

[\[CC home\]](#)

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Agenda - September 2001

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm on Monday 3rd September in the Burgh Chambers of the Town Hall, Queen's Gardens. There will be a short break at about 8pm during which the 200 Club draw will be taken.

0. Presentation

Group Captain Martin Routledge, Station Commander at RAF Leuchars, to re-present the repaired Burgh Chambers Lectern.

1. Attendance

Apologies: Maries Cassells, Helen Lawrie

2. Minutes of July 2001

(read for accuracy in matters of substance - harangue the secretary for minor (spelling etc) errors outwith the meeting).

3. Presentations

(For anyone wishing to address the meeting on a matter relevant to St Andrews. Please contact the Secretary or Chair before the meeting. Priority will be given to those who have been invited to speak or have given advance notice)

3.1. The Future of Strategic Planning

Is Fife to be split in two for strategic planning purposes? And what is strategic planning in this context? David Sneddon, Planning Service Manager in the Central Area, to give some background. Iain Smith MSP has copied to us his objection to the proposal. See also Appendix A.

3.2. CCTV

Detective Constable Tom Coutts from Glenrothes. (See also appendix B)

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville (West)

4.2. Sheila Hill (South)

4.3. Jane Ann Liston (South East)

5. Planning Committee Report

6. Matters Arising from previous meetings

6.1. Entrust

Archie Strachan

6.2. Town Library

[July 6.3.] Appendix C - Report from Ken Fraser.

7. New Business

7.1. Future of the Lammas Market

7.2. Geological Wall - Formal Opening

Will take place at 11am Sat 29 September. "The wall is built mostly of local sandstone, and incorporates 22 rocks representative of Fife. [...] The Wall is designed to increase the public's awareness of the importance of geology in everyday life, especially its industrial and architectural applications, and the richness of the local geological heritage."

7.3. St Andrews Community Hospital

The next stage of consultation following the approval of the Initial Agreement Document by the Scottish Executive's Capital Investment Group. Alan Harrison is the Client Adviser/Project Manager appointed by Fife Primary Care NHS Trust to develop the Outline Business Case for the proposed St Andrews Community Hospital and Resources Centre. He needs representatives of various 'stakeholder' organisations, including community council, to assist this process. See Appendix D.

Who should assist?

7.4. SEPA Fife Waste Issues booklet and questionnaire

Long booklet showing complex options for waste strategy in Fife with feedback questionnaire for return by 10 September.

Who should deal with this?

7.5. Best Kept Town result

Second (of five). Judges comments: "Overall the town was well kept. Hanging baskets provided a good show within the town centre. Supermarket (Safeway) was well managed with attractive surroundings. Community Council representative was enthusiastic and informative. The town could benefit from more seating."

Following items for information:

7.6. St Andrews Tourism Public Meeting

(a.k.a. Tourism Consultative Forum) 7.30pm 27 September at the Eden Clubhouse. The main issues to be discussed are tourism and transport issues and the proposed environmental improvements for South and College Streets.

7.7. Fife Council East Area Services Committee

2pm Wednesday 5th September, County Hall, Cupar. 3.30pm public questions. Agenda items of interest: Lammas Market, Local Holidays, Changes to waiting restrictions in North Castle St and East Scores, Local Fora, Community Planning, Hay Fleming Trust.

7.8. Lists of Justices of the Peace

Fife Law & Admin write to inform us that lists of JPs are available through the Library, Local Office and Citizens Advice Rights Office (Cupar) or by telephoning Cupar 412200.

7.9. Eden Estuary to be Special Area of Conservation?

Scottish Natural Heritage write to tell us that the Scottish Executive is proposing the Eden Estuary as a SAC (along with some minor trickle outlandishly named the Firth of Tay). Map and background details available.

7.10. Links Trust Annual Report 2000

We have a small number of copies for circulation.

7.11. APRS Summer Newsletter

75th anniversary year of the Association for the Protection of Rural Scotland. Mobile phone masts, Logierait Bridge, Planning (includes comment on the Fife Structure Plan and St Andrews greenbelt), Renewable energy campaigns.

7.12. Play Strategy for Fife

Final consultation draft received.

