

10 November 2011

Agenda Item No. 6

Madras College, St Andrews

Report by: Kenneth Greer, Executive Director (Education)

Wards Affected: 17, 18, 19, 20 & 21

Purpose

To inform Committee of the results of the re-appraisal of the potential sites for the location of the new Madras College.

Recommendation(s)

Committee is asked to:

- (i) Note the results of the re-appraisal of available options which confirms the Committee's previous position that, in the event that should the Langlands option not proceed, the remodelling and extension at Kilrymont is the best remaining option; and
- (ii) Determine the way forward for the location of the new Madras College to replace the current split site school.

Resource Implications

Provision is made within the Capital Investment Programme for capped funding of £40M for the replacement of Madras College.

Legal & Risk Implications

Key risks are summarised in the report.

Impact Assessment

An initial impact assessment has been carried out, and since impacts are positive there is no requirement to carry out a full assessment.

Consultation

Standing groups for consultation on the capital project for Madras College are the School Estate Development Board and the Madras Local Development Group. This paper reports on a number of engagement sessions with local stakeholders.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 At its meeting on 22 September 2011 the Policy, Finance & Asset Management Committee agreed:
 - i To note that the University of St. Andrews had decided to withdraw from the negotiations with Fife Council to build Madras College on their land;
 - ii To confirm that the options appraisal work previously undertaken in 2009 (with the addition of appraisal of Craigtoun) will be revisited and that a report on site selection be considered at the Education and Children's Services Committee meeting on 10th November, 2011 for a decision on the preferred site for the new school; and
 - iii To confirm that the budget for Madras College, St. Andrews will be £40m.

2.0 Issues and Options

- 2.1 Prior to re-evaluating the sites a series of stakeholder engagement events were convened to consider the validity of the criteria and weightings used in the original evaluation exercise in 2009.

2.2 Local Development Group (LDG)

The LDG, extended to include representation from all associated primary schools met on 27 September, 2011 to consider the sites re-appraisal exercise.

The meeting took the form of a presentation by Education Services, followed by a workshop led by Education but supported by officers from Asset and Facilities Management Service (AFMS) which considered the methodology used in the original sites appraisal with particular reference to:

- List of sites to be appraised – original list plus Craigtoun Park and minus the three University sites;
- The continuing relevance of the original criteria used;
- Any additional criteria;
- Ranking of the criteria; and
- Weightings to be applied.

The output from this meeting was used to inform the two public meetings that followed and is summarised in Appendix A.

It should be noted that a minority group disagreed with the approach outlined and wished to be disassociated from the process.

2.3 Public Meeting – Newport

The meeting on 4th October took the form of the same presentation given to the LDG and the output from the LDG and views were sought. About 40 people attended the meeting and the issues are summarised in Appendix B.

Although various issues were discussed there did not seem to be a single unifying topic.

2.4 Public Meeting – Kilrymont

The meeting on 5th October took the same form as the meeting at Newport. Again about 40 people attended the meeting and the issues are summarised in Appendix C.

Although there were a variety of issues explored there did seem to be strong support for the de-listing of Kilrymont leading to its demolition and replacement with a new school. This seemed to be due to the belief that we cannot provide as good a school in a remodelled Kilrymont as would be provided in a new build.

As a direct consequence of this it was agreed:

- i. To score Kilrymont as a new build;
- ii. (separately) To score Kilrymont as a remodelling and new build extension option; and,
- iii. To provide a 'story board' of how a remodelled Kilrymont could look to assist stakeholders understand what could be provided.

2.5 Feedback Meeting – Kilrymont

Following the scoring exercise on the site selection, a briefing note outlining the outcomes the scoring exercise and the three previous meetings were made available in advance of the meeting. These were published on Fife Direct and on the Madras College Parent Council websites.

The meeting on 24th October was attended by around 65 stakeholders and took the form of brief presentations on:

- Output from the Madras Local Development Meeting on 27th September and the Engagement meetings on 4th and 5th October in Newport and Kilrymont respectively;
- Site evaluation outcomes; and
- Storyboards of how a remodelled Kilrymont could look to assist stakeholders understand what could be provided.

Throughout all presentations there were lengthy question/comment and response opportunities.

During the session the meeting was informed of professional opinion provided to the Council by an officer from Historic Scotland (in advance of the meeting)

regarding the possibility of de-listing and demolition of the listed building at Kilrymont. (Appendix D). This information was also in the briefing note made available in the briefing notes published in advance of the meeting of the 24th October.

3.0 Site Evaluation

3.1 The site evaluation approach followed the same process as that used to assess sites in 2009, with the relevant amendments which emerged from the engagement meetings outlined in para 2. The outcome of the 2009 assessment was that Langlands (b) site emerged as the preferred option. At its meeting in December 2009, PFAM also agreed that the remodelling of Kilrymont, as the next best alternative, should be held open as an option in the event that the proposal at Langlands fail to meet delivery or timescale aspirations.

