



REPORT

To: Infrastructure Committee

04 May 2004

From: Executive Director
Infrastructure Services Department

SUMBURGH AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE CONSTITUTION

1 Introduction

- 1.1 In December 2003 the Department for Transport issued new guidelines for airport consultative committees.
- 1.2 The Chairman, Mr George Henderson, has reviewed the constitution of the Sumburgh Airport Consultative Committee in light of the new guidelines and has produced a draft revised constitution.
- 1.3 This report presents the draft revised constitution for approval.

2 The Constitution

- 2.1 The draft revised constitution is attached as appendix 1.
- 2.2 Very little has had to be changed to conform with the new guidelines and, in practice, the consultative committee will continue its business as before. As is the case with the existing constitution, the new constitution is silent on the number of representatives from each organisation. However, in the case of the Councils' representation, the number will remain at 5, including the Member for the area who is appointed on an ex officio basis.
- 2.3 There are two areas where it is proposed that existing practice be continued, although not in line with the guidelines. These are that HIAL management should remain as full members of the Committee and that HIAL should continue to provide the secretariat.

3 Financial Implications

- 3.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

4 Policy and Delegated Authority

- 4.1 The Infrastructure Committee has full delegated authority to act on all matters within its remit (Minute References SIC 19/03 and 70/03) and for which the overall objectives have been approved by the Council, in addition to appropriate budget provision.

5 Recommendation

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 01 - Public Report

- 5.1 I recommend that the Infrastructure Services Committee approve the revised constitution for the Sumburgh Airport Consultative Committee and note that there is no change in the Council's representation.**

Report Number : IFSD-02-04-F



Shetland Islands Council

REPORT

To: Infrastructure Committee

04 May 2004

From: Head of Planning
Infrastructure Services Department

LAND AT NORTH LOCHSIDE, LERWICK

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report advises Members that there has been an expression of interest in developing this site. The report points out that there are two main options. One of these is to take no action and leave the site as it is. The other is to contemplate some form of development on the site. If it is the Committee's view that the idea of developing the site should be considered in more detail, with appropriate community consultation, a draft brief has been prepared which would help inform of those considerations. It addresses site-specific issues which would need to be considered by any applicant prior to the submission of a planning application.

2. Background

- 2.1 The area of land to which the report relates covers 1.1 hectares and is situated at North Lochside in Lerwick. The land is owned by Shetland Islands Council and is currently used as general recreational ground. The future use of the site needs to be determined in terms of the public interest. In making decisions about that, the Council as Planning Authority needs to exclude from its mind any financial gain that would arise.
- 2.2 The draft planning brief has been attached as Appendix 1 to this report. The brief describes the characteristics and history of the site and outlines uses for the land, that a developer might feel were possible, whilst including an option for no change.
- 2.3 In addition to outlining potential uses the brief also highlights relevant zoning, Structure and Local Plan policies as well as possible constraints with regard to developing the site.
- 2.4 If Members wish to contemplate the possibility of change on the site, the brief – subject to any amendments that Members may wish to make today – would be issued at this stage for consultation purposes only. Its issue would not commit the Council to giving favourable consideration to any options. Once the views of consultees and the public are known, the Council will have the opportunity to modify the brief, possibly excluding some suggested uses or introducing others not mentioned.
- 2.5 A possible conclusion following the consultation process might be that the site remain in recreational use, but that the Council itself would retain the site and possibly create new recreational facilities on it. It would also be possible for the Council to decide at that stage that there should be no change at all on the site and to proceed no further. In either of these cases, there would be no need to issue the brief formally for the consideration of external developers.

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 02 - Public Report

- 2.6 If the Council did wish to contemplate developments by others on the site, for whatever purpose, the brief would be finalised and issued along with the particulars of sale of the land.**
3. Financial Implications
- 3.1 No financial implications arise from this report.**
4. Policy and Delegated Authority
- 4.1 The Infrastructure Committee has full delegated authority to act within its remit (Min Refs 19/03 and 07/03) and for which the overall objectives have been approved by the Council, in addition to appropriate budget provision. No change in Council policy is proposed at this stage; the most that is contemplated is public consultation on options.**
5. Recommendation
- 5.1 I recommend that the Infrastructure Committee arrives at a decision for the future of this site by coming to agreement on one of the following two options:**
- (a) Decide not to issue the draft brief for consultation on the basis that the use of the site should remain unchanged.
 - (b) Decide that the brief, incorporating any amendments that Members require, should be issued for consultation. Those consulted would include all neighbouring occupiers and residents, the Lerwick Community Council and other appropriate statutory and voluntary organisations. The consultation process would be managed in consultation with the Local Member.

Report Number : PI-10-04-F

APPENDIX 1

DRAFT PLANNING BRIEF:

LAND AT NORTH LOCHSIDE, LERWICK

APRIL 2004



CONTENTS

	Page Number
Background	
1. Purpose of the Brief	3
2. The Site and its Surroundings	3
3. Plan 1: The Site	4
4. Land Ownership	5
5. Site History	5
The Brief	
Access & Services	5
Potential Land Uses	5
Constraints	6
Further Issues to be Addressed by the Brief	7
Relevant Policies	8-11

1. Purpose of the Brief
- 1.1 This Brief has been prepared by the Council's Planning Service to assist in the preparation of proposals for any possible development of this site. The Brief suggests, for consultation purposes only, uses to which developers might wish

to put on the site. The inclusion of these uses in this Draft Brief does not mean that the Council regards them as acceptable. **A decision as to what, if any, development of the site should take place can only be made in light of consultation.** The document also sets out draft guidance on planning, roads and other issues that exist at this site.

- 1.2 This Brief takes account of National Planning Guidance, The Shetland Structure Plan and Shetland Local Plan. The local planning aims for Lerwick, which are outlined in the Lerwick Community Council Area Statement of the Shetland Local Plan, are of particular relevance:

- To maintain Lerwick's position as the principal settlement in Shetland.
- To maintain and improve the quality, vitality and viability of the town.
- To protect and enhance the built and natural environment.

- 1.3 Following consultation on this Draft Brief, it will be open to the Council to decide that no further action should be taken in relation to the site. However, should the Council wish to take forward one or more of the options for development, a final version of the Brief will be prepared for the consideration of potential developers. The Brief will at that stage become Supplementary Planning Guidance in relation to the Shetland Structure Plan and Shetland Local Plan.

2. The Site and its Surroundings

- 2.1 The site as shown on Plan 1 is located at North Lochside in Lerwick. It covers an area of 1.1ha and is covered by grassland, which has an undulating topography and a sloped embankment on the eastern boundary, which abuts the North Lochside Road.
- 2.2 The eastern boundary of the site extends 75m along North Lochside road. Housing bounds the site to the east, north and northeast. There is semi-detached two-storey housing on Bruce Crescent and North Lochside road, and detached 1½ storey housing on Burgess Street. To the southern boundary of the site lies recreational ground which currently used for football and rugby pitches. To the west lies North Staney Hill, which incorporates the area of land that was identified as a possible location for the new Anderson High School.
- 2.3 The land is currently undeveloped and has no defined use other than informal recreational ground. A public right of way exists with a footpath running through the site. In addition to this a drain runs along the western boundary.
- 2.4 The boundary around the site is formed by timber fencing with the exception of the western boundary, which is formed by post and wire fencing.

