

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Agenda – October 2004

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm Monday 4th October 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 made.

(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 1998 on are on line at <http://www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/>)

0. Best Kept Town Award Presentation

1. Apologies

2. Minutes of September 2004

Read for accuracy in matters of substance – harangue the secretary for minor errors (spelling etc) 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. Madras: Community Links and Pupil Involvement

Lindsay Matheson, Rector of Madras College.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville (West)

4.1.1. Prohibition Orders

Appendix A: further information from Transportation Service.
[Sep 4.1.2.]

4.2. Sheila Black (South)

4.3. Bill Sangster (Central)

4.4. Jane Ann Liston (South East)

5. Planning Committee

Appendix E: Local Transport Policy briefing paper. This was referred to in passing last month, reproduced for information.

5.1. Minutes

Appendix K: 13 & 27 September

5.2. Updates

5.2.1. Golf Range Lights

[Aug 5.1. A.1.2.] In response to enquiries Elspeth Cook (Development Service) said that Transportation Services:

“have confirmed that the floodlights were assessed in relation to the impact on all road users ... What they have assessed is the ‘disability’ factor i.e. where the light is so bright that the road user is dazzled and unable to proceed safely and the ‘discomfort’ factor where you are affected in a minor way by the change to the light levels driving past the site. Transportation Services are content that there will be no disability factor associated with the floodlight proposals. The light levels will be less than the existing floodlight system.”

so no formal objection was raised. —PL

5.2.2. Feddinch Golf Access

[Appendix K.1.11] Permission was granted for a second, works access to the site despite our road safety objection —PL

6. Matters Arising from Previous Meetings

6.1. Water Services

[Aug 7.5.] Appendix B: Report by Health Education & Welfare committee on two consultation papers.

6.2. Housing Maintenance Consultation

[Aug 7.4.] Joe Peterson responds on behalf of HE&W:

Whilst not experts in the field of housing provision, after having looked at the documents we see no good reason to oppose the proposals as they seem logical and sensible. We would therefore be broadly supportive of the proposals.

7. New Business

7.1. Community Council Induction

Penny Uprichard suggests we should start to plan now how to bring new members “up-to-speed” on community council and the history of various local issues after the new year election.

7.2. Phone Boxes

BT are again looking to remove phone boxes...

Appendix F: request for our view on removals from Bruce Crawford MSP (Mid-Scotland and Fife) and interim response by Pete Lindsay (following email circulation for views).

This was the first notification we received from anyone that phones are again under threat. A quick check round some boxes indicated that we were close to the end of the proposed consultation period, though this has been extended once or twice since. We have lately received the full BT notification which was sent to Fife Council for distribution. Unfortunately the papers are too faint to scan (OCR) for reproduction here.

Appendix G: Objection to BT. There have also been supporting objections by Cllrs Jane Ann Liston and Frances Melville.

On 30 September Fife Council passed a motion proposed by Jane Ann Liston, seconded by Bill Sangster:

Fife Council regrets BT's non-compliance with the procedure agreed with the industry regulator with respect to telephone-box removal, in particular their lack of consultation with the local authority and community councils.

We therefore agree to arrange to meet BT to discuss particular removals, in full consultation with local members and community councils.

Appendix I: Iain Smith MSP to BT

7.3. Community Council Code of Conduct

We have been contacted by members of Saline CC who are concerned about the imposition, as they see it, of the code of conduct (Schedule 3 of the Scheme for the Establishment of Community Councils in Fife) without proper consultation.

Do we have any feelings on the matter?

7.4. Review of Electoral Boundaries

Appendix J: announcement of review of electoral arrangements for proportional representation.

8. Reports from Officer Bearers

8.1. Chair

8.2. Treasurer

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. St Andrews, New Brunswick

Appendix C: Twinning enquiry and reply.

8.3.2. James Stirling

Appendix D: response to approach about the proposed cultural project [August 7.3.]

