apart from Physical Education, there were serious discussions about Sciences, Music and Additional Support needs to name three.

The reason that Mr McLaughlin said that Madras was almost unique, was the catchment group who attend Madras and year upon year perform better than any school in Fife in relation to Higher and Advanced Higher provision. He claimed that Madras is one of the few schools in Fife where pupils applied to the top-notch universities, such as Oxford and Cambridge. He thought that to combine with the University would give the pupils opportunities to extend their learning to a point well beyond the normal ability of a school alone to provide. He felt in terms purely of education the opportunities provided in the St Andrews area should not be lost. He also felt that this combination could provide opportunities not only within the local catchment, but also beyond, if courses and provision could be organised. He thought that Madras could in this context be a national and possibly international centre of excellence in certain areas.

He went on to mention his attendance at a public meeting in the Tayport/Newport area, where local parents were concerned about bussing issues and had brought forward the same arguments about a Tay Bridgehead school. The Rector of Madras, Ian Jones and Mr McLaughlin had made a presentation, and convinced the parents, that the co-located school was the best option for their children. He acknowledged past mistakes by Fife Council in helping parents understand the benefits of a single site school.

Mr McLaughlin commented on his past experience in building new schools in other parts of Fife under PPP. He felt that this investment was benefiting the pupils and staff in these schools. He added that there were a very significant number of schools in Fife, which still needed such investment. He cited Waid Academy as needing investment to bring it up to date, and added that the Education Service was concerned that a delay to the Madras development could have the risk factor of losing the capital fund, and making the Madras issue drop down the priority list and other schools move up the list. The Council saw the development of a new Madras as a priority. He cited a school development in the Leven area, which had been opposed by local people and not built.

He then turned to what he viewed as positive areas of the ongoing project. He felt that there had been significant progress in working with the University.

Dr Goudie then asked Mr Paul to begin addressing the questions raised by the Community Council. He reminded Mr Paul and the meeting that he didn't see the meeting as addressing all of the project issues, and that the Community Council had in the past month put in a submission to say that it didn't want to make a judgement until it had seen a planning application.

Mr Paul said that he was happy to share what he could. He acknowledged that the project was still a work in progress and he didn't have answers about everything.

The first question related to the effects of traffic. Fife Council envisaged that the principle access point for car and bus traffic would be the A91. The existing road into the University Sports Centre would remain, but be largely used by service traffic. A general strategy was to split pedestrian and vehicle traffic. Work is being done with the University to map out and enhance pedestrian and cycle routes, as a way to encourage more pupils to get to school by these means, rather than being dropped off by car. He cited examples of where this idea had been tried, but acknowledged that it hadn't been universally successful. He envisaged the development of a school travel plan.

The second question related to the sharing of sports facilities. Mr McLaughlin said that he and his staff were working with the University on this issue. There had been an extensive exercise in looking at current

usage at school, university and community. They had come to the conclusion, particularly in relation to Physical Education that they could deliver the range of services currently provided with certainty. In relation to concerns about cost, he added that Fife Council had policies of encouraging healthy living and wouldn't want to price facilities beyond the willingness of users to pay, and thought that there could be a set up to give preferential pricing to local users. He also added that with Madras College being the most heavily used facility of its type in the county, it would be hoped that this could be continued. He cited examples of other school new builds, where community use has continued to be possible. Mr Paul envisaged that the facilities, which could be built into the new school, could be of a standard to allow joint use with the University for larger events, such as conferences.

The third question related to climate change. Mr Paul emphasised Fife Council's aim to be a green Council. Fife Council he said are envisaging a state of the art, energy efficient building. Fife Council wants to achieve an excellent rating in terms of energy efficiency, using an industry standard to measure what they want to achieve. He added that it would not be possible to support two state of the art facilities on the available budget. Fife Council is discussing with the University how to maximise the energy efficiency and achieve maximum sustainability. One idea being investigated is the possibility of plugging into a district heating system being considered by the University to supply the North Haugh Campus. This would not be affordable if considered by Fife Council alone as a system just for a new Madras College.

