

[\[2003 index\]](#)

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Agenda – July 2003

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

(Copies of Agendas and Minutes of the Community Council are held at Fife Council's Local Office, St Mary's Place and the Town Library, Church Square. Those from mid-1998 on are online at <http://www.louisxiv.demon.co.uk/standrewscc/>)

1. Apologies

Ian Goudie, Frank Riddell (also for August).

2. Minutes of June 2003

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

3. Presentations

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

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville (West)

4.2. Sheila Hill (South)

4.3. Bill Sangster (Central)

4.4. Jane Ann Liston (South East)

5. Planning Committee Report

Appendix A: Letter on Computer Science Building.

Appendix B: Letter on David Russell Hall redevelopment.

6. Matters Arising from previous meetings

6.1. Iain Smith MSP

[June 7.5.] Appendix E: request to attend community council February 2004, and general response to Chair's questions (see also Appendix F for other MSPs).

6.2. Scheme for Community Council

[Feb 6.3.] The final draft is out for review until 15 August. There are a number of points to be made again in line with our previous submissions.

6.x. Any other matters arising...

7. New Business

[It seems like everyone is clearing out-trays for the summer...
PL]

7.1. Civic greetings to Patras?

Ted Brocklebank MSP has passed on correspondence regarding a forthcoming visit by Mr Ian Mackie, a native St Andean with connections in town still, to Patras, Greece, on the 60th anniversary (May '04) of his father's death at sea there in the war.

Mr Mackie kindly offers to convey appropriate 'civic greetings' to Patras in view of both his connection here and Patras being the site of St Andrew's martyrdom, if we are so inclined.

7.2. Carlyn Kirkcaldy Dance School: Funding Appeal

Appendix D: Dawn Waddell sends information on the funding appeal concerning the community use dance facilities at Madras Kilrymont.

7.3. 'Bothways' Bus Stops

Fife Council proposes to install a number of Bothways stops, where one sign does for buses stopping on both sides of the street. Locations: Warrack St, Priestden Pl; Kilrymont Pl, Kilrymont Rd (2) Madras College and further west; Shoolbraids (2) north and south ends. They welcome comments or questions.

7.4. Twinning

Rachel Hay, the Locality Assistant, forwards a letter from the Comité de Jumelage of La municipalité de Mougou which lies equidistant between La Rochelle and Poitiers, somewhat north of Cognac. They seek a suitable twinning partner in Scotland and wrote to the Tourist Office here, whence it comes to us.

7.5. Dissolution of Fife Health Trusts

We have received a formal consultation document from NHS Fife. Response required by 31 August. Dissolution occurs 1

October.

7.6. Lammas Market

Alistair Barnard, Community Services, reports Fife Council have received a request from the showman tenant of Market Street to open on Sunday (hours to be negotiated).

7.7. RSCDS Summer School

Pete Lindsay suggests:

Mr James Senior mentioned recently that in times past the Community Council, or perhaps the Town Council, made some form of presentation (flowers or whatever) to the RSCDS in recognition of the very many years they've been coming to St Andrews, and the number of visitors they bring in. Though this custom lapsed some years ago should we try to revive it in recognition both of the factors mentioned and the RSCDS's 80th anniversary?

7.8. Planning: 3rd Party Right of Appeal

The Association of Scottish Community Councils have accepted (in the form of Douglas Murray the ASCC Secretary) an invitation from the Scottish Executive to represent Community Council interests on a Steering Group prior to, during, and after the proposed Consultation Paper on 'Planning – Third Party Rights of Appeal'. Having heard us at various ASCC AGM conferences in recent years he specifically invites our views on the subject.

[Passed to Planning Committee – PL]

7.9. Beach Parties

Sample application/booking form will be circulated at the meeting.

7.10. St Andrews Rifle Range

EnviroCentre Limited are investigating potentially contaminated land on behalf of Fife Council. They ask if we have any historical or anecdotal information on the old range site, now partly covered by Newmill Gardens and Maynard Road.

7.11. 200 Club

Archie Strachan reports as Club Administrator that a donation of £500 towards the funds of the 200 Club has been received from the Royal & Ancient Golf Club.

7.12. Scottish Civic Forum Council & Board elections

We have a number of ballot and nomination papers, to be returned by 1 August 03.

7.13. SEPAView

Scottish Environmental Protection Agency newsletter, spring 03: Planning a new sustainable future; Lessons from Spain: clean-up of the Prestige oil spill; Shetland, salmon and SEPA; The Scottish Scene; Monitoring man-made radioactivity in Scotland; Environmental Justice; Promoting Partnerships; Scotland – what's it worth, what is the environment worth in monetary terms to the economy; Environmental justice; Promoting partnerships; National waste plan.

7.14. Environmental Services Newsletter

Summer 2003: Food safety week; Occupational health and safety; Recycling; Fife cleans up it's [sic] act; Contaminated land programme; Take a pride in Fife.

7.15. VONEF Newsletter

June 2003: Campaign for a new Scottish Charities Act; Scottish Human Rights Trust; Data Protection Act; Golden jubilee award; Direct payments road shows; Cash for environmental projects; First aid training; Mental health and ethnic minorities; NEF Association for Mental Health; Pathways to recovery in mental health; Supporting people with mental health problems into employment, education or training; Cancer Network Fife; Right for Fife; Intermediate care; Health Councils in Scotland; New co-ordinator for Fife Community Care Forum; Joint future

7.16. Cycleclips Newsletter

Summer 2003: Maintenance standards for cycleways; Route updates; Developing best practice; Area transportation plans; Health; Cycling advice; Bike events 2003; Pupils visit council chambers; Safer routes to stations; Heads you win.

7.17. Take a Pride in Fife Strategy

A copy of the environmental strategy document from Fife Environmental Network has been received.

7.18. Community Safety News

June 2003 issue: Who's a safe Fifer; YouthStart; Memo Minder; Keeping Safe; 'Pop'tastic; Senior Citizens snatch up alarms; Secured by design (refurbishment) for Lochgelly Co-op; Duke of Edinburgh.

7.19. Area Waste Plan

A copy of the National Waste Strategy: Scotland, Fife Area Waste Plan has been received.

"The Plan, which forms part of the National Waste Plan, has been approved by the Scottish Executive and Fife Council. The

plan sets out Fife Council's obligations to reduce, reuse and recycle waste to comply with the provisions of the EU Landfill Directive, determines the Best Practical Environmental Option to meet these obligations, and provides additional recommendations and objectives to assist the Council in meeting these obligations."