8.3.3. "Transport Plan" Consultations

[Sep 4.4.4.] Transportation were made aware of our opinion that consultation sessions must include evening/weekend sessions so those "stakeholders" working during the day have some chance to participate.

It turned out that there had been a degree of misunderstanding; the September sessions were initial consultations on upgrading Market Street not on the new Transportation Plan. However the general point about extending the hours was heeded and an evening session added.

8.3.4. Forthcoming speakers

November World Class Vision.

9. Reports

9.1. From Committees

9.2. From Representatives

10. Any Other Competent Business

Please notify Chair of AOCB items before the start of the meeting or at the break. Hint: Given that the end of the meeting is often taken in something of a rush, unless items are urgent it might be better to submit them for next meeting's New Business.

Appendix A – Traffic Prohibition Orders

Explanation from Transportation Service, forwarded by Cllr Frances Melville.

The type of order normally introduced would be a heavy goods vehicle weight restriction order. This is usually signed prohibiting vehicles greater than 7.5t. The sign is a black lorry with a 7.5t legend within a red circle. Exceptions can be allowed for any other class of vehicle and for essential access and normally this is a sub plate below the sign saying except for access. We try not to make too many exceptions as drivers just simply bend the rules and claim they were legitimately using the road.

The start of the weight restriction would ideally be at the

30mph sign leaving the village – this would avoid any problems with signing all the side roads, access for deliveries and refuse lorries etc and indeed the bus issue which has been raised at the CC.

At the St Andrews side the same would apply with the limit starting at the 30mph. signs. Advance warning signs would be required on all approaches including the main C4 road to the Hungry Horse. A lot of signs would be necessary!

I can also see some other disadvantages in that the residents who live on the High Road will feel that the restriction order doesn't apply on their road and lorries will ignore the signs.

It is a matter of weighing up the advantages versus the disadvantages.

At the moment I feel that the problem is not that great to go to the extent of this type of order with the extensive signing required although if the CC feel strongly enough I am happy to take a report on the issue to Committee. I think I would need to have some more facts to back up the case ie. How many HGV's are using the route on a daily or weekly basis. If only occasional traffic it may not be worthwhile.

Maybe some additional advisory signs and further monitoring might be more appropriate as the way forward just now.

Appendix B – Water Consultation

Response by Joseph Peterson on behalf of the Health Education and Welfare Committee

Scottish Executive Consultation Documents

- 1) Paying For Water Services 2006-2010
- 2) Investing In Water Services 2006-2010

These documents are in our opinion too complex for the average person with no knowledge of the Water Industry to answer in a meaningful capacity.

Paying For Water Services 2006-2010.

A response to this document hinges on who you think should be responsible for paying for the existing levels of provision of services and future increases in spending. Do we agree that customers should pay for the service rather than through general taxation in line with Executive thinking? We feel that any response should be based on the opinion of the whole Community Council.

Investing in Water Services 2006-2010.

This document makes a series of assumptions based on a number of Drivers, which are both mandatory and desirable. It

covers the billions that need to be spent on the various aspects of improving the quality of water. Sewerage, pollution and environmental impact are also discussed. The key question here is to produce a cost-effective, deliverable, affordable and sustainable programme and do we think these are the right criteria? Again we feel that any response should be based on the opinion of the whole Community Council.

Appendix C – New Brunswick

From Tim Henderson, Town Manager, St Andrews, New Brunswick.

We are rich in history, fine golf courses, seascapes and tourism. Sound familiar? I have been asked to obtain information and informally ask you if the possibility exists to "twin" with St. Andrews, Scotland in some fashion. One of generous citizens have offered to send representatives from our Town to visit your beautiful Burgh to explore this exciting concept.

Please let me know if you feel this may worth pursuing.

Response, Pete Lindsay:

Thanks for contacting us. I'm very sorry to say that we have a policy of not twinning formally with anywhere, on the grounds that we receive so many offers it would be invidious to single out any one above the others.