3.2 The cross-service group of officers, chaired by AFMS and including experienced representatives from:

- Education Service
- School
- Community Services
- Planning
- Transportation
- AFMS

re-ran the appraisal of the original sites, excluding the University sites and with the addition of new build options at Kilrymont and Craigtoun Park.

The results of the site appraisal ranked the remodel and new build option at Kilrymont first followed by the new build at Kilrymont. Two sites, South Street and Station Park, were considered as a “Fail” under Development constraints. However, for the purposes of equity, a further scoring exercise was undertaken on these two sites. The final combined scoring matrix is attached as Appendix E.

The note of the scoring meeting including a more detailed review of each site is attached as Appendix F.

3.3 At the feedback session on 24 October 2011 (para 2.5 above) it became clear to council officers that two sites were of particular interest to those in attendance and these were discussed extensively on the evening. The main options are:

- Remodelling and new build using the listed building at Kilrymont;
- Demolition of the listed building at Kilrymont and replacement with a new build school;
- New build at Station Park.

- 3.4 In response to views expressed, officers have:
- Investigated the prospects of gaining approval to build at Station Park.
 - Investigated the ground conditions and likely finish requirements, including indicative costs, associated with a possible build at Station Park.
 - Developed assessments of the impact and cost of decant from Kilrymont in the event of a rebuild at that site.

Detail on the outcome of these investigations is contained in Appendices G1, 2 and 3.

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 Of the 9 options assessed, the appraisal scoring mechanism identified the re-modelling and extension of Kilrymont as the best option.
- 4.2 On the issue of delivery by 2015, only one site (Kilrymont, re-modelled) has been identified as complying with this criterion.
- 4.3 Whilst it may be possible to build on any of the other sites considered, there are significant risks which, as a minimum, will delay the delivery of a single site school by at least one year. On some sites there is not only the risk of delay of at least one year, but also the risk of failure to reach agreement or legal approval to use a site. There is a particular risk of delay around the option of Station Park. Although the site is in Council ownership, because of the site's sensitivity, securing planning permission would take some time and is by no means certain to be achieved.
- 4.4 Members should note that, irrespective of which site is approved by committee as the preferred site, there is an obligation of the Education service to undertake a formal consultation under the terms of the Schools (Scotland) Consultation Act, seeking the views of parents, pupils and the wider community of North East Fife on the preferred site.

List of Appendices

Appendix A - Output from Madras Local Development Group Meeting 27 September 2011

Appendix B - Issues Raised at Blyth Hall Meeting on 4th October 2011

Appendix C - Issues Raised at Kilrymont Meeting on 5 October 2011

Appendix D - Letter from Historic Scotland

Appendix E - Site Scoring Matrix

Appendix F - Note of Site Selection Meeting on 7 October 2011

Appendices G1, 2 and 3 – Issues outlined in Para 3.4 of this report.

Background Papers

The following papers were relied on in the preparation of this report in terms of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1973:

- Education & Children's Services Committee 20/08/2009
- Education & Children's Services Committee 12/11/2009
- Education & Children's Services Committee 08/04/2010
- Policy, Finance & Asset Management Committee 12/06/2008
- Policy, Finance & Asset Management Committee 10/09/2009
- Policy, Finance & Asset Management Committee 03/02/2009
- 1996 Local Plan
- 2009 Finalised Local Plan
- 2010 St Andrews Development Framework
- Policy, Finance & Asset Management Committee 21/04/2011

Report Contact

Colin McCredie

BFF Programme manager

Asset & Facilities Management Service

Colin.mccredie@fife.gov.uk

08451 555555 x 440484

Appendix A

Output from Madras Local Development Group Meeting 27 September 2011

Criteria and weightings:

1. Development Constraints/ Public Opinion/Consultation (P/F)
2. Education Impact (rank a 1) (weighting=3)
3. Impact on Pupils During Build (rank a 1) (weighting=3)
4. Speed of Feasible Delivery and Occupancy/Target 2015 (rank a 2) (weighting=3)
5. Community Impact (rank a 2) (weighting=3)
6. Deliverability (rank a 2) (weighting=3)
7. Transport Issues (rank a 2) (weighting=3)
8. Site Ownership (rank b) (weighting=2)
9. Planning Constraints (rank b) (weighting=2?)
10. Site Area and Shape (rank b) (weighting=2?)
11. Site Topography (rank c) (weighting=1)
12. Environment and Existing Services (rank c) (weighting=1)