7.20. Scotland's Water

An information booklet from the Water Customer Consultation Panels on the water industry, its structure, functions, charges, performance, contacts and consultation avenues.

7.21. Strandline

Newsletter of the Marine Conservation Society's Adopt-A-Beach project, spring 2003: RMS Mullhein runs aground; Jellyfish survey [pretty pictures! –PL]; Beachwatch finds rising tide of litter; Clean beaches start at home; Skates and ray – the great egg case hunt; Adopt-a-beach training workshops in England & Wales.

7.22. Scottish Civic Forum Participation Summit

Alan Spinks, new SCF local coordinator writes to introduce himself, and broach the idea of a participation summit to discuss how to have discussions. The forum will involve private, public, voluntary bodies and politicians of various levels.

8. Reports from Officers

8.1. Chair

8.1.1. Press Statement Appendix C. Follows from a report in The Courier 26 June 03.

8.1.2. MSP Responses Appendices E and F.

8.2. Treasurer

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. Locality Assistant Rachel Hay has asked to speak at August's meeting on how the Locality Assistant post is progressing.

8.3.2. Response to *The Courier* letter column Appendix G: letter responding to attack on Ian Goudie for 'interest' over the Computer Science redevelopment by someone based in the current CompSci facilities. Draft was circulated by email.

9. Reports

9.1. from Committees

Written reports of meetings are required by terms of the

Scheme for Community Councils.

9.2. from Representatives

For any verbal reports of meetings attended etc. Issues requiring a decision by community council should be raised under items 6 Matters Arising or 7 New Business, as appropriate.

10. Any Other Competent Business

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

Appendix A – Computer Science Building

Letter by Ian Goudie, on behalf of Planning Committee, to Fife Council Planning Service.

Ref. 02/03697/EFULL. Proposed Computer Science Building North Haugh, St Andrews.

I write on behalf of the Planning Committee of the Community Council to restate our objections to the above application, and to question some of the assertions and implications of the report, published last Friday, for the East Fife Area Development Committee. The information available to us suggests that some parts of this report are seriously misleading, and that it is based on mutually contradictory assumptions. The major points of our objection can be summarised as follows: -

(i) Making provision for a rail link is not a fanciful idea favoured by troublesome community councillors. It is a requirement of the Fife Structure Plan deliberately inserted by the Scottish Ministers in the face of opposition from Fife Council officials.

(ii) Compliance to the Structure Plan implies ensuring there is an alignment for the rail link which would be generally seen as realistic, not fraught with obvious practical difficulties, and not so expensive as to render impos-sible the goal of an integrated transport system fit for the 21st century.

(iii) These requirements cannot be met by unthinking adoption of the alignment proposed by the Fife and South Tayside (FAST) Rail Study. This is a seriously flawed piece of work, which has never been subjected to the rigours of full public scrutiny, and which appears to have been written to justify a pre-chosen conclusion that the St Andrews rail link is a non-starter. The conclusions of the study have been effectively set aside by the decision of the Scottish Ministers: the proposed

alignment in the study is equally unsound.

(iv) The watered-down version of the FAST study that appears in the committee papers is so ill-defined as to render sensible comment almost impossible. It appears to be a last-minute smokescreen.

(v) The proposed Section 75 agreement would give legal force to the aesthetic prejudices of the planning officials, despite it being common knowledge that they are at variance with the oft-stated views of the people of the town with regard to the relative merits of existing buildings on the North Haugh.

(vi) The proposed condition 8 for this application, relating to the cycle route to David Russell Hall effectively pre-empts Fife Council's decision on an important part of the recently revised application for transportation measures relating to the redevelopment of that residence.

History of the rail link policy

It is important to remember the planning history of the proposal to reinstate the rail link to St Andrews. This Community Council argued repeatedly the importance of keeping the reinstatement option alive (e.g. in our sub-missions of 30 April 2000 on the Draft Structure Plan and of December 2000 on the 2020 Tourism and Transport Vision for St Andrews). Our argument on the need to safeguard the route of the rail link in the Structure Plan always fell on deaf ears as far as Fife Council was concerned. Accordingly on 27 March 2001 the question of the rail link formed one of the objections to the Finalised Structure Plan that we put to the Scottish Ministers. With them, our case received a more favourable reception, and the wording in the current Structure Plan reflects their intervention. The Structure Plan (para. 2.2.5) says "The Local Transport Strategy identifies the need to review the requirement for new stations at Leven and St Andrews (including a new rail link). Proposal PT2 reads "Land for the following routes and facilities will be safeguarded from prejudicial development and identified in Local Plans, in accordance with the Local Transport Strategy", and the list thereunder includes "The Leven and St Andrews lines including new stations (subject to review through Local Transport Strategy)".

Correcting the chronological order

It is customary for committee reports to specify the planning history of proposed development sites with some precision. The absence of dates and the ordering of paragraphs 2.9 to 2.11 of the committee report, however, give the misleading impression that the negative conclusions of the FAST Rail Study post-date the positive intervention by the Scottish Ministers. It is clearly intended that committee members should understand that the

most recent statement on the rail link proposal is that of the FAST Study. The report attempts to lead members by the nose into a belief that the whole idea is economically unsound and can therefore be safely ignored in the context of the present application.

The reality is rather different. The FAST Study was conducted in 1999, and its findings were therefore available when the Scottish Ministers considered the matter. Clearly they were not persuaded that the whole idea of a St Andrews rail link was a nonsense, and they were not persuaded that the blinkered attitude of Fife's transportation officials was in line with national goals. So the notion that the possibility of a rail link should be kept alive is not the misguided fantasy of amateurs in St Andrews, but a line endorsed by central government. It is not appropriate therefore for Fife Council officials to revert to their former stances, to brush aside the intervention of the Scottish Ministers, and to proceed as though no implied rebuke had been uttered.

Costs chosen to look prohibitive

Para. 2.10 of the committee report specifies that the projected net cost of the rail link was estimated at £46.8 million in the FAST Study. This information is clearly intended to underline the argument that any rail proposal would be uneconomic. Councillors may wish to note, however, that the Study was prepared for a consortium led by Fife Council, and it is extremely rare in local government to find consultants' reports with conclusions which are not substantially in line with those that the client wishes to hear. In fact the figure of £46.8 million quoted in the committee report incorporates no fewer than 30 years of projected revenue losses, discounted at 6%. The projected annual loss of around £1.3 million is based on highly conservative estimates of likely demand. The Study fails to portray the complexity of current rail funding. Support for rail services is deemed to be in the national interest, and subsidisation is a standard part of government policy. The average UK wide subsidy was 3.3 pence per passenger kilometre in 2001-02, whilst the ScotRail figure for the same period was 8.7 pence. As the projected annual revenue of £0.67 million by 2010 was based on an average fare rate of 8 pence per kilometre, the significance of this figure is clear. The quoted net cost of £46.8 million included £28.3 million of capital costs, but lack of appropriate disaggregation hinders any assessment of the reality of this figure. Particularly at the St Andrews end of the line, it is evident that the route has not been chosen to minimise capital costs.