There are lower level "cultural links" between links organisations, schools and the like to other towns across the world. I can pass on appropriate details to the local press, schools and tourist organisations if that would be of any interest?

Appendix D – James Stirling

Response by Pete Lindsay to the Comune di Latina

The Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council has considered the matter but has decided not to join your project.

The one James Stirling building in St Andrews is not considered a success, neither in terms of its appearance, nor its function. We heard heartfelt evidence from one member of our Community Council who lived in the Andrew Melville Hall of Residence (designed by James Stirling) in the 1970s: as constructed it was not a pleasant place to live. Although it has undergone much remedial work in the intervening years, even modern student representatives were reduced to laughter at the idea of Andrew Melville Hall of Residence being a worthy piece of architecture to celebrate.

The second James Stirling design for St Andrews University, for an Arts Centre, was never built, not because of the concerns

over the previous hall of residence design, but because no arts centre was built at all.

While we choose not to support the project, we appreciate that others' experience of the work of James Stirling is different from ours, so we do wish your project good fortune.

Appendix E – Local Transport Strategy Briefing Paper

Local Transport Strategy:

Local Authorities are required to prepare their Local Transport Strategies (LTS's) to provide the policy context for their statutory Road Traffic Reduction Act Reports, which require to be submitted to the Scottish Executive. LTS's are also used to explain Local Authorities' transport policies and strategies to the public, and to support funding bids to the Scottish Executive and other funding bodies.

A future rail link to St Andrews was identified in the Local Transport Strategy for Fife published in October 2000. The rail link is a long term strategic proposal and will continue to be supported both in the Structure and Local Plans until such times that the scheme is able to satisfy the five key objectives of STAG (Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance). The key objectives of STAG are Environment, Safety, Integration, Accessibility and the Economy. The Tay Estuary Rail Study (2003) investigated again the feasibility of a rail link to St Andrews. However, the scheme was unable to satisfy the STAG criteria in the short to medium term. Considering the scheme, in terms of transport planning, St Andrews would need to expand with development densities increased around where any public transport interchange is proposed.

The Transportation Plan for St Andrews has been developed to address a number of issues in the town centre which seeks to provide a balanced policy of sustainable travel and demand management. I have outlined below the key policy objectives.

Move away from car dependence by the dual approach of demand management and public transport/cycling/walking investment;

Strengthen radial public transport links (bus and rail) from St Andrews to the surrounding towns and Dundee, Perth, Edinburgh and Glasgow, for example A91/A914 corridor, including demand responsive feeder services into St Andrews Bus Station and Leuchars Rail Station Interchanges;

Seek to develop a rapid transit system (RTS) into St Andrews where significant improvements can be made in journey times and reliability, however significant new development is required to justify a rail link;

Continue to **improve the centre of the town** as the main

focus of commercial and community life, whilst enhancing air quality and the amenity of the street environment with increased priority for pedestrians and non-motorised forms of transport;

Expansion of the Park & Ride site at North Haugh and the provision of a new site on the East of the town to serve rural residents, commuters and tourists for whom travel from home by car is the most appropriate option;

Subsequent development of Park & Ride will seek to **intercept drivers at a greater distance from St Andrews** on main radials or in town and villages particularly on the key corridor routes;

Limit parking provision in the centre to that which is essential for residents, commercial and social activities, giving priority to short-stay users and seeking to ensure safe and attractive parking for those who must travel by car;

Work towards a **coordinated network and comprehensive network of bus services within St Andrews** (including the redevelopment of the Bus Station, and safeguarding land for a future RTS station) and integrate with external public transport links;

Develop **multi-modal interchanges at key locations**; Work towards a **comprehensive system of safe cycle routes** within St Andrews, linked to villages within 2 miles of the urban edge, for example Strathkinness;

You may be interested to know that research suggests there is a strong link between pedestrian activity and retail activity. There has been a noted reduction in the number of vehicles coming into the central area despite an increase in the amount of traffic still coming to St Andrews. Surveys indicate that pedestrian numbers in the town centre have increased since the implementation of the pedestrian priority measures. It is surely in all interests to support such measures that encourage increased pedestrian activity in the central area.