Appendix B

Issues Raised at Blyth Hall Meeting on 4th October 2011

1. Area at Craigtoun Park needs to include for playing fields
2. Playing fields should be a consideration when looking at sites, better to have all facilities on one site rather than splitting education and playing field on different sites
3. Parking spaces should be considered carefully as this would "knock out" South Street
4. Pupils views on this development should be taken into consideration
5. Examine possibility on possible excambion on site FC do not own as this would minimise impact on £40M
6. Two options should be considered for Kilrymont site Option 1 for rebuild Option 2 for refurbishment
7. Delisting of Kilrymont should be pursued robustly with public opinion used as back up for this argument. Example given of Harris Academy in Dundee where this was successful.
8. Reinforced that Kilrymont remodelling is the only option that would give the school a pool facility
9. Construction material costs should be considered in analysis of sites i.e. High costs of materials for prominent sites eats into the £40M
10. Public opinion would be better to give this a score and a high weighting rather than a pass / fail
11. Should consider the bussing for Craigtoun Park as it will mean less buses need to go into the town, and easier walk for pupils living in the West of St Andrews
12. Consideration for new site should include for public transport to the site, not all parents use cars to get to the school.

Appendix C

Issues Raised at Kilrymont Meeting on 5 October 2011

1. Is there any point in considering sites not in FC ownership, as you do not know if the owners will sell the sites
2. Kilrymont assessment should be scored for two options. Option 1 for remodelling the existing and Option 2 for demolition and new build. This was agreed by FC reps at the meeting
3. Two additional criteria should be added for sustainability / carbon footprint as this will be different for each site. It is not obvious from the criteria indicated currently how this would be scored.
4. Impact on Community should be a criteria not just impact on pupils
5. Where are refurb unknowns included in the criteria
6. "Story board" with images of how a refurbished Kilrymont would look would help the public understand more about this option. This was agreed by FC reps at the meeting
7. Decant options must be included in the criteria and should be scored
8. Why are you speaking to Historic Scotland specifically on Kilrymont when the same level of detail is required for all sites
9. Where is criteria allowance for a single site school including playing fields
10. Value for money – This needs to be taken into consideration and is not obvious from current criteria e.g. decant costs will reduce funding available for the building thus this is not value for money. This needs to be included in the scoring matrix and should be obvious and transparent.
11. What was the cost of decant in 2009 and how was that integrated into the previous criteria.
12. FC should use the parents support when approaching Historic Scotland with regard to de-listing Kilrymont. Parents happy to support FC in this approach
13. How do you judge public opinion
14. Public Opinion should not be included as a criteria as it is impossible to score as pass/fail
15. Carbon issues / transportation are not given high enough priority
16. Challenge on de-listing should include recent B listing demolition i.e. Craigbank Church in Dundee
17. Best to have no pass / fail at all, all criteria should have a score
18. Impact on pupils criteria should be expanded to pupils and teachers and psychological impact
19. Educational impact has not been given a high enough weighting, upgrade this or downgrade other weightings
20. Fear that delivery of Education would be compromised in a decant situation
21. Sites outwith St Andrews – Need to take into account the long term costs of transport as well as safer routes to schools

22. Who takes the lead in Public Opinion criteria? How can you judge public opinion if a member of the public is not involved in the scoring, public should be involved in this?
23. Public need to know the detail of why sites fail, need for transparency in the process
24. Development Constraints - How can you make any decision if you do not have the full detail of the site e.g. geology
25. Why not take local knowledge into account i.e. flooding of Station Park
26. Majority feeling of meeting public opinion should be scored but weighting of 3 is to high
27. Public opinion on Kilrymont remodelling may change if they had detail on decant options
28. Is 2015 important if we have to wait to get the right site? General feeling of meeting 2015 was important

Appendix D

Letter from Historic Scotland

Mr Colin McCredie
Fife Council
Kingdom House
Kingdom Avenue
Fife
KY7 5LT

Longmore House
Salisbury Place
Edinburgh
EH9 1SH

Direct Line: 0131 668 8089
Direct Fax: 0131 668 8722
Switchboard: 0131 668 8600
Steven.Robb@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

Our ref: HGG/A/LA/1999
Our Case ID: 201104136
Your ref:

14 October 2011

Dear Mr McCredie

Madras College, Kilrymont Road Campus, St Andrews

Thank you for arranging last weeks meeting at the school. It was very useful to have a look around the building and hear your Council's aspirations for the site.

The building was designed in 1963-4 by Robert Sorley Lawrie (1903-77), Fife's County Architect, and opened in 1967. It was Category B listed in July 2007 as an innovative and unique design, and features in our recent publication *Scotland – Building for the future – Essays on architecture of the post war era (2009)*

<http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/scotlandbuildingthefuture.pdf>

A copy of the list description which contains more information about the reasons for listing can be accessed at:

http://hsewsf.sedsh.gov.uk/hslive/hsstart?P_HBNUM=50926.

Your Council wishes to consider options to incorporate the Madras College school on a single campus. We discussed both the proposed demolition of the building together with opportunities for the conversion of the building.