Mr McLaughlin claimed that parents in the Newport/Tayport area were very much enthused by an appropriate development of the University. However should Fife Council move to an alternative position and build two schools, he claimed that a significant number of parents would swap school, resulting in a considerable number of families wanting to transport their children individually into St Andrews to obtain benefit from the school. He claimed this to be a reality. He added that for a whole host of reasons, the best provision Fife Council could make for the entirety of the catchment area would be to build on a single site in St Andrews. He claimed that this was now a strong wish of these parents, who previously were not fully aware of what was on offer for them. Mr Paul added that another benefit for the town would be the diversion of the school traffic coming from the north into the town, slightly reducing traffic impact upon St Andrews.

The fourth question was about South Street and Kilrymont. In relation to Madras South Street, there is a memorandum of understanding that the historic part would transfer to the University. In return Fife Council would obtain title to the site of the new school. Fife would still retain the modern part of Madras, South Street In relation to Kilrymont, Fife Council would put it on the market to test whether anyone would want to take it on in its original form. If there is no interest, Fife Council would have to consider what other steps might need to be taken in relation to the site.

The fifth question was about views from the Golf Courses. Mr McLaughlin ascertained that this related to the issue of the sight line. He said that some work had been done to check out this issue. He understanding was following discussions with the University, that it might be possible to have a three story building and not affect the sight line. He thought that this would be tested through the planning process. He felt that it was difficult to give a clear answer as there was no building plan drawn up to allow this to be further investigated. In reply to a query from Dr Goudie, he explained that one part of the process would be to put down a footprint, based on an existing building to see how it might fit upon the site. He added that Fife Council were viewing the new Madras as an "iconic building", which would not only have to fit in with the site, but with the ambience of St Andrews.

Mr Paul followed Mr McLaughlin's comments and said the philosophy of the Project team was that "form should follow function". The team had done quite a lot of work with Mr Jones, the rector and other colleagues at looking at a detail of the composition that's would be required of the school, the relationship between the subject areas, the movement of pupils and the core facilities required. As part of the business case process, they would be working in detail with the University, to hear more about their aims and aspirations about how they would see the new school working. The aim would be to have a cohesive solution that would meet the needs of both organisations. They recognise in relation to this development, that there is a huge amount of expectation. Fife Council recognize that the new Madras will be an important public building, that has to be seen and present itself as such. Once the various studies mentioned earlier have been completed, they will be able to look at the "skin" of the building.

Mr McLaughlin then talked about the issue of a safe lunchtime regime for pupils. He felt that Fife Council had moved on considerably in relation to lunch hours for pupils and the health agenda was one of the key drivers. He thought that building the new school would enable Fife Council to offer attractive lunches to young people, potentially reducing the number of pupils going down to town for their lunch. However he acknowledged that it was not a matter of corralling the pupils into the school for the lunch hour. He also talked about safe routes to/from school and described how this would be part of the process of planning a new Madras. Fife Council had an obligation to look at safer routes to/from schools. Mr McLaughlin hoped that with alternative options to occupy a lunch hour available on the new school campus, that there would

be less temptation for pupils to want to leave the campus at lunchtime. He also briefly commented upon the current links between academics at the University and Madras, many of which he felt were very successful. He then talked about the Co-Location Working Group, which reported to Fife Council. He cited an example in relation to microbiology, which he said might be studied by a small number of Madras pupils at senior level, and how working with the University on that particular aspect, in terms of resource requirement would be a sensitive approach.

He then commented upon the fact that the size of Madras College enabled it to offer a very broad curriculum, something he claimed that a smaller school, the size of Waid would be unable to do. He added that co-location would enhance these benefits.

Mr Paul explained some of the options that Fife Council had considered for the Langlands site. Access was recognised as a key issue. A number of options, such as enhancing the present service road were considered, but rejected, with the access from the A91 for vehicular traffic and other routes for pedestrian/cycle traffic more appropriate. A car park might be located at the bottom of the escarpment. Mr Paul went on to acknowledge, that because of the cost of developing the access road and car park, Fife Council recognising that there might be development in St Andrews West, might want to consider whether the developer would contribute towards the cost of an access road.