I feel it would be more appropriate to ensure that visitors to St Andrews are encouraged to use peripheral car parks and the park and ride. For example, the traffic management system in the town centre works well for the majority of the year and is achieving its objectives. The number of pedestrians crossing Bell Street, for example, has increased by over 30% since the zebra crossings were introduced. Traffic flows in the central area have decreased by around 10%, whilst traffic entering and leaving the town via the A91 has increased by about 8%. This is confirmed by parking surveys of the main car parks in the town which indicate that a number of drivers are now parking their cars on the outskirts of the town centre rather than bringing their cars into the heart of the town. This is further

helped with the introduction of the free Park and Ride service again this year which should encourage even more people to park their cars in peripheral car parks.

I've omitted a couple of pages of interesting, but difficult to scan, tables: one shows the growth of traffic coming into St Andrews on the A91 (1.21% pa since 1990, from 10817 AADT (average daily trips?) to 12600 AADT in 2003); the other lists the current parking space supply on and off street. — PL.

Appendix F – Phone Boxes

From Bruce Crawford MSP (Mid Scotland and Fife)

I have been advised that BT is to close a proportion of public call boxes throughout Scotland, many in Fife.

Before I respond to BT, I would welcome the views of the community council on the closure of public call boxes in your community. I have attached a list of those planned for closure with locations where call boxes are situated.

In some communities public call boxes are mis-used in a variety of ways, from vandalism and hoax callers to being used as a public toilet. Such is the pride we have in our nation! In other communities, and despite the proliferation of mobile phones, public call boxes are also used as vital life lines, especially in an emergency or where people do not want to or cannot afford to use a mobile phone.

Again, I would welcome your views, and take your advice on the next steps. Where communities are keen to save their public call box, I would be more than willing to be of further assistance.

Phone Number	Address
01334 474830	Sandyhill Rd, St Andrews, KY16 8EG
01334 476082	Outside 43, South St, St Andrews, KY16 9QR
01334 476115	St Mary St, St Andrews, KY16 8AZ
01334 478653	Union St, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9PH
01334 472880	Outside 113, Market St, St Andrews, KY16 9PE
01334 476381	Outside Post Office, South St, St Andrews, KY16 9UH
01334 476636	Junc The Canongate, Largo Rd, St Andrews, KY16 8PJ

01334
477400

University Halls, Kennedy Gardens, St Andrews,
Fife, KY16 9DL

Response by Pete Lindsay

St Andrews community council has a policy of opposing closure of all single phone boxes in the residential areas of St Andrews.

1) For general reasons of social need; not everyone has a land line or mobile phone in their house.

1a) St Andrews has proportionally a very large transient population of students, alternating with holiday makers. Not all of these have mobile phones, but we understand that many of the properties they rent do not have outgoing phone lines.

1b) St Andrews has a substantial proportion of elderly and retired people in its population – a group unlikely to have mobile phones.

2) As valuable local landmarks for those on major thoroughfares.

3) We have grave concerns over BT's very poor local consultation procedures, These do not seem to be in line with OFTEL, and presumably now OFCOM, guidelines as we understand them from previous occasions.

3a) The presence of signs in the call boxes directing comments on the proposed removal to an unnamed local authority/community council, with no contact details, is quite inadequate – we have previously suggested adverts in local press as a very minimum.

3b) BT are are obliged to contact local authorities down to Parish or Community Council level; they refuse to do this in Scotland claiming they cannot get contact details "because the National Association of Local Councils is unable to provide Community Council boundary lines" (BT letter to Fife Council, Oct 03).