The actual FAST Study proposal and the doctored diagram

Para. 2.10 of the committee report also implies that the route

recommended by the FAST Study was the one indicated on the diagram accompanying the committee papers. This appears to be somewhat economical with the truth. Councillors may have noted that the diagram is dated 16/6/03. This is a doctored version of Figure 7.2 in the 1999 report, from which various elements that might have provoked thought have been removed.

Figure 7.2 implied an elevated line entering the town on a bridge over the North Haugh access road, leading to a proposed station site on the existing embankment, extending some 150 metres north-west from the slip-road up to the bus-station. The accompanying text read "The option which gives the best penetration of the town to a location adjacent to the bus station and the site of the former station, would carry a substantial cost penalty of £1.3m because it is located at a higher level and it is assumed a new bridge would be required to maintain the University's access road. This would involve approach earthworks wherein a 6m high embankment would be re-quired from just west of the university grounds to where it meets the original embankment near the former station site. This embankment and bridge would be a major intrusion in the area, even with effective landscaping works. The new station would consist of a single platform 150 metres long with a building at its east end for sale of tick-ets and passengers waiting."

The new version of the diagram ends the line just after the point where it reaches the old embankment, about half way up the Petheram Bridge car park. The bridge over the North Haugh access road is deleted. Even the station has disappeared! This is no basis on which to plan the future transportation for the town. The diagram raises far more questions than it answers. Why has a detailed proposal been neutered and rendered so woolly as to be entirely useless? One can only surmise that it is hoped that everyone will project on to the diagram the future that they personally would wish to see, and that the inherent clashes between their stances will not be revealed until some future date.

Impracticality of the FAST study's embankment

There are indeed good arguments for avoiding an elevated line. Any realistic approach to reinstatement suggests that you should attempt to minimise both the cost and any possible opposition to the route. The FAST Study indicates that a bridge and embankment would add substantially to the cost of the line. It would also provoke totally unnecessary opposition. When planning consent was sought for the Gateway, its likely role as a first point of call for visitors to the town was stressed. This role was endorsed only last week by the Kingdom of Fife Tourist Board Chief Executive Patrick Laughlin (Courier, 18/6/03). It makes no sense to have a building intended as a

first point of call hidden from the main road by a railway embankment. There are also many who would object to an embankment on aesthetic grounds, or because they appreciate the view of the Gateway from the north. Indeed the FAST Study candidly says that one of the "principal environmental impacts" would be "The adverse impact of the railway on the St. Andrews Gateway International Visitor Centre". In view of the town's need for a rail connection, to stir up unnecessary opposition in this way would be foolish.

Impracticality of a level crossing

The alternative of a level crossing on the North Haugh access road is even less acceptable. This is now a well-used road, and cutting it for the sake of such a short distance could not be justified. Even a short queue of traffic at the level crossing would interfere with the Petheram Bridge roundabout and would constitute a safety hazard. In fact, on the new ill-thought-out diagram, the access road would be permanently cut were a station platform, of the length previously intended, to be installed from the end of the track as indicated.

Other undesirable options

If the rail line does not cross the North Haugh access road, the options are few. A station in front of the Gateway, separating it from the A91, would again undermine its role as a first point of call for tourists, and would lead to many of the same environmental concerns. The option of a new St Andrews station lying somewhere to the west of the Gateway implies a lengthy walk from the bus station, creating difficulties particularly for the elderly and infirm. The integrated public transport system that central government wishes to promote becomes unachievable. Moving the bus station to the North Haugh would simply transfer the problems to those having to carry their shopping back to their bus, who do not want the inconvenience of becoming totally reliant on a park-and-ride service.

The best available solution

The planning arguments clearly indicate that the best available option is to have the station to the south of the Gateway. It avoids the logistical problems of crossing the access road. It avoids the political opposition to the rail link on the environmental and aesthetic grounds that a line to the north of Gateway would provoke. Obviating the need for an embankment makes a significant reduction in the capital cost of the rail link. It keeps the rail station within easy reach of the bus station.

Implausibility of the technical objection

Para. 2.11 of the committee report says that "Any other option

to the south of the Gateway Centre was not considered feasible due to engineering restraints in attempting to bend a rail line south of the Gateway Centre". This is a naked attempt to blind 'em with science, but it does not look plausible to the layman. On the westernmost edge of the diagram accompanying the committee papers, the railway is approaching the town heading straight for the Gateway. If, instead of bending north as shown, the line were to follow a curve of comparable radius to the south, it would reach the site of the proposed Computer Science building. This in itself would be significantly closer to the town than anything we are ever likely to see if the present application receives consent. Somewhat greater easterly penetration could be achieved by a further bend of radius no greater than that shown on the old embankment in the original Figure 7.2 of the FAST Study. (Perhaps this is why the diagram was doctored.) In practice, the engineering problem could probably be further alleviated by a minor realignment extending to the west of the area shown in this diagram.

Inconsistency of the planning philosophy

Para. 2.11 of the committee report implies that, in absence of an up-to-date Local Plan, the only alignment for the rail link that can be safeguarded is the one proposed in the FAST Study. By implication no cognisance can be taken of the flawed nature of that document. This approach contrasts sharply with the words of reassurance that we have heard from the planners on the question of the Green Belt. The status of the Green Belt is comparable to that of the rail link. In each case the general notion is supported in the Structure Plan, with the detail to be determined in the Local Plan. For the Green Belt, the planners have enunciated the very sensible line that proposed developments likely to lie in the putative Green Belt will be deemed premature. There has been no mention in this context of the Tyldesley Study, nor any assertion that while that remains the only published study of Green Belt boundaries, its judgements will be definitive. The analogy indicates that it is inappropriate to give definitive status to the flawed FAST Study.

The Section 75 agreement

The three line comment at the end of the committee report on the Section 75 agreement is hardly a masterpiece of open government. When asked on Friday, a top Fife Council planning official was unable to shed any light on its meaning. What chance do the public stand?