Demolition of the listed building

Scottish Ministers' policies for the historic environment are contained within the SHEP (Scottish Historic Environment Policy), July 2009. The relevant paragraph relating to the demolition of listed buildings is contained below;

3.50. In the case of applications for the demolition of listed buildings it is Scottish Ministers' policy that no listed building should be demolished unless it can be clearly demonstrated that every effort has been made to retain it. Planning authorities should therefore only approve such applications where they are satisfied that:

- a. the building is not of special interest; or*
- b. the building is incapable of repair; or*

c. the demolition of the building is essential to delivering significant benefits to economic growth or the wider community; or
d. the repair of the building is not economically viable and that it has been marketed at a price reflecting its location and condition to potential restoring purchasers for a reasonable period.

Only one of the four tests need be addressed to justify the demolition of a listed building.

The first test (a.) is concerned with the special interest of the building, i.e. whether it is listed or remains of listable quality. In order to address this test the building would have to be delisted, a process that would begin by asking Historic Scotland for a review of the listing. However, as the school was listed as recently as 2007, and there appears to be no significant changes to the building since this date this would seem unlikely. If you would like to ask for a review of the listing you can do this through the form on our website at

<http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/listinganddesignedlandscapesproposalform.pdf>.

You may wish to argue why you consider the building does not merit listing at Category B.

The second test (b.) concerns the condition of the building and its ability to be repaired. We do not believe that it is incapable of repair and therefore this test is unlikely to be addressed.

The third test (c.) concerns significant benefits to economic growth or the wider community. This test is often argued for major infrastructure projects such as the construction of the Clyde gateway and M74 extension in Glasgow, where it was essential to demolish a listed building to complete the route.

In order to successfully address this case it would have to be essential for the listed building to be demolished to achieve significant community or economic benefits. In this case, as one of the most popular community facilities in Fife, there are already benefits to the community within the existing building. If no new significant benefits are achieved, and the existing buildings loss is not judged essential, it would be difficult to argue for its demolition on this test.

The fourth test (d.) is a two part test which firstly must argue that the building is uneconomic to reuse, and secondly that the market (in the form of restoring purchasers) must be given the opportunity to purchase the building, often at nominal cost. We assume that as the site is likely required for the new school this test would not be appropriate.

As it stands we do not believe the building meets any of the tests required in order to justify its demolition.

You also raised the issue of Craigiebank Church in Dundee, a Category B listed building and part of the planned Craigie Garden Suburb. In this case the construction and detailing of the church had caused significant problems from soon after its completion. Efforts to address the inherent problems in the building had not been successful (indeed they may have harmed the building), and the applicants argued that the extensive repairs required to address the building and

bring it to useable condition would result in a new external façade that would reduce the authenticity and historical character of the building, affecting its listing. Our Conservation Group assessed the building and found that the applicants argument was substantially correct.

Refurbishment of the building

Many school buildings across Scotland from a wide variety of periods are listed and continue to remain in successful educational use. There are also many examples of listed school buildings which are no longer required for education and have been adapted, in some cases quite radically, to cater for a new use to ensure that they have an appropriate future within their communities. Listing is intended to recognise special interest, but we also understand that listed buildings need to adapt to meet changing requirements and listing is not intended to curtail sensitive proposals for change.

The Kilrymont Road building has a unique and carefully measured design and forms an interesting grouping with several components. The assembly hall and dining hall range with their distinctive 'pagoda' rooflines and high quality interiors are linked via a connecting corridor to a kinked four storey curtain walled classroom range. There is also a freestanding sports hall to the west.

It was useful to walk around the building and discuss alterations that may require to be made to accommodate the new combined school campus. The classroom block is described in the list description as utilitarian, a foil to the more decorative assembly hall block. I consider that there is considerable scope for alteration within the classroom block, whilst retaining its distinctive rooftop elements, form and glazing pattern. Throughout the buildings the replacement of glazing was necessary, and it should be possible to replace all glazing to a similar pattern to the existing in new double glazed units. The replacement and insulation of flat roofs with modern materials should also be able to be achieved successfully.

It was clear that in order to incorporate the combined school campus there would need to be a considerable addition to the buildings. I consider that an extension to the west of the site, linked to the sports hall, (and corridor block) would maintain the principal views of the listed building.

It is difficult to be too specific at this stage, and much will depend upon the detailed justifications and detailing made by the architects. However, my first impression was that the buildings are robust and would be capable of the alterations and extensions required to provide a new campus school without losing the essential character of the building. Often the incorporation of an interesting existing building by a skilled architect can result in a successful building.