From the NALC web site:

"The National Association of Local Councils is a powerful body, speaking for some 10,000 Parish and Town Councils in England and Community Councils in Wales." [my emphasis – PL]

Hardly surprising it doesn't have info on Scottish Community Councils...

3c) Despite our understanding that BT should be contacting community councils directly, each time this issue has arisen since BT started the campaign to remove pay phones St Andrews Community Council has been contacted via a different

area of Fife Council (Chief Executive, Community Services, Planning) reflecting, we suspect, BT's varying approaches to Fife Council.

3d) We are therefore, perhaps, unsurprised that this time round the first official approach we have is from an MSP. We are making urgent enquiries through our Fife Councillors as to how this has occurred – has Fife Council been informed at all of the BT proposals? Our first suspicion is that BT have changed their approach again in the hope of circumventing local opposition.

4) Lest we be accused of knee-jerk opposition to removals through sentiment or innate conservatism I emphasise that Community Council has not, to date, opposed the removal of eg duplicate phone boxes at a particular location, nor of town centre phone boxes where we feel there is generally adequate alternative provision in the form of pay phones in nearby shops / restaurants / bars etc.

Finally: NB This particular set of proposals has not been discussed formally by community council; I shall pass on any changes in our position.

Appendix G – Objection to BT

The Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council objects to the removal of the following local pay phones:

01334 474830	Sandyhill Rd, St Andrews, KY16 8EG
01334 476115	St Mary St, St Andrews, KY16 8AZ
01334 476636	Junc The Canongate, Largo Rd, St Andrews, KY16 8PJ
01334 477400	University Halls, Kennedy Gardens, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9DL

As with previous rounds we have general reasons of social need in the cases of these locations in residential areas of St Andrews; not everyone has a land line or mobile phone in their house.

St Andrews has proportionally a very large transient population of students, alternating with holiday makers. Not all of these have mobile phones and we understand that many of the properties they rent do not have outgoing phone lines.

St Andrews has a substantial proportion of elderly and retired people in its population; a group unlikely to have mobile phones.

These phone boxes are isolated, mostly without immediate alternative pay phones in the area

They serve as valuable local landmarks in their areas; and on major thoroughfares in two cases.

We again have to raise our concerns over BT's very poor local consultation procedures. These do not seem to be in line with OFTEL, and presumably now OFCOM, guidelines as we understand them from previous instances.

The presence of signs in the call boxes directing comments on the proposed removal to an unnamed local authority/community council, with no contact details, is quite inadequate – we have previously suggested adverts in local press as the very minimum.

BT are are obliged to contact local authorities down to Parish or Community Council level. Why has this not happened?

Our local authority Fife Council, seems unaware of the proposed closures; why have local elected members not been contacted?

Why is the first intimation, beyond reports of notices in the boxes, via an MSP?

Lest we be thought to be indulging in knee-jerk opposition to removals through sentiment or innate conservatism I emphasise that Community Council has not, to date, opposed the removal of eg duplicate phone boxes at a particular location, nor of town centre phone boxes where we feel there is generally adequate alternative provision in the form of pay phones in nearby shops / restaurants / bars etc.

Appendix I – Iain Smith MSP: BT Payphones

Iain Smith MSP has written to Ian Shanks, Head of Scottish Affairs, BT Scotland

Review of BT Payphones in North East Fife

Further to my previous correspondence on a specific issue regarding this review I now feel compelled by the weight of popular opinion to urge you to reconsider the whole of your proposals to withdraw a number of BT phone kiosks from the area.

I am sure that I don't need to tell you what a vital public service payphones provide, even in these days of personal mobile telephones. A great many concerns have already been voiced to me regarding those for whom public call boxes remain one of their only forms of communication; and I feel that the removals planned in your review may contribute to the further cutting off and alienation of some of the most vulnerable in our society. There is also the additional matters of the provision of call boxes for use in emergencies, and perhaps most importantly the local communities' feeling that they have not been adequately consulted on the decision to reduce the

number of kiosks in their areas.