3. Land Ownership

- 3.1 The site as shown on Plan 1 is owned and maintained by the Shetland Islands Council.**

4. Site History and Current Policy

- 4.1 Historical maps of Lerwick (dated 1975) identify that the site lies within the area of land previously used for the Lerwick town dump. For this reason there is a potential risk that the land may be contaminated and further investigations would have to be carried out by any prospective developer, in full consultation with the relevant agencies.**

- 4.2 In terms of the Council's Zoning Policy, it should be noted that part of this site lies within a Local Protection Area. This area has been identified on Plan 1. In addition to this the majority of the site lies within Zone 1 of the Council's Housing Zone Policy. The site is neither an allocated housing site nor identified as a development opportunity in the Shetland Local Plan.

5. Access and Services

- 5.1 The site lies adjacent to the route served by the Lerwick town centre bus service, whilst the Viking bus station lies within ½ mile of the site.

- 5.2 Services such as mains water and drainage, electricity and the district heating scheme lie close to the site.

6. Potential Land Uses

6.1 Possible Uses for the Site are:

- **No Change** – The site contains a public right of way and provides an area of open space for residents of Lerwick, and nearby residents in particular, for informal recreation. Furthermore, part of the site is zoned as a Local Protection Area. An undeveloped use ensures that the amenities of nearby residents are protected and that no extra strain is put on the existing road network or services.
- **Residential including affordable housing** – The majority of the site lies within an area covered by Zone 1 of the Shetland Local Plan Housing Policy, as defined by Local Plan Policy LPHOU4. Any residential development would have to take into account the amenity of nearby properties, have a high design standard and comply with Structure Plan and Local Plan policy on Sustainable Urban Drainage, Car Parking/Access and Open Space. The level of affordable/social rented accommodation, if any, should be agreed through further consultation, as defined by Structure Plan Policy SPHOU1
- **Open Space** – There is potential here to create an improved area of public open space such as a landscaped park that would provide social benefits to the residents of Lerwick and the local area in particular. A use such as this is encouraged by National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG 11 – Sport, Physical Recreation and Open Space) which encourages the retention and enhancement of informal open space.
- **Recreational Ground** – The site affords the possibility of being developed to provide recreational facilities. A potential use could be as a skatepark and bmx park. A geophysical survey would be required to see if the land was suitable for construction, for example the site may have to be built up. The amenity of nearby residents would have to be taken into account with such an application to ensure they were not adversely affected by any development.
- **Retail** – The site is fairly close to the Grantfield/Holmsgarth commercial area, but is separated from it by housing. If a retail use were to be considered – for example a supermarket selling mainly food – any proposal would have to conform to Local Plan Policy LPCOM10. When

taking into account the effect that could occur on the vitality and viability of the town centre and rural shops (Policy SP COM1) by such a development it would be recommended that a prospective developer submitted an independent retail impact study with any planning application. It may also be necessary to restrict the amount of floor space for the sale of non-food goods through a legal agreement. A development such as this would involve significant change in the character of the site and it would be impossible to avoid a major impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residents.

- **Office** – There may be potential for a Class 4 Business Use, which includes office or light industrial activity, provided the development was carried out in a manner designed to limit any detriment to amenity.

7. Constraints

7.1 **Contaminated Land**

The land to which this Brief relates was part of the old Lerwick rubbish dump well within living memory and old Ordnance Survey plans confirm that point. There is therefore the possibility that the land may have been contaminated by that use. Any planning application would have to be accompanied by a survey showing the type and extent of any contamination and a scheme of measures necessary to either remove the contamination or make the land suitable for the proposed use. Any new development would have to comply with the Council's Contaminated Land Strategy, **Policy LP WM12** of the Local Plan, PAN 33 (Development of Contaminated Land) and Structure Plan **Policy SP GDS4**.

7.2 **Public Right of Way**

A public right of way runs through the site (See Plan1). Any new development would have to ensure that the public access was not reduced or restricted as specified by **Policy LPTP14** of the Local Plan. A developer would have to apply for a diversion order from the Council.

7.3 **Local Protection Area**

Part of this site, the area of land to the South of the public right of way, is identified on the Lerwick Proposals Map of the Shetland Local Plan as a Local Protection Area. Policy **LP NE11** of the Local Plan covers land within Local Protection Areas. The aim of this policy is to maintain areas regarded by the local community as being worthy of protection and the policy seeks to maintain these areas free from development, except that which is for the benefit of the community as a whole. The policy means that any development on this land would have to demonstrate community benefit.

7.4 **Access and Car Parking**

The North Lochside Road can be very busy at peak times and the development of a traffic generating development may have a significant impact upon the road network. On-street car parking is currently provided adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site and is used by residents of 14-36 North Lochside road in particular. Furthermore, this area is sometimes used as a parking facility for the town service bus.

If the Brief is brought forward there will be full consultation with the Council's Roads Department to examine the issues of access, safety and car parking. The use of road traffic assessments would also be beneficial.

8. Further Requirements for the Brief

If the Council decides, after consultation, that one or more of the kinds of development mentioned in the Draft Brief would be appropriate, the Brief will be finalised so that it can be made available to interested developers. At that stage, further technical information would be added to the Brief, for example:

- Layout and siting
- Access and Parking
- Landscaping
- Design
- Transport Impacts
- Possible safeguards for the amenities of nearby residents

The guidance provided in relation to these topics would generally flow from the policies contained in the Structure Plan and Local Plan, the most relevant of which are appended to this Draft Brief.

Head of Planning
Shetland Islands Council
April 2004

Shetland Structure Plan 2000

Policy GDS4 – General Development Policy GDS4

New development will conserve and, where possible, improve the quality of life and the environment by:

- a) controlling the location, scale and design of new development to respect, protect and conserve the natural and built environment;**
- b) minimising water, air and land pollution and waste generation;**
- c) considering all opportunities for the re use of land and buildings**
- d) avoiding hazards to health and safety:**

Policy SP HOU1 – Affordable Housing

The Council will work in partnership with other housing organisations and agencies to ensure the provision of social rented housing to meet need throughout Shetland.