There does indeed appear to be every reason why Fife Council should be coy about this Section 75 agreement. This Community Council has made clear on many occasions that most people in St Andrews prefer the Physics and Mathematics buildings to the more lurid appearance of the Biomolecular

Sciences (BMS) building, which most residents would like to be hidden or reglazed. Despite this, Fife Council has been trying unsuccessfully to persuade the University to make the Computer Science building three storey in order to hide Maths and Physics. Para 2.7 of the report says, "Rather than insist on larger buildings to the front (north) of these building, it was agreed in discussion with the University to enter into a legal agreement to require that these buildings would ultimately be either redeveloped to a height no greater than the proposed building or reclad in a style which is consistent with the rest of the surrounding buildings and significantly improves their appearance".

Para 2.4 indicates that the Master Plan for the North Haugh would include details of future recladding and would be subject to public consultation. If, however, the Section 75 still takes the form suggested at the previous meeting, the University will already be legally bound to restyle the North Haugh in a manner which is the exact opposite of that which most of the public would wish to see.

The coherence of the committee report must also be called into question. If, as per para. 2.11, the future route for the rail line is as in the FAST Study, there will be an embankment rising to some 6m between the A91 and the North Haugh. Requiring the University to spend money restyling buildings which are not in the public eye would be to insist on a scandalous waste of public funds. Indeed, although para. 1.6 says that "a legal agreement is al-ready in place", it is hard for anyone with any familiarity with University funding to conceive what the terms of that agreement might be. Universities do not have spare cash for fanciful projects such as removing storeys or recladding. One has to assume that any time constraint in the agreement is so lax as to render it meaningless, and that this is simply window-dressing for the committee.

The papers for the previous meeting also suggest that the Section 75 agreement would require the University to prepare a Master Plan for the North Haugh by 31 March 2004. The main topics for the Master Plan, listed in para. 2.4, notably fail to include any reference to the rail link. Indeed the whole exercise is probably too late to preserve any sensible alignment if the current application receives consent. As I commented to the last Community Council, there is no point in investigating the optimal design of stable door once the horse has already bolted.

Proposed Condition 8

This condition requires the existing pedestrian/cycle route to David Russell Hall (DRH) to be upgraded prior to occupation of the Computer Science building, with the details of the work being agreed with Fife Council prior to commencement. Given

what was said at the meeting last week between the University, the Fife Council and the Community Council, it seems highly probable that the Fife Council and the University will interpret this condition as requiring a tarmac surface on the path from DRH to Andrew Melville Hall (AMH). It is not at all clear that this will give any planning gain, as this path has functioned in a perfectly satisfactory way with a gravel surface for over 25 years. Its only problem is occasional flooding and this is more likely to be exacerbated than cured by the introduction of a non-porous surface. The only way to encourage greater usage of this route to the proposed Computer Science building by cyclists would be to make the steep slope by the Sports Centre conform to the maximum 5% gradient for cycle paths specified in the standard government-backed reference "Cycling by Design". This would cost real money, and the University would have a very real argument that the relevance of this path to any Computer Science building is minimal.

The condition does, however, raise an important procedural difficulty. Resurfacing of the DRH-AMH cycle path forms a part of the recently revised application for transportation measures relating to the redevelopment of DRH. This resurfacing is being offered instead of the cycle path in University grounds alongside Buchanan Gardens that the Community Council was told had been agreed at the time of the consent for Phase 1A of DRH. This substitution is contentious, as the earlier off-road alignment was seen as a very positive step forward. The revised application has still to go through formal council procedures, and people may well wish to comment on the relative efficacy of the various cycling measures in encouraging students to use their bikes. Such comment would, however, be to no avail if the University had already been required by the present condition to put a tarmac surface on this path. The University could then argue that it could not also be expected to spend money on a cycle path alongside Buchanan Gardens, and so the decision would have been pre-empted.

Concluding comment

The required time-scale for this response makes it highly likely that not all the problems and inconsistencies in the Council's stance on this application have been noted. A Community Council cannot, in a weekend, compensate for institutional inaction stretching back for a decade. The problems that have arisen with this application could and should have been foreseen and averted several years back. As the Courier reported as long ago as 23 December 1997 that, "While the North Haugh site is highlighted in the local plan for light development, she (Cllr. Melville) said that things had been developing "bit by bit" over the years – adding that the University had failed to make its long-term intentions for the site clear". Equally Fife Council failed to heed repeated warnings

on protection of the rail route. It is highly regrettable that both the University and Fife Council took no notice until very recently of Cllr. Melville's call for some strategic planning in the area. As a consequence, members of the East Fife Area Development Committee have again been put in an unenviable position. Rejection of this application would indeed be a serious blow to the University, whilst granting it consent would cause major damage to the prospects of ever alleviating the transportation problems of the town.

Appendix B – David Russell Hall Redevelopment

Letter by the planning committee to Fife Council Planning Service

- (i) Proposed erection of student residences, etc. (Phase 1B), David Russell Hall, Buchanan Gardens, St Andrews.**
- (ii) Formation of traffic calming and cycleway "improvements", David Russell Hall / Buchanan Gardens / Kennedy Gardens, etc.**

We write as members of the Planning Committee of the Community Council to object to aspects of the above applications. It is evident that neither application can sensibly be determined in isolation from the other one. Two of our major objections to the main application for the buildings (hereafter called application B) are ones that we spelt out two years in response to the previous applications for this site, namely the inadequacy of the number of parking spaces envisaged and the dangers of the proposed access arrangements. It is important that the application for the related transportation measures (hereafter called application T) is assessed relative to the status quo position. It must not be deemed to be acceptable simply because it is not as ill-judged as the recently withdrawn version.

Inadequacy of the proposed car parking provision

It is clear to us that the proposed number of car parking spaces remains far short of what is required. In view of rising levels of student car ownership, it is doubtful whether the intended provision is adequate for term time use, and it is woefully short of what is needed for the holiday and conference market over the summer. For individual and family holiday use, around 300 spaces would seem more appropriate, whilst for large conferences attended by individual academics or businessmen, over 500 spaces could easily be needed. For some conferences, the University has organised a shuttle service from car parking on the North Haugh, but there appears to be no way of guaranteeing that this would happen in the future. Once

consent has been granted, much more likely is the wide-spread parking on the grass that has been seen in recent days, or a reversion to parking on the roads. If there is no intention to increase the parking provision, a condition should be imposed restricting the proportion of the residence which can be used for holiday or conference purposes. As we have previously noted, realistic parking provision implies the need for a much larger area at the rear of the site, with consequent implications for site lay-out.