I am led to believe that your code of practice with OfCom sets out that the removal of single boxes must be consented to by both the local authority and the community council. What responses have you received from your local consultation over the current review, which I understand ends this week? I would like to thank you for keeping me informed on this matter, but in the light of all the concerns which I have heard voiced regarding the potential loss of a vital service in many areas – I hope that by drawing these to your attention too they might have some bearing on the review and convince you to reconsider a number of potential removals.

Appendix J – review of Electoral Boundaries

From Bob Smith, Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland

Fife Council Area Review of Electoral Arrangements for Proportional Representation

I am writing to inform you that, following the enactment of the Local Governance Scotland Act 2004, the Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland is required to conduct a review of electoral arrangements within the above Council area and make recommendations to Scottish Ministers.

Following changes to the legislation, the Commission is required to consult with Councils as the first stage of the review process. The Commission has, therefore, contacted each Council with a view to arranging an initial meeting. The Commission is then required to provide each Council with the details of its initial proposals. Following completion of this stage of the consultation with Councils, the Commission will publish its provisional proposals as part of the statutory public consultation process and invite representations. Interested parties will have 12 weeks from the date of publication to make such representations. It is likely that this stage of the review will take place early in the New Year.

When the Commission publishes its provisional proposals, you will be informed of the locations at which maps and associated documentation will be deposited. The maps and other documents will also be made available on the Commission's web site at www.lgbcscotland.gov.uk

Appendix K – Planning Committee Minutes

Minutes by Penny Uprichard

1. Planning Meeting – 13.9.04

Apologies – B. Christie. Present I. Goudie, P. Lindsay, B. Ryan,

P. Uprichard.

There was a brief discussion on the Transportation meetings (not open to the public) to be held in the Town Hall on Thursday 30 September from 2-7pm, and Tuesday 2 November from 2-5pm. The main subject on the agenda will be Market Street.

1.	38 Market Street – alter and extend dwellinghouse including dormers, roof light, railings and rear deck, and replacement windows	N.C.
2.	23 Hepburn Gardens – conservatory extension including demolition of garage	N.C.
3.	The Balaka, St. Mary's Place – extension to rear of restaurant toilets and kitchen, and addition of store and staff toilet to rear	N.C.
4.	Grange Road – erect 12.5 metre Monopole telephone mast including three antennae, control and electrical cabinets. OBJ – in AGLV, loss of visual amenity. Could it share with another nearby mast, and could it be placed the other side of the trees where it is less visible from St. Andrews? Are residents below the level of the antennae?	Obj. P.U.
5.	11 Shorehead – enclose balcony with UPVC windows	N.C.
6.	22 Queens Terrace – change of use of flatted dwelling to 4 person HMO	N.C.
7.	73 Kilrymont Road – rear dormer extension	N.C.
8.	4 Strathkinness High Road – alteration and extension to dwellinghouse revised scheme	N.C.
9.	4 Playfair Terrace – refused	
10.	8 Kinnessburn Terrace – approved	
11.	Feddinch – extra access requested. OBJ. on the grounds of road safety	Obj. PL
12.	6 St. Mary's Place – access ramp. OBJ. on the grounds of the need for easier accessibility	Obj BR

Planning Meeting – 27.9.04

Present: I. Goudie, G. Davidson, B. Ryan, P. Uprichard

1.	Land adjacent to 37 Kinnessburn Road – erect 3 storey dwellinghouse amended design. Demolish existing outhouse and construct 3-bedroom detached house	N.C.
2.	20 Queens Terrace – change of use of flatted dwelling to 4 person HMO	N.C.
3.	27 North Castle Street – flat roof extension to dwellinghouse. OBJ on grounds of infill within the	OBJ. P.U.