Mr McLaughlin answered a question about the Station Park playing fields. He acknowledged the value of the facilities and made it clear that there was no plan to sell off Station Park. Mr Paul added that there was a joint memorandum of understanding with the University about managing sporting facilities, such as Station Park.

Dr Goudie sought clarification on the continuing school use of Station Park and also asked about any plans for a safe crossing of the A91. Mr McLaughlin in reply acknowledged the need, but felt that this would be addressed during the development of the new school. He recognised the problem of an underpass, but accepted that a bridge might be an answer. Mr Paul added that with regards to the school curriculum, most of the needs of pupils could be met up at the joint University/school facilities during week. Mr McLaughlin confirmed Mr Paul's comments on this matter, commenting that Station Park tended to be mostly used on Saturdays by teams, most of who were mini-bussed to the site. He added, that he was avoiding saying that there was no guarantee that the bridge would be built.

Dr Goudie opened the discussion to questions of clarification from Councillors. Mr Roberts commented that at the recent Headon presentation, the implication was that the school was very much part of the western development and that you wouldn't get one without the other. Mr Roberts wanted reassurance that the school development would be separate, not linked. Mr Paul confirmed that the school was viewed as a separate development. He then qualified his answer by saying that as part of the planning application process, they might seek to procure facilities for the University, that would be developed in conjunction with the school at the same time. He went on to say that Mr Headon or any party that acted on his behalf would submit no application. Mr McLaughlin added that there had been no discussions between himself and the Rector, Mr Jones and any developer, and that the Education Service's function was to deliver a new school. He recognised that there had been recent concerns following presentations on the Local Plan about a possible link, but reassured the meeting that there would be no link and that the application for a new school would not be contingent on any development proposals for S Andrews West, but would be a stand alone application.

Miss Uprichard started by commenting that three sites were noted as being under consideration in the local plan. She reminded Mr Paul about his statement about "Building Fife's Future", which covered six projects. She asked if this had been out to consultation and how it fitted with the local plan? Mr Paul replied that it hadn't been out for consultation as it was part of Fife's Capital Investment Plan. He added that it took its roots in the manifestos of the Administration. There would be consultation on individual projects.

Miss Uprichard in reply commented that although the school site was being consulted upon in the Local Plan, and the Local Plan programme was to go until late 2011, the present proposals would be effectively taking over the school proposals from the Local Plan exercise before it's completion. Mr Paul acknowledged that the options in the Local Plan were possible options for location, but weren't intended to be prescriptive. He added that Fife Council's preferred site is the one opposite the University Sports Centre. If the business case for the site is approved a planning application will follow. Miss Uprichard felt that the procedure seemed to be quite misleading, and she couldn't understand how consultation on the Local Plan which wouldn't be completed for some time, and would appear to be a paper exercise, could be taken into account before the planning application. Mr McLaughlin in reply, said that he could understand the concerns of local people in relation to the Local Plan, a broad Fife Council Strategic Plan and a set of building proposals coming from an Education Service. He added that in the main the Education Service had to put proposals forward when they had their capital programme. The difficulty was that if a school weren't built until the Local Plan was fully consulted and approved or the broad Strategic Plan approved, the plans for new schools would remain inactive for a considerable period of time. His dept's obligation

was to have an effective educational infrastructure for Fife children as soon as they could manage, within available resources. He recognised the difficulties in relation to the Local Plan, and said that they tried to indicate as best they could where a school might be. The consultation on the planning application will be crucial. He added that there had been similar difficulties across Fife involving the local plan and school developments.

Dr Goudie replying said that it was unfortunate within the St Andrews context that there always seemed to be reasons that things needed to be done on a one of basis. He felt that there was a lack of a coherent overview, citing the hospital development as a similar issue with the loss of funding as an alleged issue if decisions weren't taken within a certain timescale.