As this application has been around, in one form or another, for two years, it is regrettable that there appears to have been no serious investigation into the appropriate number of car parking spaces. None of the proposed uses is in any sense novel, so there should be no difficulty in acquiring relevant data on the amount of car-parking space needed for a development of this size. The Institution of Highways and Transportation says that "Parking demand projections can be obtained by comparisons with other similar sites or by using one of the national database systems." and that "Parking provision ... needs to take account of peak usage and future growth in demand."

Access arrangements and the Buchanan Gardens / Strathkinness High Road junction

We continue to believe that the proposed access arrangements are dangerous. As we have said in the case of the pedestrian crossings near roundabouts in the town centre, it is when the motorist faces two or more hazards in quick succession that the greatest dangers occur. We therefore called two years ago for the creation of a round-about at the Buchanan Gardens/Strathkinness High Road junction with the sole access to the David Russell site being from that roundabout. The logic behind the approach taken by the transportation officials is very hard to follow. They ignored our call for a roundabout at this point until this Spring when it was included in the first version of application T. At the public meetings on this application, this proposed roundabout was generally favourably received, except by the residents of the nearest house. The predominant argument was that roundabouts would assist in slowing traffic, provided they were well-engineered, and not just mere white painted discs on the road. With this proviso, it would seem possible to accept the verdict of the majority, whilst, by suitable detailed re-design creating acceptable arrangements for the nearest house.

It is therefore hard to understand why this proposed roundabout was withdrawn in this latest version. The T-junction proposal which has been substituted will not slow approaching eastbound traffic on the Strathkinness Low Road, which will still have to face the hazards posed by the Strathkinness High Road and the residence access in quick succession. In view of the

location of Fife Park on the Strathkinness High Road, there will be student drivers emerging at both of these junctions. The rates charged by insurance companies for young drivers indicate all too clearly that they are not amongst the most cautious. Traffic volumes in the area are likely to rise still further. For instance, the University has indicated it has no current plans to redevelop Fife Park, but that is in no sense a binding commitment.

Buchanan Gardens / Hepburn Gardens junction

In the context of the Hepburn Hall applications, we called in April 2001 for redesign of the road layout to create a four-way junction where Hepburn Gardens and Buchanan Gardens meet. Although the scope of the redevelopment there was not as great as was at one stage envisaged, we can see a case in principle for a roundabout at this junction. The design shown in these plans, however, is too minimalist to ensure an appropriate reduction in vehicle speed, particularly in the case of eastbound vehicles on Buchanan Gardens. Redesign of the road layout, including a bulge in pavement on the north side to slow eastbound vehicles, is needed if this roundabout is to be safe. If technical reasons are advanced why this is not possible, we would endorse the view being expressed by some local residents that this roundabout should be deleted from these plans.

Speed advisory signs

We would support the clear view of the local residents, expressed at both the public meetings, that speed advisory signs would be helpful, and are obviously much more appropriate in this context than the 12 speed cushions previously suggested.

Cycling – the status quo position

Just after Phase 1A of this development had been granted consent, Cllr. Melville told the Community Council that, as a component of the accompanying transportation measures, an off-road cyclepath was to be constructed, just inside the University playing fields, alongside the fence on Buchanan Gardens. This was welcomed as a very positive move. It has been clear to this Community Council for some time that painting white lines on roads has negligible effect, if any, on cycling participation rates. Provision of off-road routes is a far better carrot to get people to leave their cars behind. The agreed off-road cycle-path by Buchanan Gardens was thus to be an example, matched within the town only by Viaduct Walk, of what good cycling provision means.

Shortcomings of the cycling proposals

It appears that, within the intervening year, Fife Council has

negotiated not a planning gain but a planning loss. Resurfacing and improving the lighting the path from David Russell Hall (DRH) to Andrew Melville Hall (AMH) is no substitute for the original agreement. Some may feel that the University has a duty in terms of student safety to make lighting improvements, but there is no evidence that the current arrangements have any impact on cycling participation rates. This path with its gravel surface has functioned in a perfectly satisfactory way as a cycle route for over 25 years. Its only problem is occasional flooding, as the ground at the northern end can get very wet at times. For this reason the farmer does not plant a 30m strip at the northern end of the adjacent field. In the absence of any drainage proposals, putting a non-porous tarmac surface on the path is more likely to exacerbate than cure its problems.

It is inappropriate to view these latest cycling proposals as some sort of compromise in relation to the earlier draft. The original proposal to have the cycle route using the steep slope by the Sports Centre made even less sense to the cyclist than the speed cushions did in the eyes of the motorist. The currently proposed circuitous cycling route from DRH to AMH to the Sports Centre to University Hall is broadly level and so does not breach the basic gradient requirement given in the government-backed publication "*Cycling by Design*", with which anyone involved in cycle path design must surely be familiar. This is, however, very faint praise and in no sense implies that the route is optimal. Similarly opening the west gate of University Hall during vacations is welcome, but is really long overdue common sense.

The key point is that, in term time, these cycling proposals offer the student essentially nothing that is not currently available. Any student who wishes can reach Kennedy Gardens by the currently proposed circuitous route, but very few, if indeed any, choose to do so. Improved lighting and a tarmac surface will not change this behaviour. Getting to a lecture is not equivalent to leisure cycling, but is rather the purposeful activity of the commuter, who does not wish on any part of his journey to go 40% further than is necessary.

If application T is passed, the result will be that most student cyclists will continue to use Buchanan Gardens, Hepburn Gardens and Doubledykes Road as their route to town. The argument advanced at the public meetings that most the students will use the path to AMH is statistically unsound. If, as the University contends, the existing accommodation at DRH is unpopular, it is obvious that those who will remain loyal to it for longest are Science students for whom the proximity to the North Haugh is an advantage. It is thus no surprise that data collected on the present cohort indicate this to be so. It cannot, however, be inferred that the same student mix will be present in newly-built accommodation. At present less than a third of

students are in Science subjects. The scheduling of more Arts lectures on the North Haugh has a significant effect on parking (50 more cars, for instance, make an impact), but this is only a small perturbation given the size of the student population. An increase in the number of students on the DRH site, coupled with a predictable change in the student mix, will thus result in a significant increase in the numbers of students using Buchanan Gardens.

Better cycling options

Rather than the current proposals, Fife Council should adhere to what was reported to us as the previous agreement for an off-road cycle path alongside Buchanan Gardens. This is much more direct than the route to the north of the playing field and would succeed in taking students off the road. Better still would be a direct cycle path from DRH to the Scott Lang building and a direct one from there to St Leonard's Road. The Community Council argued for the latter half of this path at the site visit for the Scott Lang application, and the University included it in the application. The path has, however, never been built. Action now would be positive for the students of DRH, the residents of Buchanan Gardens and Hepburn Gardens and the users of the Scott Lang Building. This history also underlines the point that even when an applicant explicitly mentions a necessary feature in an application, it is no guarantee that it will be implemented. Particularly where there is public interest in that aspect of the application, imposition of a suitable condition may still be appropriate. In particular, transportation measures agreed for application T should be explicitly enumerated in the conditions of application B.

