

## **Madras College**

Briefing Note

20 October 2011

22.09.2011 **PFAM Committee**

Report by the Executive Director of Education that proposed that the site options appraisal work previously undertaken be revisited with a view to an alternative site for the school being considered at the next meeting of the Education and Children's Services Committee on 10 November, 2011.

The committee agreed:

1. 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;
2. to confirm that the options appraisal work previously undertaken in 2009 (plus appraisal of Craigtoun Park) 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
3. to confirm that the budget for Madras College, St. Andrews will be £40m.

27.09.2011 **Extended Local Development Group (LDG)**

LDG extended to include representation from all associated primary schools instead of one representative covering all primaries in a geographical area. The LDG had a representative from St Andrews university but he stood down following the university's withdrawal from the project. We are still awaiting a replacement university representative.

The meeting took the form of a presentation by Education Services, followed by a workshop led by Education but supported by officers from Property and CAM 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;
- 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 with the process.

04.10.2011 **Public Meeting – Newport**

The meeting 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.

05.10.2011 **Public Meeting – Kilrymont**

The meeting 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 a strong general preference 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:

1. to score Kilrymont as a new build;
2. to score Kilrymont as a remodel and new build extension option;
3. provide a 'story board' of how a remodelled Kilrymont could look to assist stakeholders understand what could be provided.

07.10.2011 **Site Re-scoring Exercise**

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. The scoring matrix is listed as Appendix D.

At this meeting the group considered all the points raised at the public meetings The note of the scoring meeting including a more

detailed review of each site is attached as Appendix E.

South Street and Station Park were eliminated on the only criteria agreed as a pass/fail – Development Constraints.

The main points in favour of the remodelling and new build at Kilrymont over new build option are:

- **deliverability** – we own the site and there is broad support from Historic Scotland to our design approach to the remodelling but no support for the demolition and new build;
- **community impact** – the existing swimming pool would be retained in the remodelling option but would not be replaced in any new build;
- **Environment and Sustainability** – re-use of the existing buildings would result in a lower carbon footprint for the provision of a new school.

In addition, the Council have to be mindful that it is custodian of a Grade B listed Building with an obligation for the care of our historic environment.

In 2009 Historic Scotland (HS) stated its opposition to the demolition and provided broad support to our proposed design approach to the remodelling of Kilrymont. Following a meeting with HS on 14 Oct 2011 they confirmed in writing their position with regard to the alternative approaches at Kilrymont. See Appendix F.

#### 19.10.2011 **Member/Officer Review of Scoring Exercise**

Following discussion it was agreed that:

- both South Street and Station Park should be scored to enable comparison of the individual criteria for all sites.

Due to the unavailability of most of the group who carried out the appraisal, the scores were extrapolated as follows:

- where the 2011 criteria substantially matched the 2009 then the raw score from 2009 was used multiplied by the 2011 weighting;
- where the criteria substantially did not match the 2009 criteria then the scoring was done by other officers familiar with the issues at hand.

The results of the updated scoring is shown in Appendix F

#### 24.10.2011 **Public Meeting – Kilrymont**

A public meeting has been arranged to present the findings of the site selection exercise and to describe the next steps starting with a report to Education & Children's Services Committee on 10 November 2011.

## **Appendix A**

### **Output from Madras Local Development Group Meeting 27 September 2011**

Criteria and weightings:

1. Development Constraints/ Public Opinion/Consultation (Pass/Fail)
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 4<sup>th</sup> October 2011

1. Area at Craigtoun Park needs to include 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, or swop, of a 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 refurbishment 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 - Cross Service Scores

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
Weighting		3		3		3		3		1		2		2		2		3		1		2		3		1		
		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	
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		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	0
3	Station Park		x		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	0
4	University (North Haugh)				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
6	University (Playing Fields)				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	4	8	3	9	2	2	63
8	Craigtoun 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	Strathkinness 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	Strathrym 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	Craigtoun 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 E

### Note of Site Selection Meeting on 7 October 2011

#### MADRAS COLLEGE, ST ANDREWS SITE SELECTION MEETING 7<sup>th</sup> 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:

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

2	South Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Not scored (by the group)</b></li> <li>• Council ownership.</li> <li>• Historic site of school in heart of town within walking distance of facilities.</li> <li>• Good public transport links.</li> <li>• Re-use of A listed building.</li> <li>• Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Challenges re development may impact on deliverability.</li> <li>• Subsequent cost of any acceptable building.</li> <li>• Great concern re increased (school bus) traffic congestion/impact.</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Some education and community issues re disruption during construction (decant arrangements).</li> </ul>
3	Station Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Not scored (by the group)</b></li> <li>• Council ownership</li> <li>• Fundamental planning concerns re protected open space, flooding, landscape, gateway view to town.</li> <li>• Public reaction - lengthy consultation process and challenges re development may impact on deliverability for 2015.</li> <li>• Good public transport links.</li> <li>• Peripheral site re pedestrian access.</li> <li>• Some issues re existing services and environment.</li> <li>• Subsequent cost of any acceptable building.</li> <li>• Some education and community issues re disruption during construction (loss of external pitches).</li> <li>• Loss of existing playing fields.</li> <li>• Potential to increase biodiversity.</li> </ul>
4	University (North Haugh)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Not evaluated.</b></li> </ul>
5	University (Lang Lands)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Not evaluated.</b></li> </ul>
6	University (Playing Fields)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Not evaluated.</b></li> </ul>
7	Pipelands (east of new hospital)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peripheral site - concern re traffic congestion - anticipated volume of school related transport (mainly buses).</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Existing services.</li> <li>• Currently designated "Employment Land" on Local Plan -</li> </ul>

		<p>departure required - planning concerns re developing to south of town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges re development may impact on deliverability by August 2015.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Potential to increase biodiversity.</li> <li>• Public transport links via new hospital.</li> </ul>
8	Craigtoun Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peripheral site.</li> <li>• Poor links to town and population.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Planning timescales/issues.</li> <li>• Subsequent cost of major road/interchange/services infrastructure requirement.</li> <li>• Sloping ground.</li> <li>• Traffic congestion until new road constructed.</li> <li>• Negative impact on town centre business.</li> </ul>
9	Strathkinness High Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peripheral site.</li> <li>• Poor links to town and population.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Planning timescales/issues.</li> <li>• Subsequent cost of major road/services infrastructure requirement – Strathkinness High Road itself is poor for bus traffic.</li> <li>• Sloping ground.</li> <li>• Potential to increase biodiversity.</li> <li>• Traffic congestion and HGV restrictions until new road constructed.</li> <li>• Negative impact on town centre business.</li> </ul>
10	Strathtyrum Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peripheral site.</li> <li>• Poor links to town and population.</li> <li>• Subject to potential flooding – SEPA maps.</li> <li>• Deliverability by August 2015 – subject to negotiations with existing land owner/trustees – currently viewing as commercial/residential opportunity.</li> <li>• Departure from Local Plan - timescales/issues.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

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

## Appendix F

### 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](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 G - Scores added for South Street and Station Park after cross service scoring

Option Ref	SITES	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
Weighting		3		3		3		1		2		2		2		3		1		2		3		1		
		A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	
1a	Kilrymont Remodel and New Build	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	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	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	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
5	University (Lang Lands)		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
7	Pipelands	1	3	3	9	3	9	4	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	6	3	3	4	8	3	9	2	2	63
8	Craigtoun Road	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	Strathkinness High Road	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	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	Craigtoun Park	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
- \_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

- X Scores from 2009 scoring added to 2011 matrix to provide a possible comparison
- X Scoring carried out after group scoring i.e. not by cross-service scoring group

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