Policy SP COM1

The Shetland Local Plan will contain policies that seek to ensure that:

- a) convenient access to shops is available to every inhabitant of Shetland including those without access to a car;**
- b) the viability and vitality of Lerwick town centre is protected and enhanced;**
- c) developments that are considered to have an adverse impact on the viability of rural shops and post offices will be resisted;**
- d) the creation of commercial employment opportunities in existing rural settlements will be encouraged, including home working, where it does not conflict with residential amenity.**

Shetland Local Plan 2003

Policy LP COM10 – Large-scale Food Shops & Supermarkets

New large-scale* food shops or supermarket developments will be permitted in Lerwick provided the following criteria are met in full:

- a) they are located within Lerwick town centre as defined on the Lerwick inset Proposals Map;**
- b) an independent retailing study (carried out at the applicant's expense) has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority, that the vitality and viability of existing centres and rural shops is not prejudiced;**
- c) the buildings are designed and constructed to a high standard**
- d) the applicant signs a Section 75 planning agreement limiting the amount of non-food shopping floorspace;**
- e) technical standards in terms of parking, traffic circulation, vehicular servicing, and pedestrian access are met in full (see Appendices D and E);**

A large-scale food shop is considered to have a gross floor area in excess of 100sq.m.

Policy LP WM12 – Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)

In accordance with Government advice the council will encourage developers to incorporate existing ponds, watercourses or wetlands as positive environmental features in development schemes. The Council will also seek to encourage alternatives to extensive canalisation or culverting, which can increase the risk of flooding and also greatly reduce the ecological and amenity value of water courses. Development and enhancement of SUDS for the benefit of the natural environment (both flora and fauna) will be encouraged. The Council still encourage the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, as opposed to the more traditional use of culverts, etc, where feasible. Consideration of a SUDS approach within a proposed development should be given at the earliest opportunity.

Policy LP TP14 – Public Access and Rights of Way

Development that supports improved public access, or the provision of new routes for public access, will be favoured, those which reduce or restrict public access along recognised routes shall be refused planning permission. The Planning Authority will work with land managers, local communities, user groups and other relevant agencies to extend and improve the footpath network (e.g. signage) and safeguard the tradition of responsible access to Shetland's countryside. Access for cyclists, walkers, horse riders and those with special needs will be catered for as far as practicable.

Policy LP NE11 – Local Protection Areas

Where an area has been identified on the Map as a Local Protection Area, only applications for the development of facilities, which benefit the community as a whole, will be considered.

Policy LP HOU4

General Requirements for All Dwellings

In all zones, applications for new houses, for the conversion of a building to form a house, or the bringing back into use of an abandoned dwelling, will need to meet all of the following requirements:

- a) the site is not located within an identified local protection area shown on the Proposals Map (see policy LP NE11);
- b) the site is not less than 5 metres above MHWS (mean high water springs) or any water course, except where the application is accompanied by a detailed assessment of flood risk which demonstrates that the risk of flooding is low, or satisfactory flood precautions are incorporated into the development. Where there is doubt the precautionary principle will apply;
- c) in respect of the provision of new housing by new building or by the conversion of existing non-residential property, the solum of the house is not less than 5 metres above MHWS, unless it can connect to an existing public sewer;
- d) a suitable and sufficient water supply can be provided;
- e) suitable waste water disposal facilities can be provided. Where more than one dwelling is proposed, a communal septic tank or connection to an existing sewer is required;
- f) if the site lies within the catchment of a drainage scheme (existing or committed), connection to the scheme will be required;
- g) the proposed development is sited to reflect the style, pattern and density of the surrounding area;
- h) all new accesses will be assessed on their merits, to ensure that a safe road access can be achieved, taking into account traffic speeds and volume, carriageway width, visibility and the number and proximity of other accesses;
- i) the proposed development is in accordance with the Council's access and car parking guidelines (see Appendices D and E);
- j) principles and guidance on siting, design, amenity space, materials and colours (see Appendix F);
- k) the proposed development will not have a significant adverse effect on neighbouring uses;
- l) the proposed development should, as appropriate, provide each unit with a minimum of 100m². of private amenity space, usually at the rear;
- m) the proposed development will not significantly harm Listed Buildings or their setting, Conservation Areas, Scheduled Ancient Monuments or sites notified for

their nature conservation or landscape value;

- n) the proposed development will not significantly harm sites of local archaeological, botanical or wildlife importance;
- o) the proposed development will not prejudice future mineral extraction where commercially viable reserves are known to be present;
- p) the proposed development does not conflict with other Structure and Local Plan policies.

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 02 - Public Appendix

Policy LP HOU4 *continued*

Zone Requirements For Proposals For Two Or More Dwelling Units

In ZONE 1; in addition to fulfilling the general requirements, proposals should reflect the character and density of the surrounding development.

In ZONE 2 applications for two or more dwellings will only be considered where they reflect the established settlement pattern.

In ZONE 3; in addition to fulfilling the requirements for single dwellings, proposals should be designed in loose clusters, which sympathetically reflect the pattern and density of the surrounding development. The overall scale and impact of the proposal will be assessed.

In ZONE 4 applications for two or more dwellings are unacceptable.

Justification

The housing zones and policies are unique to the Shetland Local Plan. The zone policies and the zone boundaries, which are shown on the area Proposals Maps, have been drawn up and developed in consultation with local communities. The overall aim of the approach is to provide a fair and consistent policy framework for determining planning applications for new houses throughout Shetland. The policy has been formulated with the following objectives in mind.

- to protect Shetland's natural and manmade resources;
- to maintain and enhance the landscape character of Shetland;
- to maintain the vitality and viability of existing settlements;
- to reflect the established settlement pattern;
- to maintain the traditional crofting and agricultural way of life;
- to support the rural population and reduce rural depopulation;
- to reinforce existing development patterns;
- to reduce servicing costs;
- to promote well ordered, sustainable and safe development.

All applications for new houses must meet the General Requirements set out in the policy; then, depending on which zone the site is in, the requirements for that Zone must also be fulfilled. Generally, the lower the zone number,

the easier it is to obtain planning permission. The zones can be interpreted as follows:

Zone 1 development is actively encouraged, subject to the general requirements being met.

Zone 2 is settled countryside in the rural areas generally away from Lerwick, where communities are

fragile and the population static or falling. In this zone development is favourably considered. However, proposals to develop on the best agricultural land will be discouraged.

Zone 3 is settled countryside mainly close to Lerwick, where development will be favourably considered where it strengthens and reinforces existing building groups. These are the pressure areas, where speculative housing development occurs. The requirement to build within or adjoining existing building groups is intended to control sporadic housing, promote the establishment of housing clusters and reduce the number of new individual accesses onto the road network.

Zone 4 is the sparsely populated or generally uninhabited areas where development is strictly controlled. This is open countryside; government policy is not to permit development here. The zone policy permits the building of new houses in exceptional cases, for agricultural or social support. As the justification is agricultural or social support, the policy requires the new house to form a group with the existing buildings on the holding.

For applications for two or more houses additional requirements are specified generally to protect the character of the rural areas and promote development within the developed areas.

Advice: Applicants thinking about building a new house are encouraged to read Appendix F of this Plan, the Shetland House guidance leaflet and discuss their proposals with planning staff before submitting a planning application or entering any agreement to buy land.

This policy conforms to:

- SPP 3 (Planning for Housing)
- NPPG 15 (Rural Development)
- Structure Plan policies GDS1, GDS3, GDS5, SP NE1, SP NE3, SP NE BE1, SP BE2, SP HOU1, SP HOU2.

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 02 - Public Appendix

This policy supports:

- The Corporate Plan
- Development Plan aims 2, 3 and 4

Background information:

- Distribution of Development Working Paper



Shetland Islands Council

REPORT

To: Infrastructure Committee

From: Lead Environmental Health Officer
[Environmental Services](#)
Infrastructure Services Department

CONTROL OF GULLS

1 Introduction

1.1 On 29th January 2004, the Infrastructure Committee requested additional research be undertaken to enable them to make a final decision on a gull control strategy. (Min Ref. 1/04).

2 Background

2.1 The report to Infrastructure Committee in January stated that removing nests is not a sustainable or cost effective strategy of gull control, and as such should be discontinued. The report recommended that grants be offered to assist homeowners to proof their properties as a long term solution to nuisance from gulls. The Committee have indicated that they wish for nest removal to continue, but also wished for additional information in order to

make a decision, including:

Date 4th May 2004

- 2.1.1 grant policy and the costs of roof proofing;
- 2.1.2 egg oiling and the gull control activities of other authorities, including Faroese counterparts;
- 2.1.3 the proofing of council houses and council properties;
- 2.1.4 the proofing of the potential food source at Rovahead;

2.2 Officers have worked with Rentokil to produce some costing for various proofing options. It is estimated that large flat roofs may cost between £1500 to £2000 for proofing, whereas proofing one chimneystack and a ridge would cost in the region of £100-200 for materials and labour, although depending on ease of access to the roof there maybe an additional cost for access equipment.

2.3 Infrastructure Committee agreed on 16th March 2004 to extend the Reserve Fund Property Grant to include gull proofing as a priority, this will enable homeowners to apply for a grant of 50% of the cost of the works up to a maximum grant of £2250 (Min Ref 14/04). A bid has also been submitted to the Scottish Executive to assist

homeowners on low income to up to 100% of the cost of proofing works. The outcome of the bid is not yet known.

- 2.4 Officers have investigated other authorities gull control programmes. It is evident that egg oiling can be successful, in particular in controlling the noise and aggressive behaviour from gulls. Oiling relies on blocking the pores of the eggshell, which oils the inner membrane depriving the fertilized egg of oxygen. It has to be undertaken by trained personnel, as the whole egg must be effectively coated for the method to work. Access to the nest has to be made twice, once to remove the eggs and then to replace them increasing the time of each visit compared to nest removal. The health and safety risks to staff also increase especially when dealing with gulls attempting to protect their eggs. Currently there are no officers trained in egg oiling at the Council, this would need to be arranged via a pest control company or a local authority out with Shetland. Nest removal is quicker, less hazardous and is immediately successful in providing relief to the householder. Oiling results in gulls still sitting on nests, on the householders roof, and there is no guarantee that oiling has been successful, until the eggs begin to hatch, or not. It is more time consuming, as officers may need to revisit a nest on a number of occasions to oil eggs as they are laid. The increased visit costs, and the need for officer training makes egg oiling a less cost effective strategy than nest removal.

- 2.5 Other authorities have used falconry, noise alarms and shooting, none of which are appropriate strategies for a town centre gull problem. It is apparent that Faroe in particular does not have a large number of complaints about gulls, there is no supporting evidence to explain this although it is suggested that it may be due to the tolerance of the local population, lack of food sources and/or the design of houses restricting roosting and nesting sites.

- 2.6 In relation to Council owned buildings, it is Council Policy to undertake seagull-proofing works to premises where it is recognised that there is an exceptional problem. This is on an ad-hoc basis, and there is no formal proofing of Council buildings. This is in recognition of the expense of undertaking comprehensive proofing to all Council buildings, as well as any on-going maintenance costs. Any decision to change this current strategy could not be met within existing resources.

- 2.7 In relation to the Council Housing stock, there is currently no provision for gull proofing works in the existing repairs and improvement budget. If the activity being undertaken on owner-occupied stock results in an increase in demand, this policy will be reassessed. If the Council wishes for gull proofing works to be undertaken on Council housing stock, a separate report will be required to Services Committee.

2.8 Whilst it is recognised that the Landfill site at Rovahead is a potential food source, as it is coming to the end of its life, proofing and gull control on that site will not be cost effective this season. The new landfill site will be fully covered by nets and will not present a food source to the gull population.

2.9 The other food sources that are encouraging the population to increase are the deliberate feeding of gulls and inadequately stored litter and domestic refuse. An information leaflet has been produced which advises the public on the steps that they can take to reduce gull nuisance. The leaflet is attached in Appendix 1. Businesses will also be encouraged to contain their waste materials and soiled equipment more effectively.

2.10As a way of preventing gulls from getting to the food source in domestic refuse sacks, the Council actively promotes the provision and use of:

- fishing nets to cover sacks;
- bruck boxes to store sacks in;
- communal refuse stores to keep sacks in on housing schemes

2.11 Members may be aware that animal-proof communal bin

stores have been provided by the Council at various housing schemes in recent years:

- for a number of years they have been used effectively at Brae, Firth, Mossbank and Cunningsburgh;
- last year a further four stores were installed on housing schemes at Sandwick and Scalloway;
- this year an additional twenty are due to be provided to Sandveien, Nederdale, Staney Hill and Kalliness areas, as a way of improving the environmental standards on the schemes for the tenants who live there.

If these new stores work as successfully as the ones already in place then they will significantly reduce the effect of the nuisance caused by gulls, especially in the residential areas of Lerwick.

- 2.12 In conclusion therefore, the recommended gull control strategy is to continue to remove nests at householders request, free of charge; to offer grants to householders to assist them with proofing properties against gulls nesting and roosting, and to issue advice leaflets. This strategy will continue until Rovahead closes at which point the strategy will be reviewed to determine whether it continues to be appropriate to remove nests or whether an alternative strategy should be applied following the removal of this food source.

3 Financial Implications

- 3.1 The nest removal will be undertaken this year as part of the Pest Control function of Environmental Health. In previous years there have been on average 65 service requests, although some of these will have required multiple visits during the nesting season. This will be managed within the existing service provision. Other elements of the Environmental Service's work such as achievement of the Health and Safety inspection programme may be affected, and if there is unprecedented high demand, they will be severely affected.
- 3.2 There will be an additional call on the Reserve Fund Property Grant to fund the

proofing works. This will be met from the existing budget, but may result in increased waiting times for grant enquirers wishing to apply for a grant for other repairs works. Depending on the demand for grants for gull proofing there may also be a knock on effect on the speed of processing grant approvals, the waiting times for grant inspections and responses to other Environmental Health service requests.

- 3.3 There will be no financial implications from the increased workloads, as this will be met from existing resources by reprioritising workloads across the Environmental Health Service.