It was maintained at the public meeting that the plans included covered cycle parking for 85 cycles. This remains a small proportion of the 513 bedspaces provided. There is evidently little belief on the part of the University that the cycling measures it is proposing will attract large numbers of students to this mode of transport. A student survey in the 1980s showed a slightly larger proportion of student cycle ownership than this. We are basically making no progress at all. Of the remaining 513 students at DRH, a small proportion will walk into town, and the remainder will use motorized transport in some form.

Energy Conservation

Whilst there may be aesthetic arguments for variation in the alignments of the residential blocks, it should be noted that a corollary of this is that most of the widely differing orientations cannot therefore be optimal in terms of passive solar gain.

Conclusions

It is unfortunate that, although the redevelopment of this site

has been under discussion for two years, little attention has been paid to the problems of access and inadequate car-parking provision. As in the case of the rail link, problems which are not tackled now are highly likely to re-emerge later in more acute form.

The University's attitude on the associated transportation measures is also disappointing. As Community councillors we are looking for more than the minimum measures needed to wrest planning consent from Fife Council. We would wish to see the green agenda embraced with much greater enthusiasm, identifying a direct off-road cycle route into town.

Appendix C – Press Statement

By Chair Donald Macgregor

The Planning Committee of the Community Council has historically been given delegated powers, for reasons connected to dates of meetings, to discuss planning matters and to make observations on these, as well as to send in comments and objections to specific applications to Fife Council's Development Committee. The Planning Committee has the freedom to decide if letters are to be sent by the committee as a whole or if a matter is to be delegated to one or more of its members.

As Chairman of the Community Council I wish to stress that our Planning Committee, whose elected (but unpaid) members devote large amounts of time and effort to this work, enjoys the confidence of the Community Council. Of course differences of opinion sometimes arise. The best way for such differences to be resolved is by discussion round a table. I look forward to being able in due course to attend such a meeting at which delegated members of the Community Council, Fife Councillors and planning officials can exchange views directly and hopefully achieve a positive outcome in terms of approaches to St Andrews and its development.

Appendix D: Carlyn Kirkcaldy Appeal

Madras College Community Use, Kilrymont School, ST ANDREWS, KY16 8DE (Head, Mr Andy Herd) Tel: 01334 412522 Fax: 01334 412563)

CARLYN KIRKCALDY DANCE SCHOOL C/o Madras College Community Use etc. (Founder/Principal, Carlyn Kirkcaldy)

APPEAL FOR FUNDING – 2003

I would like to introduce you to the Madras College Community Use facility and one of its major children's resources the Carlyn Kirkcaldy Dance School. A staggering 190 girls aged from 3 to 18 currently form its ever-growing membership.

There are a number of dance schools in the St Andrews area but the Carlyn Kirkcaldy Dance School is the only one which is available through the Madras College Community Use facility. This means that (compared to other 'private' schools which charge between £3 and £4 per class) the opportunity to learn Ballet, Jazz, Highland and Tap dancing is available at the very affordable rate of £1.70 per class. Low income families are eligible through Fife Council for a Fifestyle card and are entitled to fee discounts of up to 50% reducing the cost of each class to 85p. Many families have two, and sometimes three, children in the Dance School attending a class for each dance style. For these families eligibility for a Fifestyle card allows them access to a wonderful resource which would be unaffordable any other way. An additional benefit is that classes are paid on a weekly basis and parents pay only for those actually attended. Other dance schools request fees on a per-term or per-annum basis which means parents have to pay a large sum of money up-front for every class regardless of whether the children are ill or have another family commitment.

The Carlyn Kirkcaldy Dance School has been part of the Madras College Community Use programme for 10 years and all its classes are taught by its founder, Carlyn Kirkcaldy. Carlyn is a St Androean who developed her dance as a young girl in St Andrews under the direction of Carol Green and Ida Ballingall before going on to take her professional qualifications at the Theatre School of Dance and Drama in Edinburgh.

After a long spell dancing professionally Carlyn returned to St Andrews in 1990 making it her family home once more. Soon after she resettled in the town Carlyn pursued her goal of setting up a dance school. One of her guiding principles (and indeed one of the principles behind the formation of Madras College Community Use) has always been that dance as a form of exercise, means of self-expression, as a profession, or simply just for fun should be accessible by all, regardless of their means. Carlyn also provides intensive dance workshops, one-to-one tuition for more experienced dancers to assist with exam preparation, and teaching experience for pupils developing dance as a career by allowing them to work alongside her during classes. (Informal Jazz and Tap classes are also taught as part of the Madras College Community Use Adult Programme.)

The 190 pupils in the Dance School who come from many different schools in the locality enjoy the added benefit of having a forum to come together in the pursuit and appreciation of dance.

Throughout each session the girls dance to classical, traditional/cultural and popular music. The autumn term begins with a mixture of exercise, stimulating dance routines, and the

learning and practice of the technical elements of each dance discipline in preparation for the formal examinations, which usually take place in December. Each New Year begins with the reporting of the exam results followed by an award ceremony for the pupils. This includes a dance performance by each dance class. (Examinations are not compulsory for dance school pupils and means that those who wish to focus on the 'lighter' side of the work of the classes are under no pressure to do otherwise.) Attention is then turned to the highlight of the year The Dance Show (see illustrations). This is an amazing spectacular which lasts about three hours and is performed twice to parents, relatives and friends of the dance pupils and is also open to any member of the public who is interested in a great evening of dance. No child is excluded from the show and each level (nursery, junior, advanced etc) of each dance discipline practices three or four dance routines which they perform as part of the show. The children love it! They love the dressing-up, the chance to be a 'star', and to be allowed to wear make-up (for the stage) when you are only 3 years old! (Video recordings are made of the dance shows and these can be viewed upon request.)

As dance tutor, Carlyn is paid by the hour from fee income for the classes she teaches. There is no profiteering on her part. Fee income from classes also supports the staffing of the Community Use facility during its hours of business. Additional resources for the Dance School have to be met by juggling the Madras College Community Use budget and by income from fundraising activities carried out by parents and dancers. These include social events, bag-packing in Safeway, bring-and-buy sales and raffles. A Ceilidh, which included Highland dance performances from Dance School pupils, was held recently. Overheads were kept to minimum since the music was for the most part provided by the members of the Madras College Community Use Accordion Class.