	conservation area. Loss of amenity. Flat roof not in the vernacular style. This application highlights the need for a well considered policy on infill in the next Local Plan, if we are to avoid the centre of St Andrews becoming a series of entirely built up blocks.	
3.	Physics Building – erect roof mounted radar scanner, 3m in diameter (renewal. Used for research of reception for mobile phones in Angus.)	
4.	5 Wallace Avenue – dormer extension to flatted dwelling	N.C.
5.	107 North Street – alterations to dwellinghouse to block up door openings	N.C.
6.	122 Lamond Drive – 2 storey extension	N.C.
7.	18 Spottiswoode Gardens – erect garage/outbuilding. Demolish existing garage	N.C.
8.	117 North Street – resurface entrance area to New Picture House, within portico projecting onto pavement.	N.C.
9.	8 Dempster Terrace – change of use of house to 6 person HMO	N.C.
10.	43 Tom Morris Drive – extension to dwellinghouse.	N.C.

Appendix L – Police Community Team Newsletter

St Andrews-related extracts

We are into our consultation period for the 2005-6 Policing Plan and we have had three Consultation Forums at Cupar Police Station which have all been well attended by representatives from Community Councils, Neighbourhood Watch and also Councillors and Members of Parliament. Everyone attending contributed to the discussions in the workshops and the open forum at the end and we have a lot of information to analyse for inclusion in our annual consultation report. Thank you to all who attended. Your presence was very much appreciated.

There have been some changes to the Community Team. PC Ruth Goldie has joined us from Central Division. She will be taking over the role as University Liaison Officer at St Andrews. Ruth has a lot of experience working with the community team at Glenrothes and will be asset to our Division.

Since 1st August 2004 there have been 69 people detected for consuming alcohol in public places and 17 people for urinating in a public place throughout Eastern Division.

The Safer Scotland campaign will run from 11th October until

3rd December 2004. The main themes will be to Tackle Knife Crime, Drinking in Public Places and Vandalism.

Neighbourhood Watch – During October we will be meeting with St Andrews NHW Co-ordinators with a view to establishing the St Andrews and District Association. A similar meeting is being held with Co-ordinators from Tay Coast to establish an NHW Association in their area. We have also received requests from individuals interested in starting up a NHW Group. PC Mark Anderson has been the instrumental in re-generating interest in NHW within Eastern Division.

POP in St Andrews

(Problem Oriented Policing (POP) is about tackling problems which give rise to repeat calls from the public and repeat attendance to these calls by the Police. We are looking at working with our partners in the community to provide long-term solutions to these problems allowing Police resources to become more proactive and intelligence led.)

Problems with noise nuisance from Students accommodation in St Andrews will be tackled by partnership working. It is our intention to work with the landlords of these premises, the University and Locality Manager to ensure the residents of St Andrews can sleep in peace. The vast majority of residences are Houses of Multiple Occupation and require to be licensed by the Local Authority. We will be looking for Landlords to take a more proactive role in monitoring the behaviour of their tenants.

Correspondence

Post Received

07/09/04	Bruce Crawford MSP	BT Phone boxes
08/09/04	Community Services	Best kept medium town
11/09/04	Volunteer Centre Fife	Evolve newsletter
13/09/04	Police	Community Newsletter sep 04
14/09/04	Orange	Network – community newsletter
15/09/04	Postwatch Scotland	Autumn Newsletter
17/09/04	Tourist Board	St Andrews world class
17/09/04	East Area Services Committee	Agenda 22/9/04
17/09/04	Links Trust	Jamie Anderson 125th
21/09/04	Chief Executive's Service	Payphone removals
24/09/04	Lady Haig Poppy Factory	Wreath
25/09/04	Development Service	Feddinch Golf

		Development
25/09/04	FoE	Fundraising appeal
25/09/04	Community Services	Best Kept: presentation
01/10/04	Wicksteed Leisure Ltd	Outdoor Play Area Equipment

September Minutes

2004 index

October Minutes