7.13. Fife Fire & Rescue Service report 2000/2001

Received.

7.14. SEPA View summer edition

Bathing Water, Foot & Mouth, Fish Farming, St Kilda, TBT paint, SEPA's new structure, Moray Firth Partnership, New Zealand, Environmentally friendly housing in Edinburgh.

7.15. Doors Open Day

9th September in East Fife including St Andrews. This is a part of European Heritage Days, aimed at raising awareness of architectural and cultural heritage by allowing access to buildings of significance in these areas which are not normally open to the general public. In St Andrews that includes free entry to the "Town House" and "Burgh Hall" (presumably a west Fifer compiled the list), the Preservation Trust Museum, British Golf Museum, Holy Trinity Church.

8. Reports from Officers

8.1. Chair

8.2. Treasurer

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. Local Holidays 2002

8.3.2. Community Council Elections 2001

Nomination papers available now from Fife Council offices or the Secretary. Completed papers to Sandra Hutchison, County Buildings Cupar by 4pm Thursday 13th September.

Polling: Thursday 11th October.

Inaugural meeting of Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council 7-8pm Monday 22 October, Burgh Chambers.

8.3.3. Bus changes

9. Reports from Committees

10. AOCB

Appendix A

Review of Strategic Planning

The Scottish Executive has recently issued for consultation a report on the review of Strategic Planning in Scotland (copy attached). This report proposes radical changes to the existing strategic planning system, with a particular and unique impact in Fife.

Fife Council will be responding to this consultation report. We are seeking the views of our key stakeholders and customers, including our Community Planning partners, to ensure that you are fully engaged in the consultation process, and that the Council's response takes account of our customers needs and expectations of the strategic planning system within a Fife perspective.

When the review was announced in November 2000, the then Minister stated that the status quo is not an option everywhere and indicated then that the review would need to address the "wicked" issues, such as who should prepare/approve strategic plans as well as their geographical boundaries. The proposals which are set out in the report extend beyond structure plans and have significant implications for national planning and local plans. A number of these proposals will require changes in legislation.

The report proposes a major change within (and unique in Scotland to) Fife: to remove Fife Council's existing responsibilities as a strategic planning authority and hence the power to prepare the Fife Structure Plan, and replace it with a city-region approach where Fife would be split into 2 parts, one planned as part of an Edinburgh city-region and the other part of a Dundee city-region. The new city-region plans would be the administrative and executive responsibility of joint committees of constituent Councils, where Fife interests would be in a minority. The status quo, where Fife is autonomous as a strategic planning authority, and which has existed since 1975, would be ended.

Initial concern has been raised within the Council about these proposals and their potentially far-reaching implications for Fife and its people. One of the key operational advantages of the existing strategic planning arrangements is that Fife Council's boundaries are coterminous with some of our key partners including Fife Enterprise and Fife Health Board. Furthermore, other key strategic plans including the Community Plan, the Housing Plan, Lifelong Learning Plan, the Shared Agenda for the local economy, and strategies including the Local Transport Strategy, Area Waste Strategy, and Environment Strategy are all focused on a Fife wide perspective. The Fife Structure Plan has important direct linkages to a wide range of plans and strategies for Fife. It also provides opportunities for, and facilitates joined-up thinking and working across Fife, as well as cross boundary with our neighbouring authorities. This provides a sound foundation for effective locally-controlled linkages through to community planning.

The coterminous boundaries are not the only advantage of the existing Fife Structure Plan. The Plan is one of

the Council's key strategic policy documents which sets out the long term vision for development across the Kingdom and will directly assist with the implementation of many of the key milestones within Fife's Community Plan. Ownership of the Plan is very important for its successful implementation in enhancing Fife's economy and improving the environment. Through close consultation with our key stakeholders and indeed through the political process within Fife itself, ownership of the Plan is enhanced.

If strategic land use decisions were being made within a city-region context, the advantages highlighted above could be perceived as disadvantages of the proposed changes. Local ownership of these new plans may be less, particularly with the proposal that Fife would be part of two city hinterlands. Would this result in issues and resources being focused on Dundee and Edinburgh, and less on their "hinterlands" in Fife? Would it be necessary in any case to have a strategic plan for Fife which resolved the differences between the 2 different strategic approaches i.e. duplication?