Mr Murphy asked what the budget was for the Madras project. Mr Paul replied that the capital in the Fife budget was £40 million, with the University putting in £10 million. Mr Murphy then asked whether it might be possible to build two smaller schools for the same amount. Mr Paul replied that that wouldn't be possible, based on his past experience. Mr Murphy asked if land price was a factor? Mr Paul replied that it wasn't unless the land had to be bought at the price equivalent to what was paid for land to have housing built upon it. Mr Murphy commented that Mr Paul had described an excellent set of benefits for Madras and the pupils, but wondered what the benefits for the University might be? Mr McLaughlin answered that the benefits might include the availability of a large meeting area for conferences, if the specifications were high enough. He also cited enhanced facilities for music study as a potential benefit. He emphasised the need to make best use of the facility for the whole community, not just the pupils or University. Mr Murphy also asked about which committee had responsibility for the decision. Mr Paul replied that the Education and Children's Services committee had the main responsibility.

Mr Fraser asked about possible child protection issues if pupils and students were sharing sporting facilities. Mr Paul said that this had been recognised, and the design of the school would address that issue. Mrs Harding wondered how many pupils were envisaged as attending the school? Mr Paul thought it would be between 1450 and 1500. Cllr Waterston gave a more precise figure for maximum numbers of 1482.

Miss Uprichard quoted from some press cuttings related to projected pupil numbers, with comments from Cllr Waterston and Sir Ming Campbell. Miss Uprichard wondered what work had been done subsequently to try and get a more accurate idea of school pupil numbers? Mr McLaughlin commented initially upon the previous school debate in St Andrews, about the closure of Grey Friars, and local concerns that the remaining primary schools wouldn't be able to cope with the numbers. He noted that both Canongate and Canongate, far from being full have empty classrooms, and that Lawhead is a single stream primary. He acknowledged the difficulty in predicting school roll figures. In relation to Madras they can be reasonably certain about the numbers coming from the local catchment, but that numbers from outside the area were less easy to predict. Miss Uprichard wondered why there was a new primary school envisaged in the local plan, if statistics for the local catchment were considered quite accurate. Mr McLaughlin acknowledged that in present circumstances it would be unlikely, but if there were a significant increase in school age population they would have to look at the requirements of primary education at that time. Miss Uprichard also asked about the consideration of an independent audit of the numbers. Mr McLaughlin replied that the independent audit had not taken place to his knowledge.

Dr Goudie commented that was it not the case, that the Structure Plan had a new primary school as a required item, to be provided by the St Andrews West developer. Mr McLaughlin said that it was standard policy to include the possible need for such provision in a large-scale development. Mr Paul said that there was a formula used by the planners to determine need for additional facilities. Dr Goudie pointed out the irony of using Scottish Govt population figures, given historical inaccuracies in estimating the population of St Andrews. He felt that Mrs Harding's question about numbers was very pertinent.

Mr McLaughlin said that they'd be happy to come back to meet the Community Council again to discuss this very important matter.

## **4. Fife Councillors**

### **4.1. Frances Melville**

Apologies.

### **4.2. Bill Sangster**

Apologies

### **4.3. Robin Waterston**

#### **4.3.1. Sands Committee**

Cllr Waterston had attended this committee, which is to do with the protection of the West Sands and other similar areas around St Andrews. The recent meeting had a presentation from Professor Robert Crawford, an expert on coastal environmental matters. Julian Ingles from Fife Coast and Countryside Trust was also at the meeting. He has been involved with a European wide project to protect coastal areas. A new body called the West Sands Management Working Group has been set up. An aim of the group is to develop a plan for sustainable coastal management. There would also be consultation with interested local groups from the University to local people. Cllr Waterston said that the problems were not to be underestimated, with particular concern about erosion at Outhead and the West Sands. He felt that there was a need to have a good, sustainable management plan. He hoped that they might be able to attract European funding for any project related to the area, from Sustainable Coastal Development.