I hope this has been useful. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Yours sincerely

Steven Robb
Heritage Management Team Leader (HB) East

Appendix E

Site Scoring Matrix

Option Ref	SITES	Development Constraints		Deliverability re Aug 2015		Education Impact		Community Impact		Impact on school and community (transitional period)		Viability		Site Ownership		Planning Constraints		Transport Issues		Site Topography		Site Area/Shape		Environment and Sustainability		Economic Impact		Total Score Percent		
		Pass	Fail	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B			
Weighting				3		3		3		1		2		2		2		3		1		2		3		1				
1a	Kilrymont Remodel and New Build	x		4	12	4	12	4	12	2	2	3	6	4	8	4	8	2	6	4	4	4	8	4	12	2	2	88		
1b	Kilrymont New Build	x		1	3	4	12	3	9	3	3	3	6	4	8	3	6	2	6	4	4	4	8	3	9	2	2	73		
2	South Street		x	1	3	2	6	3	9	2	2	3	6	4	8	3	6	1	3	4	4	2	4	4	12	3	3	63		
3	Station Park		x	1	3	4	12	3	9	4	4	2	4	4	8	1	2	3	9	3	3	4	8	3	9	2	2	70		
4	University (North Haugh)				0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	0	0	
5	University (Lang Lands)				0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	0	0	

6	University (Playing Fields)				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7	Pipelands	x		1	3	3	9	3	9	4	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	6	3	3	3	6	3	9	2	2	63
8	Craigtown Road	x		1	3	4	12	2	6	4	4	1	2	2	4	2	4	2	6	3	3	4	8	3	9	1	1	60
9	Strathkiness High Road	x		1	3	4	12	2	6	4	4	1	2	2	4	2	4	1	3	2	2	4	8	3	9	1	1	56
10	Strathtyrum Estate	x		1	3	3	9	2	6	4	4	1	2	2	4	2	4	3	9	2	2	3	6	3	9	2	2	58
11	Craigtown Park	x		1	3	4	12	2	6	4	4	2	4	3	6	1	2	1	3	3	3	4	8	2	6	1	1	56

Notes:

The evaluation matrix comprises an agreed set of options on the LH column and an agreed set of relevant criteria/factors across the top.

Once raw scores are applied, the spreadsheet which underlies this matrix automatically calculates the overall results/scores.

The matrix is scored, first, by agreeing and applying the relative weightings (using 1-3 scale) of the criteria being examined e.g. education could be x 3, whereas site area could be x 2.

The evaluators next consider and record whether or not there are any significant development constraints (deal breakers) threatening the viability of options.

Next, the criteria are scored in turn (using 1-4 scale) against each option under column A - column B automatically calculates the weighted multiplier.

Lastly, the overall score automatically appears at the RH column as a percentage/100

Key to Raw Scores (A):

- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Some Issues
- 3 = Acceptable
- 4 = Excellent

Key to Weighted Scores (B):

- x 1 = Desirable
- x 2 = Important
- x 3 = Crucial

Appendix F

Note of Site Selection Meeting on 7 October 2011

MADRAS COLLEGE, ST ANDREWS SITE SELECTION MEETING 7th OCTOBER 2011

Note of Meeting

This note describes the main discussions and conclusions arising from the meeting of a Fife Council, cross-service, officer group set up to review potential Madras College sites within St Andrews following abandonment of an earlier, proposed, joint project with The University of St Andrews.

Group members attending:

Ian Jones, Head Teacher, Madras College
Andy Herd, Head of Community Use, Madras College
Richards Simmons, Transportation
Alan Paterson, AFMS
Bill Lindsay, Local and Community Policy
Tom Nisbet, AFMS
Ian Nicol, AFMS (Chair)

The original university sites were not considered in this review exercise. As a result of public consultation, the original Kilrymont option was sub-divided into 2 versions, i.e. Re-model and New Build, and Craigtoun Park was added to the list.

Formal notes from Local Development Group and 2 public meetings considered by group in coming to their conclusions. Notes appended for reference.

Agreed changes to former criteria and weightings:

- a) Public opinion not considered separately but taken within Development Constraints, where applicable e.g. formal education and planning consultation, retain as Pass/Fail scoring.
- b) Deliverability by proscribed date no longer Pass/Fail but scored as other criteria - weighted x3 as "crucial".
- c) Impact on school and community (transitional period) - new category added and weighted x1 as "desirable" to reflect the temporary and managed nature of the risk involved.
- d) Separate Deliverability category renamed Viability to reflect Best Value issues such as existing services, cost risk etc - implicit deliverability factor within a number of the other criteria - weighted x2 as "important".
- e) Environment and existing Services renamed Environment and Sustainability to better reflect the Council's Big 8 aspirations – x3 weighting unchanged.

The group agreed that certain sites should be ruled out of the exercise if key development constraints such as time, quality and cost could not be fully satisfied. This aspect was then examined and discussed in some detail, site by site, resulting in two options failing to

pass these fundamental requirements, i.e. South Street and Station Park, and were not scored in detail.