It is important that you comment on these proposed changes. There are two issues in particular, which the Council would like your comments on:

- Do you agree that Fife should remain as a single strategic planning authority, rather than be geographically split into the hinterlands of Dundee and Edinburgh? Why is the retention of a Fife Structure Plan important to you? Or, if you think there is merit in the government's proposals, should all of Fife be in only one city region?
- The proposals within the consultation report are to set up joint committees to oversee these new structure plans. The potential implication of this is that a committee of councillors from a number of Councils, sitting in either Dundee or Edinburgh, would determine decisions on strategic land use issues in Fife. Do you agree with this approach?

Other questions are raised within the consultation report itself. Your views on these more detailed aspects of the proposed changes are also welcomed.

Your comments should be returned by 29th August 2001. All comments will be taken into account in preparing the Council's response to ensure that the Council promotes what is in the best interests of Fife and its people. It is anticipated that a report will be presented to the Environment and Development Committee on 15th October.

Additional copies of the consultation paper can be obtained by telephoning Sandra Gillespie on 0131 244 7543 or from the website '<http://www.scotland.gov.uk>' click on "Your Views" and scroll down table to "Review of Strategic Planning" and double click.

I look forward to receiving your comments. Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact either Pamela Ewen on 01592 416238 or Jenni Whittle on 01592 416339.

Yours sincerely

David Rae
Acting Corporate Manager (Environment & Development Strategy)

Appendix B

For Information (this was sent in July): letter of objection to proposed sites of CCTV cameras in St Andrews - Pete Lindsay for Planning Committee.

I write on behalf of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council. We wish to object to this application. We have a variety of concerns, set out below.

Consultation - lack thereof

Various community bodies have called for introduction of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras to the

centre of St Andrews over several years. However now that funding for this goal has finally been achieved there has been little or no consultation with the St Andrews community, either in general or those representative bodies, on the location and operation of the cameras. We are disappointed that we are therefore forced to use the blunt instrument of a formal objection to this application over matters that could and should have been sorted out in a public consultation process, which could have resulted in a broadly agreed proposal with wide community support.

We have to wonder at the number of cameras and the reasons for their locations. No public justification has been provided for these visually-intrusive units in terms of community benefit. We should like to know if there is actually a need for all the proposed cameras or whether perhaps the number of cameras has been determined opportunistically by funding.

Community council is not against the deployment of cameras in places of proven need; although spending the money on real police officers 'on the beat' would be preferable. We do object to an intrusion into the environment of the town merely on the basis, so it seems, that 'we've got the money for them so we have to put them somewhere'.

Environment factors

On the matter of the visual environment of the town we specifically object to ALL the pole-mounted cameras - or rather to the poles themselves. While the cameras must be visible to carry out their deterrent function that is not a sufficient excuse to further clutter the streets of St Andrews with 7-8 metre high poles placed, it seems from the provided mock-ups, on the edges of pavements for maximum visibility.

- Pavement-edge positions obstruct pedestrians as they go about their business; most of these locations are busy pedestrian areas at some times of day.
- Pavement-edge street furniture forms an additional hazard for road vehicle users in the event of an accident.
- We note that streetlights and other essential street furniture are no longer positioned on kerbsides if at all possible.
- Fife Cllr Frances Melville reported to community council [June 2001] that due to the on-street clutter in St Andrews of maps, bollards, cycle racks, pedestrian crossings, etc - all legitimate and worthy street features in themselves - the cost of preparing the centre for the Lammas Market has rocketed in a year from £700 to £3,500, which eats away at the income of the already hard-pressed St Andrews Common Good Fund. Surely further deliberately obtrusively-positioned street furniture is to be avoided.

We feel wall-mounting of those cameras actually necessary would be more acceptable. They would certainly still be obvious enough to maintain their main, deterrent, function with only a slight reduction of the field of view for their secondary function of watching the world go by. There would however be a great benefit in the reduction of ground-level clutter.