In my capacity as a parent I attended a recent fund-raising meeting Chaired by Mr Andy Herd, the Head of Madras College Community Use. At this meeting I became aware that the Madras College Community Use budget is stretched to the limit and to buy and maintain much needed equipment and further costumes to enhance the activities of the Dance School additional efforts would have to be made.

The Madras College Community Use budget has supported the Dance School most recently by upgrading its multi-media sound system (c. £1300.00) and by contributing approximately £2400.00 towards the purchase of costumes. However, given the full range of its activities (see attached leaflet) it can not sustain or justify such a large commitment on a regular basis to the Dance School alone.

The aim of this Appeal is either to attract one-off offers of support to purchase particular items of equipment (for example:

- Portable dance flooring. School halls do not always provide the best surface for dancers and access to this flooring, which rolls out like a carpet, would give the dancers the optimum work surface in terms of safety and comfort. Portable flooring would cost around £2,500.00 (see attached information sheet).

and/or

- Portable and Adjustable Dance Barres. These are much needed by the Dance School. They can be used by dancers of all ages to assist them in the practice of their particular dance discipline. Two 2.2 metre T Stand Portable Barres with Extensions would cost around £400.00 (see attached information sheet).

or to secure a commitment (for any amount) to support the Dance School on an annual basis over a period say 3, 5 or more years or throughout the life of the Dance School, whichever is reached first.

Any such offers of support would also greatly help with the extra costs in relation to costumes for the Dance Show each year. Although as many costumes as possible are adapted for re-use each year, and the parents do most of the sewing from material themselves, the costs can run to at least £1,000.00.

Donors might wish to consider the recognition of their goodwill through the additional support of a named annual dance award.

I am very grateful to you for taking the time to read about what I believe is a marvellous local resource which currently stimulates the hearts and minds of 190 young girls aged 3-18.

If you are inclined to further your interest in the Carlyn Kirkcaldy Dance School, the Head of Madras College Community use, Mr Andy Herd, and/or the School's Principal, Carlyn Kirkcaldy, will be pleased to provide additional and more detailed information in connection with this Appeal.

DAWN WADDELL,

(in support of Madras College Community Use and the Carlyn Kirkcaldy Dance School).

[The full, illustrated, appeal support pack with illustrations and indicative pricing information is available from the Secretary – PL]

Appendix E – Iain Smith MSP

Thank you for your letter dated 9th May. Please accept my apologies for the delay in replying.

Firstly, unfortunately, the first Monday of the month is very popular for Community Council meetings in North East Fife and I am afraid I am "booked-up" for the rest of the year. Can I therefore suggest that I visit St Andrews Community Council on the first Monday in February 2004? In the meantime, I would be happy to meet with Community Council office bearers if that would be helpful.

With regard to the campaign for a new secondary school in North Fife, we are still very much pressing Fife Council and the Scottish Executive in this regard. I have enclosed copies of recent correspondence on the matter, for your information, including the text from the Members' Business Debate. Please rest assured that I am doing all I can to fight for a new secondary school.

I am arranging to meet with Alan McGregor to discuss the St Andrews Tourism Vision Group during the Summer. I will, of course, be happy to assist in whatever way I can in this regard.

I think the idea of a bus link from Fife to Edinburgh Airport is worthy of further consideration. To that end, please find enclosed a copy of the letter I have written to the Head of Transportation at Fife Council, Dr Bob McLellan. I shall forward his response as soon as I receive it. Meanwhile rail links to Edinburgh Airport are to be provided by 2010.

Turning to the new St Andrews Hospital, I will continue to press NHS Fife and the Health Minister, Malcolm Chisholm MSP to ensure the hospital is opened as soon as possible. Indeed, I have attached here a recent oral question I asked the Minister on that very subject, and his answer.

Finally, universities are due to get a significant increase in funding over the next three years. I meet regularly with the principal and am confident that St Andrews University will continue to maintain its proud record of achievement.

I hope the above addresses all the issues you raise. However, should you require any further clarification or information, please do not hesitate to contact me again.

[Copious debate transcripts, letters etc, referred to above, are available from the Secretary – PL]

Appendix F – MSP Responses

Bruce Crawford MSP (11/05/03)

Thank you very much for the e-mail. Tricia Marwick MSP has St Andrews under her wing from an SNP perspective. I am sure she will be in touch with you shortly.

Brian Monteith MSP (13.05.03)

Many thanks for your letter. The three Conservative MSPs for Mid Scotland & Fife have decided that the best way for us to deal with constituency issues is to divide up the nine parliamentary constituencies in our region between the three of us. That being the case, all matters regarding North East Fife and St Andrews in particular are the responsibility of Ted Brocklebank MSP. I am sure Ted will respond explaining his views on the points you raise,

Ted Brocklebank MSP (13.05.03)

Thanks for your note. You are quick off the mark in your new capacity as chairman of the community council. It will take me rather longer to get sorted out here I think.

Of one thing you can be sure – I will be doing my utmost to promote St.Andrews and NE Fife as part of my over-all responsibilities towards Mid Scotland and Fife. To show my good intentions I have this morning, while trying to do battle with all kinds of systems, including the e-mail one, given notice of my first written question. It reads as follows; 'What representations will the parliament make to Fife Council to ensure that urgent consideration is given to the creation of a new Secondary School at the Tay bridgehead?' Depending on the outcome of current negotiations between the LibDems and Labour about a possible coalition on Fife Council I plan to draft a parliamentary motion about the need for a new secondary school.

Hopefully you will keep me posted as to other issues that may need my attention from time to time.

Murdo Fraser MSP (15.05.03)

Thank you for this message. Issues relating to the North East Fife constituency are dealt with on behalf of the Conservative Group by Ted Brocklebank, who will be responding to you.

Appendix G – Response to The Courier letter column

Response by Pete Lindsay, on behalf of Community Council as Secretary, printed in The Courier 17/6/03.

Dr Ishbel Duncan (June 10) is concerned by the report (June 2) of Dr Ian Goudie's letter to Fife Council planning objecting on behalf of the St Andrews Community Council's planning committee to the proposed new computer science building on St Andrews North Haugh.

The Courier could not be expected to reproduce his full letter and detailed arguments. I can assure her that it is quite open on the subject of Dr Goudie's very limited personal interest in

the new building, pointing out that he does work in an adjacent building in an office that does not overlook the proposed site.

The letter shows the proposed building raises some serious matters of public concern. It was endorsed without dissent at the full community council.