The main factors relating to each listed site are outlined below:

	Site Option	Commentary
1a	Kilrymont Remodel and new build option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council ownership. • Currently within walking distance of much of St Andrews population. • B listed building - re-use is sustainable approach - supported by Historic Scotland. • Best option re delivery by August 2015. • Existing structures and services. • No planning issues re existing use. • Full educational curriculum can be delivered on site - reducing pupil roll. • Existing swimming pool retained/refurbished. • Limited area means retention and use of Station Park playing fields for major matches/events. • Some education and community issues re disruption during construction (decant arrangements) • Long term co-location with surrounding housing, e.g. continued concern re (mainly school bus) traffic congestion. • Potential to increase biodiversity.
1b	Kilrymont New Build option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council ownership. • Currently within walking distance of much of St Andrews population. • Demolition of existing B listed building would not be supported by Historic Scotland – potential delay/refusal - adverse impact on deliverability by August 2015. • Existing services. • Full educational curriculum can be delivered on site – reducing pupil roll. • Limited area means retention and use of Station Park playing fields for major matches/events. • Some education and community issues re disruption during construction (decant arrangements) • Long term co-location with surrounding housing, e.g. continued concern re (mainly school bus) traffic congestion. • Potential to increase biodiversity. • No swimming pool facilities would be provided in a new build

2	South Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed development constraint criteria but subsequently scored. • Council ownership. • Historic site of school in heart of town within walking distance of facilities. • Good public transport links. • Re-use of A listed building. • Conservation Area. • Challenges re development may impact on deliverability. • Subsequent cost of any acceptable building. • Great concern re increased (school bus) traffic congestion/impact. • Limited site area re people/user volume means retention and use of Station Park playing fields for all outdoor sports provision - i.e. split site - thus full educational curriculum cannot be delivered from this site • Some education and community issues re disruption during construction (decant arrangements).
3	Station Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed development constraint criteria but subsequently scored • Council ownership • Fundamental planning concerns re protected open space, flooding, landscape, gateway view to town. • Public reaction - lengthy consultation process and challenges re development may impact on deliverability for 2015. • Good public transport links. • Peripheral site re pedestrian access. • Some issues re existing services and environment. • Subsequent cost of any acceptable building. • Some education and community issues re disruption during construction (loss of external pitches). • Loss of existing playing fields. • Potential to increase biodiversity.
4	University (North Haugh)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not evaluated.
5	University (Lang Lands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not evaluated.
6	University (Playing Fields)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not evaluated.
7	Pipelands (east of new hospital)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peripheral site - concern re traffic congestion - anticipated volume of school related transport (mainly buses). • Issue re access via un-adopted distributor road to NHS PPP Project and/or subject to negotiations with current land owner/occupier (additional infrastructure) - multiple interests. • Existing services. • Currently designated "Employment Land" on Local Plan -

		<p>departure required - planning concerns re developing to south of town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges re development may impact on deliverability by August 2015. • Limited site area re people/user volume means retention and use of Station Park playing fields for all outdoor sports provision - i.e. split site. • Potential to increase biodiversity. • Public transport links via new hospital.
8	Craigtoun Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peripheral site. • Poor links to town and population. • Deliverability by August 2015 - requires new distributor road to be built for satisfactory permanent access and subject to negotiations with existing landowner/ developer - multiple interests. • Planning timescales/issues. • Subsequent cost of major road/interchange/services infrastructure requirement. • Sloping ground. • Traffic congestion until new road constructed. • Negative impact on town centre business.
9	Strathkinness High Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peripheral site. • Poor links to town and population. • Deliverability by August 2015 - requires new distributor road to be built for satisfactory permanent access and subject to negotiations with existing landowner/ developer- multiple interests. • Planning timescales/issues. • Subsequent cost of major road/services infrastructure requirement – Strathkinness High Road itself is poor for bus traffic. • Sloping ground. • Potential to increase biodiversity. • Traffic congestion and HGV restrictions until new road constructed. • Negative impact on town centre business.
10	Strathtyrum Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peripheral site. • Poor links to town and population. • Subject to potential flooding – SEPA maps. • Deliverability by August 2015 – subject to negotiations with existing land owner/trustees – currently viewing as commercial/residential opportunity. • Departure from Local Plan - timescales/issues. • Limited site area re people/user volume means retention and use of Station Park playing fields for all outdoor sports provision - i.e. split site. • Partially sloping ground/angular site shape. • Subsequent cost of any acceptable building. • Subsequent cost of major interchange/services

		infrastructure requirement.
11	Craigtoun Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council ownership (subject to access restriction) • Peripheral site. • Poor links to town and population - no safe pedestrian/cycle routes to school - new routes needed. Located outwith 30 mph zone. • Deliverability by August 2015 uncertain - subject to access negotiations with existing landowner during and after construction. • Departure from Local Plan. Poor site re planning - green belt, neighbouring users etc. - timescales/issues. • Loss of established parkland landscape and environment. • Major road interchange/infrastructure requirement. • Nearly all pupils require bussing to school – ref 1m/2m map - long-term cost and sustainability issue. • Negative impact on town centre business. • Large site could potentially accommodate school and all playing fields

Appendix G

Appendix G.1 - Planning Comment on Station Park Option

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Local Plan Policy Framework

- The Station Park site is identified as Open Space in the adopted *St Andrews Area Local Plan (1996)*. Policy E10 of the adopted Local Plan indicates that “irreversible development for purposes other than outdoor recreation will not be supported on areas defined ‘OPEN SPACE’ on the Proposals Map”.
- The Station Park site is identified as Protected Open Space in the emerging replacement *Finalised St Andrews & East Fife Local Plan 2009*. Policy C4 of the Finalised Local Plan indicates that “existing open spaces which are identified on the Proposals Map will be protected from development”.