Wall-mounted units are not without possible problems. There is reference in the documentation provided to separate control boxes being needed by these to house electrical/electronic gear otherwise contained in the bulbous base of the mounting poles. We can find no reference to the size of these or their position in the case of the proposed wall-mounted units. It may be that they are in fact insignificant, in which case no harm would be done by disclosing the details, or they may be perhaps of size commensurate with the mounting pole base - which would again raise grave concerns about street clutter.

Without diluting our general objection to pole mounts we have additional specific concerns:

Camera 1: St Mary's Place/Bell Street junction. Pole shown as set in the middle of the pavement on a busy corner near a pedestrian crossing. Even set at either pavement edge this seems to be a very poor location, presumably driven solely by the field of view rather than any consideration for the pedestrian public. We wonder if instead of this unit some arrangement could be reached with the Students' Association which already has a camera well-placed to cover Market Street and its continuations. Similarly, perhaps the unobtrusive camera at Madras College watching Blackfriars Chapel ruin could be adjusted/upgraded to provide cover for Bell Street?

Camera 2: Market Street, Cross Keys nib: appallingly obtrusive, nearly in the middle of the street, and thus visible from much of the length of Market Street. Given the curve of the north side of the street, placing this camera further east on a corner mounting could cover not only much of Market Street, but also Church Street and College Street, should these be thought worth watching.

Camera 5: South Street, WH Smith nib: again this position is far too visible for a pole mounting, intruding on views from various directions of the Town Hall, Holy Trinity Church, generally along the street and particularly long views towards the Cathedral ruins. The choice of this position is puzzling as it doesn't even give a particularly good view into the depths of Logie's Lane/Church Square.

Camera 7: City Road/Bus Station: concern that this will intrude on views of Hope Park Church for people leaving the bus station - who surely deserve the unmarred best we can offer to uplift their spirits after the aesthetic delights of the stances. Also this camera may overlook private gardens at the back of Hope Street/Howard Place.

Camera 8: Junction Pilmour Place/Golf Place: proximity to the Macintosh and Hamilton halls of residence as well as hotels emphasises the need for effective privacy controls.

Camera 9: Bruce Embankment: given the lack of any tall building in the immediate vicinity for this to blend in with, however poorly, the combination of position and height in this case was found particularly offensive by some. That this gives it an unparalleled field of view to watch the cars parked in the vicinity is not a mitigation. Should the car park and one side of the toilet block need intensive scrutiny, perhaps lower better-positioned cameras should be investigated, or even positioning on, say, some nearby building currently under consideration for major development itself.

Camera 10: Ellice Place/Murray Place junction: again this appears to be set at the roadside of the pavement, adjacent to a lights-controlled pedestrian crossing. This must to some extent impede views and constitute a road safety hazard to both pedestrians and road-users, it is hard to see how this position could seriously be advocated. There are a number of tall buildings in the vicinity on which a camera could be mounted, out of casual view, though still quite noticeable from the eye-catching swivelling, and from higher up having a better field of view adding coverage of Greyfriars Garden.

General safeguards on operation

Finally we must turn to what is the most contentious issue with CCTV - privacy. We are sure that the public will have questions on this subject in particular and strongly believe they should have an opportunity to see the proposed positions and consider whether they regard the safeguards as adequate - before implementation and preferably before the granting of planning permission.

We welcome the information on the use of masking 'privacy zones' blocking views into private property. Whether this is sufficient to assuage concerns over privacy remains to be seen. We believe that public awareness displays should be undertaken with demonstrations of the equipment and its safeguards before it is installed, ideally before a planning application is submitted...

The extent of 'privacy blocking', though welcome at any level, is not clear. Illustrations show windows, but not doors, being blocked on-screen, though a view through an open door could be as much an intrusion into a private residence as through a window. Similarly, should there be private gardens overlooked by these cameras (Cameras 7 and 10 have some potential for this) will these areas be blocked either as a matter of course, or at the request of residents? Indeed will residents' rather than, perhaps absentee, landlords' views be sought on the matter, and on a regular basis to account for the changes in residents in these areas of high turnover? Given that many of the locations shown have a high proportion of seasonal residents it is most unfortunate that this application comes forward during the university vacation.

A question not addressed in the information provided on privacy blocking is whether the image is merely blocked on screen – are the recorded images also masked. Being intruded upon retrospectively is still being overlooked and still a breach of privacy.