I am sure Dr Duncan is aware that opposing one's employer's planning applications is not usually seen as a route to personal advancement. We are grateful therefore that Dr Goudie takes the attitude that not to speak when an application is in conflict with Fife Council's Development Plan and St Andrews' long-term interests would be fail-ing in his duty to St Andrews as planning convener of its community council, whoever his employer.

Correspondence

Date	from	subject
05/06/03	St Andrews University	The Roundel
05/06/03	Police	Community Newsletter
06/06/03	Community Services	Best Kept Town & Village
09/06/03	Law and Administration	Holidays 2004
10/06/03	Mrs Willsher	Thanks
10/06/03	David Seth	Eligability of CC to vote on Loches
11/06/03	Civic Scotland	Elections to CS council
23/06/03	SEPA	SEPAView newsletter spring 03
23/06/03	Environmental Services	Environmental Services newsletter – summer 03
23/06/03	Comité de Jumelage Mougou	Twinning
23/06/03	VONEF	Newsletter June 03
23/06/03	C&L Investments	Ashleigh Guest House redevelopment
23/06/03	Millennium Cycleways Project	Cycleclips newsletter summer 03
23/06/03	Ted Brocklebank MSP	Greetings to Patras
23/06/03	Fife Environmental Network	Taking a Pride in Fife
23/06/03	SMP Playgrounds	Brochure
23/06/03	Fife Environmental Network	Take a Pride in Fife Strategy
23/06/03	Law and Administration	Scheme for Community Councils – final draft

23/06/03	St Andrews University	DRH Traffic Calming & Cycle Path
23/06/03	Environmental Bodies' Council	Newsletter June 03
23/06/03	Police	Community Safety Newsletter June 03
23/06/03	Environmental Services	Fife Area Waste Plan
23/06/03	Water Customer Consultation Pan-els	Scotland's Water industry info booklet
24/06/03	Wickstead Leisure	Playground Equipment Brochure
24/06/03	Dawn Waddell	Carlyn Kirkcaldy Dance School funds appeal
24/06/03	Iain Smith MSP	Response to Chair etc
25/06/03	Transportation Services	'Bothways' Bus stops
27/06/03	Marine Conservation Society	Strandline newsletter spring 03
27/06/03	Scottish Civic Forum	Participation Summit
28/06/03	Community Services	Best Kept Town
28/06/03	CC Support Working Group	Agenda
01/07/03	Douglas Keir	Fife Heritage Orchestra
02/07/03	NHS Fife	Dissolution of Trusts consultation
03/07/03	East Fife Women's Aid	Leaflets etc
04/07/03	Bums off seats	Healthy Walks in Cupar & St Andrews
04/07/03	EnviroCentre	St Andrews Rifle Range
05/07/03	Police Community Team	July newsletter
05/07/03	University	DRH opening ceremony invite: 17 July

July Agenda Additional

Circulated at the meeting

Apologies for the very late circulation of the papers this month. A broken spoke necessitated a back wheel rebuild before I was mobile for the deliveries. [PL]

A couple of items got lost in the editing:

8.3. Secretary

8.3.3. Heraldry Frank Riddell suggests we invite Mark Dennis to speak in September and adds by way of background:

"I have been approached by Mark Denis who drew the Coats of Arms for us. He is holding an international conference on heraldry in St Andrews in 2006. He wants to get the town and the university involved and is offering a sort of flag/banner to be presented to us carrying our coat of arms and a similar offer is made to the university. It all sounds quite exciting to me."

8.3.4. Contacts Please let me have any corrections or additions for the contact list, especially phone/email and postcode.

9.1.2. Recreation Committee: my copy of the printed Recreation committee minutes were mislaid for a while hence the omission from the June report, but I have now found them and they will be included in the record of the meeting.

Additional Mail (7/7/03)

Development of St Andrews Community Hospital and Health Centre

Two letters from Dr Andrew Kilpatrick, Chairman – North East Fife LHCC

1) Cost Option Appraisal of Sites

I am writing to confirm that the Trust has now completed the Cost Option Appraisal of three sites for the development of the new St Andrews Community Hospital and Health Centre and has identified Largo Road as its preferred site.

I am writing to offer you and other interested representatives of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council a personal invitation to attend a closed meeting with representatives from the Trust and our consultants, Jones Lang Lasalle in advance of our Public Meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to outline the issues that have informed the decision to progress with the procurement of the new hospital and health centre on the site at Largo Road.

The meeting will take place on Thursday 17 July 2003 at 5.30pm within St Andrews Golf Hotel, The Scores, St Andrews. Representatives from the East Neuk Community Councils will also attend the meeting and I would be grateful if you could limit representation to four people.

2) Selection Of Preferred Site

As you will be aware the Trust has been undertaking a Cost Option Appraisal to identify the best site for the new St Andrews Hospital and health centre. This has just been completed and I am writing to inform you of the outcome of that process. As you will be aware three sites were considered

in this process, namely the site at St Leonard's fields, a site adjacent to Largo road and a site adjacent to Craigtoun road. After lengthy analysis Largo Road has been identified as the preferred site.

St Leonard's Fields was initially identified as the Trust's preferred site, based on an evaluation of physical and environmental issues. The next stage, (which is required by law for public bodies) was a Cost Option Appraisal. This built on the work already carried out and served to identify the most cost-effective site that was considered to be deliverable, in line with the Trust's overall programme and objectives. It should be noted that between these two assessments the land available at St Leonard's fields was reduced and the land available at Largo road increased.

Despite every effort, it has not proved possible, for a number of reasons, to make the site at St Leonards Fields work. The site at Craigtoun road had difficulties in relation to uncertainties over the town boundary and costs in relation to diverting mains services. However the site at Largo Road, with the additional land, provides us with a site that will deliver an excellent health care facility that is also affordable for the NHS in Fife.

We propose to hold a public meeting in the Upper hall of St Andrews town hall on the evening of Wednesday 23rd July at 7pm to outline the issues that have informed our decision and to explain why we have decided that Largo road provides the best overall site to deliver the health care facility that St Andrews and North East Fife needs and deserves.

However I would like to invite you to attend a meeting prior to this date, with representatives from the Trust and our consultants in the Cost Option appraisal, Jones Lang Lasalle, so that you have the opportunity to discuss these issues. This meeting will be held on 17 July and details will be confirmed separately.

Fife Wide Final Best Kept Town & Village Competition

Linda Scott, Community Services: "St. Andrews is through to the above final, the judging will take place on Monday 14th July or Tuesday 15th July am as soon as the list has been finalised I will let you know the exact date and time they will be in St. Andrews."