Urban Design Issues

- The playing fields lie on the Coastal Plain beside the A91 to the North-west of St Andrews.
- They fall within the Settlement Envelope, but just beyond the built settlement edge, in an area dominated by landscape features: the Old Course golf links with the West Sands dunes beyond on the seaward side, and a thick belt of trees to the south, immediately beside the road.
- The settlement edge is fragmented by isolated buildings and, in particular, by the Old Course Hotel and Country Club, which has strong cultural associations with St Andrews, and is highly visible across the playing fields on the approach to St Andrews.
- The approaches by road provide the critical first impression of the town for visitors. The A91, Old Guardbridge Road, brings the heaviest volume of traffic, including most tourists, to St Andrews. Petheram Bridge embankment – which lies past the playing fields and closer to the town centre - forms a natural gateway to the town.
- Alison Grant’s *Landscape Capacity Assessment and Proposed Green Belt Study 2003* provide useful background material on landscape and visual matters. She states that “on approach, the playing field provides an undeveloped foreground which allows some of the pre 1900 buildings of St Andrews, raised on a coastal terrace, to be immediately visible on arrival from the west. This sense of arriving directly into the historic town is a distinctive feature of St Andrews. The sense of drama is heightened by the emergence of the road from enclosed woodland to open playing fields followed by the sense of ‘gateway’ created by the stone railway abutments.”
- Alison Grant states that development¹ on Station Park would have a negative impact on:
 - **landscape character** – the openness of the landscape character of the playing fields, which are an extension of the open character of the coastal plain and links and dunes character, would be lost;
 - **settlement form** – the extension of the settlement onto the playing fields would diminish the compact form which is particularly associated with the historic townscape;
 - **sense of arrival** – drama of arriving immediately at historic townscape on

¹ In undertaking her study ‘development’ was assumed to be domestic scale residential development. The potential impact of a High School campus, therefore, would be of a greater order of magnitude.

arrival at St Andrews would be lost if the playing fields were developed; and

- **settlement edge** – the settlement edge is already fragmented by the university buildings located away from the coastal terrace: the focus should be on reducing this fragmentation...development on the playing fields would simply add another element to this disparate edge.
- In the opinion of the Council's own urban designers, considerations such as the general form, scale and mass of the buildings and other facilities required for a High School campus, including parking and servicing, would serve to increase these negative impacts.

Transportation Comments

- From a Transportation point of view this site would operate well in vehicular traffic terms but not so good with respect to pedestrians.
- As the majority of pupils will be bussed from the Taybidgehead area to Madras, locating the school to the west of the town, off the A91, would ensure that almost all the school buses, and a considerable number of other vehicles, are kept away from central St. Andrews.
- The proximity to the St Andrews West Strategic Land Allocation also makes the site attractive.
- In almost all cases pedestrians would have to access the site by crossing the A91. Whilst controlled pedestrian crossings would be provided, there is an increased safety risk associated with Station Park as a development location as, in essence, the segregation of Station Park from most of the rest of St Andrews by the A91 creates a barrier for pedestrians. Overbridges or underpasses could also be considered, but personal safety risks are associated with these, as well as the potential visual impact of such structures (an overbridge was in place until the early 1990s).

Site Constraints

- The Station Park site is identified on the SEPA flood map as being at risk of flooding from both rivers and the sea. This is likely to increase processing time for any application, and to increase development costs.

Development Management Process

- Any application for development on this site would follow the Major Application route in terms of process, which would mean a mandatory 12 week minimum proposal of application notice consultation period.
- As part of the Development Management process, the proposal would also require screening for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and scoping for the content of that EIA, and the initial view from Development Management is that development of a secondary school on this site would indeed be likely to require an EIA, given the visual impact of development in this location on the view of the Royal and Ancient clubhouse and the Hamilton Grand from the main approach road.
- A formal consultation process with key stakeholders would be required in relation to development on this site, including contact with:
 - Scottish Water;
 - SEPA;
 - SNH;

- Sport Scotland (due to loss of playing fields);
- The Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council; and
- St Andrews Preservation Trust.
- In addition, the initial view from Development Management is that a formal process with Architecture & Design Scotland would also be required for such a development on this site.
- A further consideration, given that the proposal is for development on Council-owned land, is that the Scottish Government has call-in powers it may seek to exercise, with the attendant delays in process that such a call-in may trigger.