#### **4.3.2. Fife Council Consultation Website**

Mr Primmer asked about this website. Mr Primmer said that he'd made a complaint to Fife Council about the problems of obtaining access. He understood that Fife Council was building a sort of portal to allow access to Council activities etc. However he'd not managed to find the Parking Plan or the Council budget via this website. Cllr Waterston responding said that his understanding was that the Consultation Portal is a Development Services vehicle for Local Plans and Strategic plans. He said that some responses had come through the portal. In relation to the Parking Plan there might be paper copies downstairs or at the library. Cllr Waterston suggested that information could be put on the Community Council website to assist people to know how and who to respond to on issues such as the Parking Plan. Mr Primmer added that he'd been mainly concerned about the difficulty in getting access to the consultations and felt that these should be more easily accessible to the public. Cllr Waterston acknowledged the difficulty.

#### **4.3.3. St Andrews West Strategic Development Framework**

Miss Uprichard asked Cllr Waterston about this matter, following an article in the Courier in which he'd been quoted as saying there should be more development upon low lying ground. There had also been a mention of this development framework, which would last thirty years. Miss Uprichard said that she'd not heard about this document and had phoned the local plan office and had managed to obtain a copy. She described it as a document put together by all of the developers, such as Headon and Mount Melville Estates. The document is the developer's view of what will happen in St Andrews for the next thirty years. The document appeared to have been produced and published around June 2009, but as Miss Uprichard pointed out does not appear in the background papers to the Local Plan. She said that a local official had told her that part of the Local Plan was based on this document, which was published between the consultation periods for the previous and current Local Plan. She wanted to know why it wasn't included in the background papers and what in the Local Plan had been based upon it?

Cllr Waterston replied that he came across this document around September 2009, but believed that it might have been included on a CD issued in June 2009, when the North East Fife Area Committee and the Planning Committee had been discussing the draft Local Plan. He added that it was referenced in the Local Plan as the "Strategic Development Framework", though he acknowledged that there could be confusion as there was also a map similarly titled. He thought that what was in the Local Plan that built on this document was principally the map in the Local Plan, called "Development Framework for St Andrews West". He added that local members were given a briefing in the spring by one of the planners, about what the thinking was behind the St Andrews West ideas. He acknowledged that it was clear that having seen this document that the presentation they were given was based on the thinking behind the idea of trying to think in terms of an integrated development over a period of thirty years. He said that Councillors were dismayed at the presentation, and even though changes were made subsequently to the ideas presented at the presentation, he wasn't certain if they were any more acceptable. In his own submission on the Local Plan, he had made it clear that he didn't think that what was in the Plan would protect the essential nature of St Andrews. He also believed that it was possible to find a way forward, in which alternative sites could be brought in use over a period of time, but if the economic circumstances don't permit, it needn't proceed in the fullness of time.

In relation to the specific document, Cllr Waterston said that it had been written by a firm called, Urban Initiatives who are architectural consultants acting on behalf of the various developers, and has been used by the developers in their own different ways to help put forward their proposals which they submitted to the Local Plan consultation. Miss Uprichard in her reply said that she was concerned about how this document could have been used to put an input into the Local Plan when it came between the two consultation periods and was not made available to the public. She wondered if some questions could be

asked about that matter? She also mentioned that in a recent exhibition there had been talk about 1500 houses, compared to the 1100 mentioned in the Structure Plan. Cllr Waterston in reply to Miss Uprichard's question about the numbers mentioned in the document said that the phrase "critical mass" was often used by the Headon Consortia as to what they saw as being the requirement for a sufficient size for a new hub. When asked, Mr Headon had suggested that the larger number included current housing north of Strathkinness High Road, down towards Hepburn Gardens, as part of the critical mass of the possible new community. At this size shops might be viable. He concluded that the 1500 was not intended to be all new housing, but part of the "critical mass".

In relationship to the democratic process, he commented upon the general nature of the consultation process. He acknowledged that this document should have been more obviously available as part of that process, but added that in any process there would be vast numbers of background documents, which he felt were not necessarily going to assist members of the public in deciding whether they liked or didn't like a particular proposal.

Cllr Morrison said that she spoken to the planners and found that there appeared to be two groups working in isolation, those doing the Structure Plan and those involved in the Local Plan. Cllr Morrison said that she'd pointed out to the latter group how the Structure Plan talked about a twenty-year period at the end of which, further development must be outside of St Andrews.

Cllr Waterston acknowledged that there was a mismatch between the thirty years quoted in the developers' document and the Structure Plan.

#### **4.3.4. Wheelie Bins**

Mrs Rowe commented upon the way wheelie bins are being left out well after the time they've been emptied. She felt that this should be reported as it was an obstruction and felt that there was no justification for those responsible for the bins to leave them on the pavement. She confirmed that these were bins belonging to local shop owners. Cllr Waterston said that she should report her observations to the Councillors and they'd speak to the Transportation officers to get the problem resolved.

#### **4.3.5. St Andrews Common Good Fund**

Cllr Waterston reported that the Common Good Fund paid £26000 to the Byre Theatre out of a total of around £60000 grants. Mr Crichton asked why the Byre was being paid so much given the fall in interest rates, which must affect the income to the Common Good Fund. Cllr Waterston understood that the amount was a fixed sum, but as he wasn't a member of the Board of Trustees of the Byre he couldn't comment further. It was suggested that the issue of the Byre financial arrangements could be brought to the attention of Cllr Sangster at the next Community Council meeting or before that date.

### **4.4. Dorothea Morrison**

#### **4.4.1. Meeting with SEPA/Scottish Water re flooding**

Cllr Morrison commented upon the previous week's meeting in Cupar about the Kinnessburn flooding. SEPA she thought were quite frustrating, claiming difficulty in certain matters, because of EU regulation on environmental matters. She felt that the Government needed to be contacted to discuss the difficulties with SEPA. She felt that the European Directive needed, which she didn't doubt was meant to ensure environmental benefits was being correctly interpreted by SEPA. Dr Goudie commented on the way that SEPA representatives had been quite negative about what appeared to be sensible suggestions mentioned at the meeting by Bob McLellan the Head of Transport in Fife Council. Mrs Rowe commented that the flooding hadn't been a problem in her younger years. She also commented that the channel under the bridge at St Mary Street was very narrow and a potential problem if blocked. Dr Goudie felt that the meeting showed the level of anger being felt with comments about direct action being taken a possibility. Cllr Waterston added that he recognised that it was extremely frustrating. He wanted to know about SEPA's view on the possible dangers/risks on going ahead with any work. He recognised that the channel for the Kinnesburn in the area was mainly artificial. He thought that all four Councillors would continue to pursue SEPA on the matter. The Councillors have got a promise of a meeting in a few months time on the matter. The Councillors would continue to work through the Head of Transport, Bob McLellan.

#### **4.4.2. Review of the winter maintenance scheme**

She asked local people who had any views on the effectiveness of the winter maintenance to contact local Councillors, so that their views and experiences could be carried forward to officials reviewing the scheme. Dr Goudie hoped that the various holes in local roads caused by the severe weather would be tackled soon.

## **5. Planning Committee**

### **5.1. Planning Committee Reports**

Mrs Denyer reported on the level of success in receiving requested plans. This appeared to be improving for the most part in the past couple of months. Mrs Denyer asked the Fife Councillors could assist in finding a suitable and affordable venue for their meetings. Cllr Waterston said that Fife Council didn't have any responsibility for finding venues for committees of Community Councils and thought that the grant given could be used towards costs incurred for committees using rooms in other premises. Mr Skelhon added that the room in Kilrymont was a good venue, but the only problem related to the lack of access during the school holidays. He felt that the Planning Committee should remain at Kilrymont and find a suitable alternative venue during the school holidays. Mrs Denyer agreed that she was happy with the Kilrymont facilities, but had wanted to be able to advise the treasurer of ongoing expenditure, even at the level of £5 per night.