Raising these questions may seem nitpicking, verging on paranoid fantasies of 1984. If the public is to give up

some measure of its privacy for the common good when in public it is essential that the limits and safeguards be rigorously questioned and monitored. To assist in this process we suggest that conditions on any consent, for this scheme - or, we hope, a future reviewed and amended proposal - include rigorous conditions on the potential for these cameras to overlook private property in any respect. This may be covered in part by the various codes of conduct to which the operators subscribe, but 'defence in depth' provided by planning consent conditions would be welcome on this.

We have said that cameras in places of proven need would be acceptable, indeed they would be welcome. It follows then that the cameras should only be operated in places of proven needs but at the times of proven need. The concerns about crime that have driven the calls for cameras to be installed have, in most of the areas covered, been matters of night time vandalism, noise and disorder. Therefore we ask that times of operation of these cameras be restricted appropriately. At most of these locations operation during the working day would be unnecessary prying, or at best a very ill-directed 'fishing expedition' for criminal behaviour.

Planning Advice Note 47

To close we quote PAN 47, "Planning For Crime Prevention" item 76 which says on the subject of the introduction of CCTV:

"As part of a wider crime prevention strategy planning authorities are well placed to co-ordinate the use of CCTV to monitor urban centres and can take the initiative to discuss the issue with local traders, community groups and, of course, the police. These discussions should focus on the extent and location of crime in an area, position and specification of cameras, funding and operating arrangements as well as questions relating to accountability and how the information collected is to be used."

We believe that this stricture on the importance of local consultation has not been met.

This planning application is premature and inappropriate at this time. It should be rejected to allow the applicant, Fife Community Safety Partnership, time to better reflect on the meaning of Partnership.

Appendix C

St. Andrews Public Library meeting 16/7/01

Pete Lindsay has already circulated a copy of the paper on refurbishment of the Library prepared for Fife Council. The statements made in the paper about the inadequacy of the present building, and the improvements possible in the refurbished one, appear (with one exception to be mentioned later) quite correct.

I would draw particular attention to:

- (1) the difficulties of a split site
- (2) the inadequacy of the present building for disabled readers
- (3) the lack of an automated issue system
- (4) the benefits which would arise from greatly enhanced computer facilities for public use.

It became clear at the meeting that the proposed refurbishment was made urgent chiefly by the coming into force of the Disability Discrimination Act (I think by 2004). This would apparently rule out use of both the first floor and the mezzanine unless lifts were provided. In fact it is being proposed to remove the mezzanine entirely (I asked if that could be reconsidered). Such physical alterations would account for most of the proposed expenditure. Of the internal arrangements in the refurbished building, such as shelves, desks, etc., nothing is known because the plans are yet to be formulated.

It was apparent that (contrary to the impression created in the paper, though not to its exact words) we could expect, by the closure of the present Children's Library, and the removal of the mezzanine and the projecting shelves on the first floor, a considerable reduction in shelf space. I calculate' that at present the shelves in public areas amount to about 600 metres of which it seems possible that about 250 metres would be removed - about the same as was occupied by the Hay Fleming Collection - leaving about 350 metres. (That would, coincidentally, be about the capacity of the recently built library in my native town of Dunoon, which has not

much more than half the population of St. Andrews.)

Owing to the uncertainties previously mentioned, it is not clear what the exact cost of the refurbishments would be, but it is not believed they would exceed the figure stated in the Council's paper of 30 th March. It is clear that the proposals for funding them have not advanced much since the previous meeting. Mr. Whitelaw declared that the main question he wished to ask the Community Council at this stage was whether it favoured the scheme in principle. If we did, he would try to make more definite progress on the financial side. (It is not clear whether the two can be so easily separated.) There are complications in the proposal to sell the Children's Library and capitalise on the income, as apparently such a transaction could be carried out only by a body "at arm's length" from Fife Council, which the Common Good Fund would not count as. Mr. Whitelaw wondered if the Community Council could be so. He also considers that this element of the proposed capital funding is crucial in releasing the other funds envisaged in the paper of 30th March. If the scheme is to go ahead in time to benefit from the New Opportunities Fund it appears that the whole financial package would have to be finalised by the end of this financial year. The Community Council representatives felt that it was important not to commit it, at this stage, to any financial involvement, before the detailed implications were known. The Council may, however, wish to express a view on the desirability of the financial proposals in general.