Legal Considerations

- It is not considered that there are any legal risks regarding the planning issues at this stage. Legal colleagues in Conveyancing are checking to ascertain whether there are any title restrictions regarding the use of the Station Park site.

OTHER ISSUES:

The selection of a highly prominent site such as Station Park for the school is likely to result in a very significant level of opposition from both the local community and the local business sector.

As the site is so prominent, the new school would be the first building visible for many travellers arriving in St Andrews, and as such there would be significant pressure for higher quality finishes than would be the norm, including stone etc. It is likely that these would add significantly to the construction costs – this was the experience when the Gateway Building (now part of the University of St Andrews) was developed.

Given the proximity of the Old Course Hotel, and the fact that any new school would partially mask the view of the Hotel on arrival, it is anticipated that the Old Course Hotel would be a strong objector to the proposals, and potentially this would result in a large number of other related objections from other tourist operators.

There could be operational issues for St Andrews' major golf events if a secondary school was developed on Station Park – Old Station Road is used for marshalling vehicles and tourist buses for both the Dunhill and the Open, as well as the fields opposite within the Strathtyrum estate for overspill parking and helicopter landing during these events.

Previous experience of planning in St Andrews shows that even for comparatively uncontroversial sites, opposition can rapidly reach several hundred objections or more, and it would be reasonable to anticipate that a similar, or higher, level of objection might be witnessed were the Council to promote this site for development, despite the essential nature of the proposed use.

Bill Lindsay
Service Manager
Enterprise, Planning & Protective Services

26 October 2011

Appendix G.2 - Indicative extra over costs for potential build at Station Park (Information prepared by RLB consultants)

The following costs are high level extra/over abnormal costs associated with construction on the Station Park site, which are based upon limited information and have been prepared in a limited timescale and should be considered as a framework for which more accurate costs can be determined. The costs are extra/over the Client's budget construction costs £40m for the St Andrews Site.

Ref	Description	Quantity	Unit	Rate	Total
1	Allowance for extra over cost of stone cladding to external walls; say 4,500 m2	1	Item	£900,000	£900,000
2	Allowance for de-watering of drainage excavations	1	Item	£100,000	£100,000
3	Allowance for 350mm topsoil strip across entire site; including carting away; assumed not contaminated	26,600	m3	£42	£1,117,200
4	Allowance for importing material to entire site; 2 metres deep; 6F2 material	76,000	m2	£25	£1,900,000
5	Allowance for Roundabout; 1 Nr	1	Item	£750,000	£750,000
6	Allowance for drainage Attenuation	1	Item	£80,000	£80,000
7	Allowance for Piling	250	Nr	£800	£200,000
8	Allowance for Ground beams; 600mm x 750mm	600	m	£250	£150,000
9	Allowance for Ground beams; 450mm x 450mm	2,000	m	£100	£200,000
10	Extra / over allowance for 100mm concrete floor slab	6,700	m2	£40	£268,000
11	Allowance for Foul water pumping station	1	Item	£30,000	£30,000
12	Allowance for additional external works	1	Item	£250,000	£250,000
Sub Total					£5,945,200
Add % Additions from Fife's Budget (Contingency / Prelims / Fees)				31%	£1,843,012
Total					£7,788,212

Appendix G.3 - Impact and cost of potential decant from Kilrymont

Currently the school is accommodated on two sites; S1 to S3 are based at Kilrymont, with the senior years (S4 to S6) at South Street.

The school have identified additional accommodation at South Street which could be used to accommodate S3 currently based at Kilrymont on site.

The school have identified that the following additional accommodation would be required in South Street to enable S1-S2 to be located thus allowing the complete school to be located on the South Street site during the construction period:

- 12 classrooms
- 1 drama studio
- 1 music room
- 2 music practice rooms
- 2 computer rooms
- 2 science labs
- 2 home economics rooms
- 2 technical workshops

Estimated cost of providing this accommodation for the duration of the construction period (18 months) would be £1.5 M. The additional accommodation would be located on the current car parking areas at the front and rear of the building.

Consideration would also have to be given and solutions found for the following:

- PE facilities – facilities at South Street supplemented by potential use of other accommodation within St Andrews
- Additional admin space
- Additional toilets - staff and pupils
- Additional staffroom accommodation
- Pupils' social space
- Additional kitchens and dining facilities
- Car parking

Community Use – If Kilrymont is remodelled then the long term impact would be that the community will have access to better facilities than that which would be provided in a new school including the retention of the swimming pool. During any remodelling and new build, as much of the current service as possible would take place in the South Street building and where this was not available, we would try to work with other local providers - Leisure Trust, Halls, University, Cosmos Centre etc. to provide support and opportunity to individuals, groups and classes.

It may be possible that some of the existing sport facilities at Kilrymont could be maintained for community use during the construction period.