4 Policy and Delegated Authority

- 4.1 The Infrastructure Committee has full delegated authority to act on all matters within its remit (Min Refs SIC 19/03 and 70/03) and for which the overall objectives have been approved by the Council, in addition to appropriate budget provision.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 In recognition that the Committee wished to continue to offer householders assistance with gull control, it is recommended that nest removal will continue to be offered by the Council's Pest Control Officers' free of charge. This will be reviewed once Rovahead is reinstated and the new tip is opened.
- 5.2 Grants will be offered to homeowners who wish to proof their properties. Initially this will be funded

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 03 - Public Report

by the Reserve Fund Property Grant, if the bid to the Scottish Executive is successful, further funding will be available to assist those on low income with up to 100% of the cost of the works.

- 5.3 Officers will continue to use education and advice to reduce food sources, such as litter, poorly stored domestic refuse and commercial waste. The information leaflet will be given to all householders complaining about gulls, requesting the nest removal service or applying for grants for proofing works.

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 I recommend that the Infrastructure Committee approve the proposed strategy for the control of gulls as detailed in section 5 of this report.

Report Number: ES -20-04-F

.



Shetland Islands Council

REPORT

To: Infrastructure Committee

From: Service Manager - Environmental
Health
Environmental Services
Infrastructure Services Department

LITTER ENFORCEMENT POLICY

1 Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to request that the Infrastructure Committee consider adopting a more proactive Litter Enforcement Policy and delegate authority to the Executive Director of Infrastructure Services or his nominee to authorise officers outside Environmental Health to take enforcement action on litter.

2 Background

2.1 The Council's Litter Prevention Plan adopted by the Council on 03 April 2002, (Min Ref 49/02) set out a three pronged approach to protecting the Shetland environment from litter: Education, Participation and Enforcement. Since its implementation, the majority of resources have been focused on the Education and Participation elements of the plan, with enforcement being considered the last resort, where the other strategies fail to prevent anti-social behaviour and to protect the environment.

2.2 The validated litter survey has shown that Shetland's standard of cleanliness is consistently higher than national standards however there have been occasions when the level of cleanliness has dropped below the high standards maintained and expected.

2.3 Shetland markets itself as a clean and green environment, so the level of cleanliness is important in maintaining this image. It is apparent from the litter survey that in order to maintain current levels of cleanliness a more proactive approach to litter enforcement is required. A combination of enforcement, education and service delivery is recognised as the most effective approach to maintaining high standards of cleanliness.

2.4 To date, litter enforcement has been focused on enforcement weeks where officers from Environmental Health have patrolled with police, approached anyone seen littering or allowing their dog to foul in public places, and asked them to remedy their behaviour. If the litter is not picked up, a Fixed Penalty Notice of £50 can be issued. To date, no notices have been issued as all persons approached have removed their litter.

2.5 Outside of these focussed campaigns litter

enforcement is carried out on an ad hoc basis by environmental health staff carrying out other duties who happen to observe someone littering. Again anyone seen littering is asked to clear up, before a Fixed Penalty Notice is issued. Clearly with a limited number of officers, who are balancing litter enforcement with their other duties and are not a constant presence on the street, this approach is likely to have limited success.

2.6 In order to increase the number and presence of authorised enforcement officers available it is proposed that other officers from Environmental Services be authorised to issue Fixed Penalty Notices for littering.

2.7 It is also proposed that the new Community Wardens (subject to consultation) will be trained and authorised to serve Fixed Penalty Notices, increasing the total number of authorised enforcement officers to fifteen.

2.8 The Environment Forum held on 20th April 2004, supported the proposed increase in the number of officers authorised to issue Fixed Penalty Notices, and was keen for the Council to adopt a more robust enforcement approach than has previously been employed. The Forum recommended that following a three-month lead in period during which the policy is advertised, Fixed Penalty Notices will be issued on anyone seen littering. Where officers witness a littering or dog fouling

offence, rather than giving a verbal warning and requesting that the litter be picked up, a Fixed Penalty Notice will automatically be issued. If the offender is under 16 a warning letter will be sent to their parents rather than issuing a Fixed Penalty notice.

2.9 The offence of littering can include the dropping of cigarette ends, paper, food wrappings, dog fouling, cans, chewing gum, food waste, bottles, and bags of household refuse placed on the street outwith the collection period. Enforcement officers will treat the offence of littering in the same manner whether the litter dropped is small (a cigarette end) or large (fast food wrappers).

2.10 Environmental Health will also use their existing powers more effectively to ensure that business premises are providing adequate refuse storage and to ensure that private land such as car parks are maintained in a litter free condition.

3 Financial Implications

3.1 Implementing a robust enforcement approach by increasing the number of authorised enforcement officers can be met from existing resources. There will be a need for training to ensure staff are competent in the application of the legislation and in interacting effectively with the public. The cost of training can be met from the Environment Services training budgets.

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 04 - Public Report

- 3.2 The £50 penalty is payable to the Council and any income will be used to support the training, advertising and education schemes. unaffected by education campaigns.
- 4 Policy and Delegated Authority
- 4.1 The Infrastructure Committee has full delegated authority to act on all matters within its remit (Min Refs SIC 19/03 and 70/03) and for which the overall objectives have been approved by the Council, in addition to appropriate budget provision.
- 4.2 The Corporate Plan states that protecting and enhancing the environment is one of Shetland's priorities.
- 5 Conclusions
- 5.1 In order to protect Shetland's unique environment a more robust approach to litter enforcement must be pursued.
- 5.2 Increasing the number of authorised enforcement officers will increase the ability to have a regular presence in problematic areas, as well as creating flexibility to address issues, which occur out of core office hours. It will act as a deterrent and will increase awareness that littering is unacceptable behaviour.
- 5.3 Adopting the robust enforcement approach proposed by the Environment Forum set out in paragraph 2.7 will reinforce the corporate priority given to protecting Shetland's environment and will alter the behaviour of those who are
- 6 Recommendations
- I recommend that the Infrastructure Committee
- 6.1 give delegated authority to the Executive Director of Infrastructure Services (or his nominee) to authorise other officers to issue Fixed Penalty Notices; and
- 6.2 decide whether to:
- 6.2.1
- or
- 6.2.2 the litter on request.
- Report Number: ES -22-04-F



Shetland Islands Council

REPORT

To: Infrastructure Committee
From: Environmental Management Officer
Environmental Services
Infrastructure Services Department

BEACH MANAGEMENT : TRIAL SCHEME **SANDS OF SOUND BEACH, LERWICK**

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to advise Committee of a proposal for developing Shetland's first formal Beach Management Scheme. This will be a two-year trial, which, if successful, may be expanded to other beaches.

- 1.2 This report was discussed at the Environment Forum on the 20 April 2004 and there was a general consensus that the proposals should be approved by the Council.

Background

The Sands of Sound Beach, Lerwick is one of Shetland's most popular beaches. It is a considerable asset to the local community and is heavily used in good weather by local families and visitors and throughout the year by dog walkers.

The beach was given a Tier 1 status by Shetland Amenity Trust in their Shetland Sandy Beach Access Audit Report (1999). This categorisation of Shetland beaches is based on their popularity, scenic quality, potential as an

economic benefit to tourism, ease of access and potential for upgrading
04 May 2004

- 2.3 During 2003, a number of complaints were received by the Council concerning broken glass, dog faeces and barbecue wreckage on the beach, which seriously detracted from the safe public use of the facilities. On at least one occasion the extent of the littering was such as to raise the possibility of the beach having to be closed to the public on health grounds. These complaints were also aired in the local media.

- 2.4 In response to this public disquiet and in furtherance of Shetland's Litter Prevention Plan (2002 – 2007) a small working group has been meeting to examine the options. This group consists of representatives of the Council, Shetland Amenity Trust, Scottish Natural Heritage, the local community and the local Councillor for the area. Proposals for a Beach Management Scheme are outlined in this paper and have the support of this working group. Other interested parties – including the neighbouring landowners and tenants – have been consulted.

- 2.5 Beach Management Schemes are now becoming more popular in Scotland. These include beaches in Fife, Sutherland, East Lothian, Highlands, Ross and Cromarty and Argyle.

Information and Proposal

It is proposed that a Beach Management Scheme be adopted with the support of the organisations and individuals involved in the working group. The Scheme would operate initially as a two-year trial and would be monitored and amended as necessary within that time.

The Scheme would promote and encourage the conservation and protection of the habitat and environment in and around the beach, whilst at the same time ensuring that the use of the beach by locals and tourists alike would be a safe and enjoyable experience. The scheme would also raise awareness of environmental issues relating to beach use to the general public.

Issues to be addressed would include cleanliness of the beach, access to it, erosion issues and general public conduct in relation to the beach habitat.

Cleanliness

It is proposed that a cleansing regime be introduced whereby the beach would be monitored and cleaned accordingly estimated to be approximately three occasions per week, May to September inclusive. Initially this will be a responsive service rather than a pre programmed one. However it is estimated that it is likely to

be to a total of 100 cleaning hours during this 25-week period. The Council's Cleansing Service would undertake this work. This beach clean would remove litter, broken glass, dog fouling and spent barbecues. It would also advise of any potentially hazardous materials arriving on the beach so that appropriate action can be taken. It should be noted, however, that the funding for cleaning is limited.

A dog waste bin will be installed near the access point to the beach. This bin will be emptied and maintained on a regular basis. It is the general opinion of the working group that no litterbins will be provided at this stage. Instead the public will be advised by notices to "take their litter home".

The beach is already part of the Adopt-a-beach Scheme operated on a UK wide basis by the Marine Conservation Society and managed locally by Shetland Amenity Trust. The beach is also currently cleaned twice during the main Voar Redd Up period by volunteers and occasionally by community service offenders. If the cleansing regime, as detailed above, is implemented a review of the above

out of season
cleansing regimes
will be undertaken
to consider beach
cleaning by local
volunteers out of
season.

Erosion

The main beach access points are currently suffering from considerable erosion due in part to natural processes, but exacerbated by the increased human use of the beach. Overgrazing of the banks adjacent to the beach may also be a contributory factor. With the support of Scottish Natural Heritage, the landowner, the Council and Shetland Amenity Trust it is proposed to take some remedial measures to limit this erosion by special planting, closer monitoring of the numbers of animals grazing the banks and by some beach improvement works which will be sympathetic to the visual amenity of the beach.

Access

Proposals to alleviate the problems of erosion at the most heavily used access point near to the former Sands of Sound cottage site have been discussed. The current access point will be closed, the stile removed and measures put in place to prevent access via this point. Improved access will be encouraged by moving the main point of entry further north to the field gate already in existence. This field gate will be rehung the other way round and remedial works will be carried out to the culvert adjacent to this point in order to make

access to the beach easier for the public, particularly those with pushchairs. This work will be led by the Council's Planning Service with the support of the landowner and tenants.

Monitoring of traffic and pedestrian access to the beach will be undertaken during 2004 by the Council's Planning Service.

Public Awareness

Small advisory notices will be affixed to fence posts in the area advising the public of the correct point of access and of the necessity of taking their litter home. There will also be a temporary, visually suitable Notice Board advising the public of the reasons for the relocation of the entry point and of the rules of conduct expected of beach users to assist in maintaining the integrity of the site. This work will be led by the Council's Planning Service with the support of Shetland Amenity Trust and the landowner.

Monitoring and Review

In order to ensure that all parties fulfil their requirements under the Scheme it is important to monitor the site. Monitoring will address both the condition of the beach and its usage by the public as well as ensuring the implementation of the agreed management actions by the parties involved. It will seek to ensure that the characteristics and structure of the beach and its role as a community asset does not significantly alter over time, subject to natural change.

Each lead body will be responsible for monitoring the compliance to the management actions they have signed up to on a monthly basis during the period May to September and quarterly thereafter. The existing working group will collate the information relating to this compliance monitoring.

This Scheme will have to adapt to changing circumstances. As activities, issues and conditions with regard to the beach change their management will also evolve to accommodate this. There will be a regular review of the scheme to assess its effectiveness, revising it where necessary in order to maintain its relevance. Any changes required will be carried out in full consultation with all those likely to be affected. The working group will jointly prepare and discuss an annual progress report on the scheme's implementation and any new findings about the state of the beach or its surrounding area. This report will be placed before the Forum next year.

The Scheme will be subject to formal approval by the landowner, tenants and community.

Financial Implications

The works proposed can be met, for the duration of the two year trial, from within the existing budgets of the various parties involved in the Beach Management working group.

- 4.2 Planning Services are placing £6,000 of their Coastal and Flooding

Protection budget RCY 80811151 and £2,000 Quality of Life funding from GRY 83021220 towards the work they are intending to carry out.

- 1.3 Cleansing Services have also identified £2,000 annually from the budget GRY52121480, Street Cleansing Operations for the cleansing work to be carried out. This work will be carried out using existing Council resources. It is not anticipated that this will have a significant impact on overall service delivery. Any demand over and above the designated 100 hours per annum will require a further review of budgets.

- 4.4 It should be noted that should major physical works be required either during the trial or at the end of the assessment period further funding would need to be identified.

- 4.5 If, at the end of this two-year trial, it is decided to repeat this management scheme to other beaches throughout Shetland there will be also a requirement for additional funding.

Policy and Delegated Authority

Matters relating to the protection and improvement of the environment stand referred to the Infrastructure Committee. Structure Plan Policy SP NE9 commits the Council to join with local communities, the private sector and all appropriate agencies in protecting and enhancing the natural environment. The Lerwick Local plan (Lerwick Community Council Area Statement) makes specific

reference to the problems of erosion at Sands of Sound (Para 4.3). The need for improvement of access in this and other coastal areas of the town is reflected in the Local Plan Proposals Map.

These policies provide support for the deployment of Council staff and resources in the project outlined in Section 3 of this report. For the avoidance of doubt, approval of this report will be taken to grant authority for the necessary work to be undertaken where that authority does not already exist. Written agreement on these proposals will be sought from the landowners concerned.

The Infrastructure Committee has full delegated authority to act on all matters within its remit (Min Refs SIC 19/03 and 70/03) and for which the overall objectives have been approved by the Council, in addition to appropriate budget provision.

Conclusions

Sands of Sound Beach is a community and public asset, which is likely to become more heavily used during the summer months. New housing developments in the immediate area will realise some 120 extra families within its catchment. Warmer summers may encourage more use of the facilities and it is already a recognised and valued recreational asset.

Problems already detected as a result of its increased use during 2003 need to be dealt with now, particularly those of erosion and littering.

The Beach Management Scheme proposed would tackle the main issues, which require to be addressed to ensure the maintenance of the good

environmental quality of the beach. It has been developed with the consent of, and with input from, all parties with a major interest in the area. It sets out management actions, and aims to act as a starting point for the enhancement of the beach habitat for humans and for wildlife alike.

The scheme will be reviewed and amended on a regular basis to ensure its continuing relevance.

The Scheme seeks to focus on voluntary management measures that involve widespread co-operation and consensus between organisations and individuals with an interest in the area. The Scheme does not intend to add new bureaucratic measures to existing manners of working but will instead clarify and reinforce existing good practice in light of the general public interest in the beach.

If successful, the Scheme may be used as a good practice guide for other Shetland beaches. This will support the work of Shetland's tourism sector as well as supporting local quality of life issues. It will also assist in the sustainable development of the area in a manner suitable to and with the agreement of the community.

It is hoped that this Scheme may assist in changing beach users' habits by raising awareness of the value of the coastline to the Shetland community.

7 Recommendations

I recommend that the Infrastructure Committee agree that : -

- 7.2 the proposed trial Beach Management Scheme be adopted as proposed; and

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 05 - Public Report

- 7.3 a report on the findings of the trial be placed before Committee at the end of the trial period with recommendations as to whether the scheme should be extended throughout Shetland.

ES-13-04-F1



Shetland Islands Council

DISCUSSION PAPER

To: Environmental Forum

From: Environmental
Management Officer

Environmental Services
Infrastructure Services Department

AN ENVIRONMENTAL LEVY BILL ON
PLASTIC BAGS – CONSULTATION
DOCUMENT

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to advise the Forum of a consultation document on a Bill to introduce a levy on the use of plastic bags by shops throughout Scotland. The Forum is invited to discuss the proposal.

Background

In October 2003 Mike Pringle, MSP introduced a proposal for a Scottish Parliamentary Bill to place a levy on specified plastic bags. This Scottish proposal would be similar to legislation already introduced in the Republic of Ireland in 2002.

Both the House of Commons and the Welsh Assembly have shown similar interest in the introduction of such a Bill, particularly in light of

the success of the Irish legislation in tackling the problem of windblown litter caused by plastic bags.

The Bill would support governmental agendas on the sustainable use of resources as well as waste minimisation and is in line with targets for the reduction of plastic waste set by recent national, EU and global initiatives.

Surveys suggest that each household has on average 40 plastic bags stuffed into cupboards or drawers and that the public does not take into consideration the waste of resources when expecting plastic bags to be handed out whenever and wherever they make a purchase.

This excess of plastic packaging is often only used once before becoming litter or being added to the waste stream for disposal in landfills or, in Shetland's case in the Waste to Energy plant. A recent survey of Shetland's waste identified 250 tonnes of plastic shopping bags as part of the normal Shetland waste stream. When it is considered that each bag in itself weighs very little this suggests a huge usage of plastic by the Shetland public when shopping.

National and individual business initiatives aimed at reducing this usage by the introduction of box schemes or the "bag for life" scheme operated by many supermarkets have had little public uptake. Similarly recycling and return facilities operated by some

supermarkets for their plastic bags have had little impact.

Proposal

The Bill proposes that a levy be raised on certain plastic bags. This levy would be collected from businesses in their area by the local authority. Businesses will be required to pass on this levy to the customer at the point of sale by charging a sum for each plastic bag used.

The money raised from the levy would be used (ring-fenced) by the local authority, after running costs, for environmental measures and improvements.

Conclusion

A copy of the consultation document is attached as Appendix 1. It makes a clear argument on grounds of good practice, sustainable development and litter prevention for the introduction of such a levy.

Areas for Discussion

5.1 The Forum is invited to put its views forward on the consultation, and in particular on how such a levy should best be collected and operate. We can then reply to Mr Pringle on behalf of the Council.



Shetland Islands Council

REPORT

To: Infrastructure Committee

From: Projects Unit Manager
Infrastructure Services Department

BRESSAY BRIDGE – REPORT ON
PROGRESS OF NOTICE OF INTENTION TO
DEVELOP AND ENVIRONMENTAL
STATEMENT. STRATEGY FOR THE NEXT
STAGES

1. Introduction

1.1. The purpose of this report is to:

- advise Members on the progress of the project;
- summarise and review the comments that were received in response to the NID and ES;
- describe further work that has been completed post publication of the NID in response to discussions at a series of meetings with those objecting to the scheme; and
- inform Members of the strategy for taking the project through its next stages.

2. Background

- 2.1. The Capital Projects Unit submitted a Notice of Intention to Develop (NID) in December 2003 for the Bressay Bridge.
- 2.2. An environmental statement (ES) was published at the same time as the NID which reported the environmental impacts of the preferred design.
- 2.3. Representations received during the statutory periods for the NID (21 days) and ES (4 weeks)

were reviewed and processed. The detail is given in Chapter 2 of Appendix 1 to this report, copies of which are available in the Members Room.

3. Summary of the Comments

3.1. By the close of the statutory periods the following representations had been made:

- letters of objection from 7 local businesses;
- letters of support from both Lerwick and Bressay Community Councils (the Lerwick Community Council letter was conditional on addressing local business concerns);
- letters of support from 15 individuals;
- 2 other letters; and
- responses from statutory consultees.

3.2. Copies of the letters are included in Appendix 1.

3.3. The key issues raised in these letters were grouped into the following categories (See Chapter 2 of Appendix 1).

1. Bridge Location/Background
2. Roads Issues
3. Environmental and Planning Issues
4. Impact on Navigation
5. Impact on Businesses
6. Health and Safety Issues
7. Information and Consultation
8. Procedural Issues

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 07 - Public Report

4. Further Consultation and Provision of Additional Information
- 4.1. Meetings were arranged with the 7 individual Lerwick businesses that had raised objections.
 - 4.2. The object of the meetings was to discuss in detail the issues that had been raised in order that the Council's Project Team (the Team) could fully understand the nature and detail of the concerns and identify additional information that should be provided to help address concerns.
 - 4.3. Additional studies are being undertaken and available information was issued to objectors for their comment.
 - 4.4. Details of the information are included in the final document together with summaries of the key issues raised by objectors and notes from the various meetings held with them (See Appendix 1 provided in the Members Room for details).
5. Strategy for the Next Stages of the Project
- 5.1. Key stages of the strategy are set out below. Additional steps are included in Chapter 11 of Appendix 1.
 - 5.2. All objectors and other stakeholders supported the concept of a fixed link between Lerwick and Bressay. After further consideration of the project, discussing concerns with objectors and other additional work, the Team considers that the bridge project should be progressed.
 - 5.3. It is recognised by the Team and objectors that there is no one solution that can fully address all concerns. The challenge therefore is to continue to mitigate as far as reasonably possible, the impacts on particular objectors in order to optimise benefits to Shetland.
 - 5.4. The Team considers that, if objections remain unresolved by mid May 2004, the application and the objections together with the responses should be sent to the Scottish Executive for determination.
 - 5.5. The air draft of the bridge should be 40m. This meets the minimum aspirations of the LPA and has been confirmed as an essential criterion for the bridge design in recent stakeholder meetings.
 - 5.6. The Team will consider the potential costs and benefits of increasing the span of the bridge to at least 180m. The LPA and other objectors raised concerns about the proposed span of 160m primarily because of navigational issues.
 - 5.7. As an alternative to increasing the span, the Team will explore, in consultation with the LPA, the potential to reduce the width of the proposed dredged channel from 120m to the minimum 100m through the use of navigational aids.
 - 5.8. The Team considers that the current line for the bridge remains the preferred location because it is the line of least constraint. The potential constraint to LFT's business is recognised but it is considered that there is a range of options that can be further investigated to accommodate the needs of that business. The Team considers that there would be significant benefit to the project and LFT to maintain a dialogue to explore and evaluate options.
 - 5.9. The design of the proposed road improvements will be progressed through the appropriate statutory procedures.
 - 5.10. There will be a continued

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 07 - Public Report

commitment to ongoing consultations with all stakeholders. A monthly project liaison meeting will be instigated with stakeholders as a means of sharing information and exchanging ideas in an open forum.

5.11. Given the particular concerns of LFT, a specific partnership will be promoted between them and the Team to further discuss their concerns and to jointly explore opportunities and measures to address them. As wide a range of opportunities as possible will be explored for the factory to successfully coexist in proximity to the bridge and to enhance the image of the business site at the end of construction.

5.12. If the Council is to be in a position to secure ERDF funding for the construction of the Bressay Bridge, there are specific elements of the project that must continue to be progressed. These are:

- Completion of the joint LPA/SIC economic impact study. This must be concluded before any Public Local Inquiry (if required);
- Completion of further options appraisal;
- Development of the detailed design of the final option;
- Development of the construction methodology;
- Development of the final cost model. This must be concluded before the Council makes a final commitment to build the bridge;
- Consents and acquisitions
 - NID for replacement link road and associated improvements
 - Works Licence Application
 - Roads Scheme
 - Traffic Orders
 - Side Road Orders

- Stopping Up Orders
- Compulsory Purchase Order
- Acquisition from Crown Estate

6. Financial Implications

6.1. There is perhaps an expectation amongst Members that estimated costs of the bridge and the various options to address objectors concerns would be presented in this report.

6.2. These costs can only be identified when all the objections have been addressed and the details of the project finalised. Indicative additional costs for addressing some specific objections such as moving the bridge location to the north or increasing the span of the current option, are included in Appendix 1 for information.

6.3. In this connection there are no financial implications other than those currently approved in the Council's Capital Programme.

7. Policy and Delegated Authority

7.1. The Infrastructure Committee has full delegated authority to act on all matters within its remit (Min Refs SIC 19/03 and 70/03) and for which the overall objectives have been approved by the Council, in addition to appropriate budget provision.

7.2. In February 2001, the Council decided in principle that a bridge should be built between Bressay and Lerwick (minute reference 6/01).

8. Recommendations

I recommend that the Committee note all of the above, and the contents of Appendix 1. In particular, I ask the Committee to note progress on the Bressay Bridge Project with regard to the following:-

Infrastructure Committee - Tuesday 04 May 2004
Agenda Item No. 07 - Public Report

- 8.1. Development of design and proposed construction methods.**
- 8.2. The responses to the NID and ES and the means by which I am addressing these.**
- 8.3. That I intend to refer the NID and ES to the Scottish Executive shortly.**
- 8.4. That I intend now to move on to subsequent stages of seeking all required statutory consents.**

Report No: IFSD-CPU-02-04-F



Shetland Islands Council

REPORT

To: Infrastructure Committee

From: Burial Grounds Service Manager
Environmental Services
Infrastructure Services Department

BURIAL GROUND EXTENSIONS PROGRESS REPORT

1. Introduction

1.1

2. Dunrossness 2004/05

2.1

headstone/footstones and this will be subject to consultation with the Community Council. We normally require sufficient land to build an extension which will last 50 years, in this case the landowner has suggested that he would like to sell land suitable for 100 years and given the low value of the land it is proposed to purchase the necessary land for a future extension. Works will include re surfacing of the car park.

3. Bigton 2005/06

3.1 The extension will be on the east side of the existing yard. Land is currently being surveyed for land purchase and design. The proposed design is in line with the Councils preferred option back to back headstone/footstones and this will be in consultation with the Community Council. The work will also involve making good damage to the access road during construction, extensive coastal protection for the access road and accommodation works for the landowner. Members recently approved the ca

4. South Whiteness 2005/06

4.1 The landowner of South Whiteness is only willing to sell sufficient land for an extension of approximately 25 years which does not offer value for

money to the Council. In addition parking at this burial ground is non existent with the road becoming completely blocked at times of funerals and there is little space to provide additional car parking. As such we are investigating the possibility of providing a new yard with suitable car parking

on a new site and are consulting with the Community Council on this. Members will be advised of the results of this consultation in due course.

5. Fetlar 2005/06

- 5.1 Recent trial pits in Fetlar burial ground have shown that land previously recorded as unused lairs has in fact been in use some two to three hundred years ago and as such is not suitable for continued use. It is therefore proposed to provide a new extension and we have commenced discussions with the landowner and appointed a project manager and architect to progress the design.

6. Rolling Programme

- 6.1 The following yards are

included in
the rolling
programme
for burial
ground
extensions.
Land
acquisition
will
commence
this year for
these yards
to minimise
delays in the
capital
programme.

objectives have been
approved by the
Council, in addition to
appropriate budget
provision.

9. Recommendation

9.1 I recommend that the
Infrastructure Committee
notes the contents of this
report.

Report No. ES-21-04-F

Lund	2006/07
Bixter	2007/08
Voe	2008/09
Muckle Roe	2009/10
Skerries	2010/11
Kirkabister	2011/12

7. Financial Implications

7.1 This report is for
information only and there
are no financial implications
arising from it.

8. Policy and Delegated Authority

8.1 The Infrastructure
Committee has full
delegated authority to
act on all matters within
its remit (Min Refs SIC
19/03 and 70/03) and
for which the overall