### **5.2. Amendment to Planning Minutes**

Dr Goudie wanted it noted in the minute of the 11<sup>th</sup> January, that the objection from Mr Headon as to how the Community Council had proceeded in relation to the Local Plan consultation had been discussed. At the following meeting a response to his objection was agreed, and has been sent to him.

### **5.3. Castle Course Case**

Miss Uprichard wanted to comment on the Castle Course case. She had sent copies of correspondence to Councillors as requested, but had not so far received a response. Cllr Waterston said that he had also been pursuing this case. He had spoken to an official and received an email from another; the latter confirming that a response had been sent out, so hopefully should be received soon by Miss Uprichard.

## **6. Matters Arising**

### **6.1. Climate Challenge Fund Update**

Mr Murphy reported on progress. Roddy Yarr he felt had done an excellent job in getting letters of support from town representatives and groups. The three applications will go before the February meeting.

### **6.2. Reports from Representatives**

No reports.

### **6.3. Treasurers Report Query**

Mr Crichton had picked up from the previous minutes an issue relating to the Treasurer's comments about the Ceilidh and the Old Folks Treat continuing in the name of the Community Council. Mr Crichton said that without a shadow of a doubt that these events did not come within the orbit of the Community Council, but were now run under the banner, St Andrews Events. He reminded the meeting that this body had it's own constitution, bank account etc. He added that the Community Council had no say in the running of the events. He didn't think that the Community Council treasurer could ask St Andrews Events to show it's books to Community Council, but could request the accounts from OSCAR. Dr Goudie proposed the holding of a GP meeting partly to discuss this issue. He added that his understanding had been that the St Andrews Events organisation was a device, while in reality it would remain within the Community Council's remit. If that was not the case, he felt that the Community Council needed to sit down to consider this at a GP meeting.

### **6.4. Local Plan Location**

Miss Uprichard had spoken to the Local Plan office recently, and confirmed that the Local Plan documents would remain in the Town Hall, until the Local Plan office reopened. The 1996 Local Plan is still available for people to look at as well.

## **6.5. St Andrews Parking Plan**

Miss Uprichard reported that the Exhibition has been extended for another 2 weeks and is also in the Town Hall. Dr Goudie said that the Planning Committee would look at the Parking Plan with a view to bringing a submission to the March Community Council meeting for consideration. He asked Community Councillors who wanted to attend any meeting discussing this plan; to advise Mrs Denyer so that she could confirm which meeting they should attend. Miss Uprichard commented on how she'd asked for the previous objections to make available as she thought that they were relevant, given that the new plan was a Revised Plan. She had received the impression that officials thought that they wouldn't be relevant, but she still believed that there was a connection to make the objections relevant. Cllr Morrison had also received the same impression about the previous objections when she spoke to officials. Cllr Waterston said that the objections received at the time of the previous Parking Plan, were attached as a single sheet summarising the main issues, and the Council responses in relation to the modifications proposed in the new plan.

## **7. Committee Reports**

### **7.1 Recreation Committee**

Mr Roberts acknowledged that he come into the Convenorship of the Recreation Committee with only a slight knowledge of its remit. Having checked out the details he was now a bit more aware of the events, but noted that two major events listed on the Community Council Website, namely the Ceilidh and the Old Folks Treat were no longer within the Community Council remit but run by a separate body, St Andrews Events. He was a bit concerned about this separation, partly because a large sum of money had also moved with the change to the new account. This had left very little money available for the remaining events run by the Recreation Committee. He agreed that there needed to be clarification on this matter.

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

There needs to be a meeting on a number of issues. Dr Goudie suggested a GP meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> February at Kilrymont at 19.00.

### **7.3. 200 Club**

February winners: Mr D Philpott, Mr G. Methven and Dr M. Illingworth

Dr Goudie also thanked Mrs Harding for writing a piece on the 200 Club for St Andrews in Focus magazine. This article would also go on the website.

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

#### **7.4.1. Martyrs Monument**

Mrs Corbin reported on a contact with St Andrews Partnership, in relation to their idea of a project to restore the Martyr's Monument. She'd received an encouraging response from St Andrews Partnership, saying that the project was exactly the type they'd like to assist, and for which they'd like to raise funds. At the present time St Andrews Partnership doesn't have funds, but this type of project would receive priority when they manage to secure funds. Mrs Corbin and her committee will be writing to a number of bodies to try and secure funding. Mrs Denyer added that the stone was the problem, being sandstone and prone to more rapid wear. Alternative methods of preservation might include injecting the monument with a silicon-based material to halt its deterioration, but whether this would be acceptable to Historic Scotland wasn't known. Another idea mooted was the possibility of putting the names of the martyrs on a plaque, instead of cutting them into the monument in its present precarious state. Dr Goudie concluded that HEW decided whether to define the project entirely or to make preliminary approaches to these organisations. Mrs Corbin acknowledged that the proposed project needed a lot more work.

#### **7.4.2. Minor Injuries Unit – St Andrews Community Hospital**

Mrs Corbin read out a letter answering some questions about the functioning of this unit at the St Andrews Community Hospital. The letter said – "Minor Injuries continues to provide a service as before. There are no plans to close the department. You are correct that any form of trauma or life threatening event would not be seen at our Minor Injuries Unit and that this has been and will always be the case. We actually have an enhanced service at our MIU. We have an emergency nurse practitioner available to treat a wide range

of minor injuries". Mrs Corbin confirmed Dr Goudie's query that there was no threat of closure to the minor injuries part of the new hospital.

### **7.4.3. Flooding Largo Road**

Mrs Corbin mentioned problems with pavement flooding, due to a car wash at the former car showroom opposite the Scooniehill Road entrance. This has been an ongoing problem for some time, but the cold weather has added to the risks of pedestrians using the pavement where the water runs out from the car wash. Mrs Corbin volunteered to write to the owners of the car wash. Dr Goudie sought Community Council agreement that Mrs Corbin should write on behalf of the Community Council on the matter.

## **8. New Business**

### **8.1. Review of the Scheme for Community Councils**

To be remitted to the GP Meeting

### **8.2. Trust Reorganisation**

Cllr Waterston explained that this was a Fife wide review aimed at rationalising the myriad of often small, local Trusts, many of which had outlived their usefulness, and in many cases had little if any money to distribute. Fife Council has been in discussion with OSCAR about merging many of the Trusts in such a way that the essential aims can still be respected. It will remain under local control.

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

### **9.1. Chair**

Dr Goudie had received correspondence from the Preservation Trust in relation to No.1 Greyfriars Garden. They were seeking a meeting, to see if there could be common ground on forming a Community Garden at this location. The Preservation Trust has three people willing to join a committee to look at this issue. Dr Goudie suggested that Mrs Denyer, Mrs Corbin and Miss Uprichard could represent the Community Council. Cllr Waterston added that the owner of the garden had been ignoring Council requests and orders to remove the green mesh currently around the garden. The Council may take enforcement powers to remove the green mesh. He acknowledged that ideally it would be good to have proper fencing, as no fencing would lead to the garden becoming more vulnerable to damage and litter. However the owner has ignored requests for any proper work on this matter. Miss Uprichard commented that in the past the price asked by the owner to sell the land had been prohibitive. She thought that he must have been hoping to get planning permission to build on the site. Dr Goudie said that he'd pass the email from the Preservation Trust, which contained a lot more detail on certain matters relating to the garden.

### **9.2. Treasurer**

See report in appendix

### **9.3 Secretary**

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

The secretary reported that a letter had been received from the new owners of Hamilton Hall, announcing consultation meetings on the future of Hamilton Hall. These meetings will be on the 12<sup>th</sup> March between 10 am and 9 pm and Saturday 13<sup>th</sup> March between 10 and 1 in the Town Hall. Details will also be published on the Old Course Hotel Web Site.

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

### **10.1. Castle Tavern - Reporters Site Visit**

Miss Uprichard advised the meeting about the planned visit on Tuesday this week of the Reporter to the Castle Tavern site in case anyone wanted to be present to try and make his or her views known.