K.F.

Appendix D

From Alan Harrison

St Andrews Community Hospital

The Outline Business Case requires to be completed as soon as practicable, but if possible by the end of November 2001.

As part of the process the Trust must ensure appropriate involvement of all external stakeholders.

The first part of this exercise is to identify the relevant organisations/bodies/individuals with an interest in this development proposal. In addition, we are required to establish the most effective way to involve stakeholders (such as the Community Councils), without exclusion, and how best to manage their involvement.

In developing the OBC I will be required to deliver on many issues. Some of the outputs are as follows:

1. Produce statement of service objectives for the investment
2. List benefits which investment will seek to obtain
3. Identify benefits criteria for selection and evaluation of options
4. Identify long list of options
5. Analyse and document short list options
6. Identify weights for benefits criteria
7. Identify scores for each criterion for each option and total weighted scores
8. Assess baseline benefits (i.e.. minimum option)
9. Identify preferred benefits option and record result

This appraisal will then be balanced with the costing of options and the affordability of options to establish the OBC preferred option.

It is essential that Stakeholders should be included in the non-financial appraisal of options by contributing to the identification and weighting of the benefits criteria that will be used to score options. The difficulty is how best to approach this and how to achieve a satisfactory outcome for all concerned.

I seek your assistance in this matter. In particular I would seek you advice on how to ensure there is no exclusion, and how best to manage Community Council involvement.

Appendix E

Pothole Watch Response

Ref: 0105.1 - North Street at l/c 47 - Loose Kerbstones

This matter has been passed to the contractor responsible for the construction of the bus boarder for his attention.

Ref: 0105.2 - Murray Park - Carriageway Deterioration

On inspection there were defects located that required repair by Roads Service, these have now been repaired.

Ref: 0105.3 & 0105.4 - Kinnessburn Road - Potholes

All potholes requiring intervention have been repaired.

Ref: 0105.5 - Kilrymont Place - Carriageway Deterioration

Surface inspected and all defects which required repair have been completed. The area will be added to a programme of permanent patching works when money becomes available.

Ref: 0105.6 - South Street - Missing Toby Cover

Maintenance responsibility for this cover lies with East of Scotland Water. This matter has been passed to them for repair.

Ref: 0105.7 - St Andrews - Loose Gravel

Any loose gravel in and around St Andrews should be remedied by routine street sweeping regime by Cleansing & Waste Management, however if there are any areas which require particular attention then please advise either Roads Service on 01334 412020 or Cleansing & Waste Management on 01334 412200.

Ref: 0105.8 - Buchanan Gardens, St Andrews

All carriageway defects have now been repaired. I will continue to monitor this area through routine highway inspections.

Ref: 0106.1 - Lawhead Road East & Hepburn Gardens

Passed to Cleansing & Waste Management for sweeping.

Ref: 0106.2 - The Scores - Carriageway Condition

Various potholes were identified for repair. These have been completed.

Ref: 0106.3 - South Street - Missing Toby Cover

Again, this has been passed to East of Scotland Water for repair.

Ref: 0106.4 - South Street, St. Andrews

The trip hazard has been noted for repair.

Ref 0106.5 - King Street - Missing Toby Cover

On inspection there were no defects relating to missing toby covers found. It may be that East of Scotland Water have repaired this defect prior to the inspection by Roads Service.

Thank you for advising me of the above. If you have any queries relating to any of these matters please

contact Lynne Davidson on 01334 412020 or e-mail Lynne-davidson@fife.gov.uk

St Andrews Pothole Watch

New:

Report: Potholes (40mm/1.5in deep) in the road, damaged pavements (20mm/.75in deep), missing or damaged toby covers, blocked drains, floods, defective streetlights etc.

Identify the location (Street and number on closest house or streetlight for instance).

Hand to Community Council Secretary Pete Lindsay or to Fife Roads Service (c/o St Andrews Fife Council offices).

Defect & Location: