

[\[2003 index\]](#)

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Agenda – December 2003

There will be a meeting of the community council at 7pm on Monday 1st December 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

Sheila Hill

2. Minutes of November 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.

3.1. Police report

3.2. Homelessness Temporary Accommodation Options in St Andrews

John Mills, Housing Service.

3.3. St Andrews in Focus

Flora Selwyn, editor, on its aims and to ask for Community Council support.

3.4. Public Toilets

Judy Routledge of New Gilston, on St Andrews toilets opening, or lack thereof.

4. Fife Councillors

4.1. Frances Melville (West)

4.2. Sheila Black (South)

4.2.1. Fire Station Grounds Maintenance Appendix E Letter from Firemaster.

4.3. Bill Sangster (Central)

4.4. Jane Ann Liston (South East)

5. Planning Committee

5.1. Minutes 10/11/03 Appendix C.

5.2. Petheram Car Park Appendix D: Objection.

5.3. Hospital EIA Appendix F: Response to the Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Report.

5.4. Environmental Impact Assessments Appendix J: Concerns raised with Cllr Melville as Chair of East Development Ctte.

5.5. Minutes 22/11/03 Appendix K

6. Matters Arising from previous meetings

6.1. Jubilee Tree

[May 6.1., April 2002 9.1.] A conventional bench and plaque has been costed by Penny Uprichard, following the discovery in May that a circular iron construction originally proposed would be excessively expensive at £2,000. Archie Strachan has the details.

6.2. Development Survey

[November 6.2.] Following concern expressed about a personal aside suggesting St Andrews' development may be influenced in its direction by global warming and sea level rise, I emailed a 'clarification' to the author of the survey – *Pete Lindsay*.

6.x. other matters arising?

7. New Business

7.1. Bus Station

Appendix E. We are invited to send a representative to a daytime workshop.

Who can attend?

7.2. Access to Western North Haugh

Appendix G. Tony Clements has concerns about the university's attitude to public access to both the North Haugh and information.

Do we wish to take action?

7.3. Removal of BT Pay Phones

Proposed: one at 43 South Street, two located at PCO South St (?), one each at PCO Union Street and PCO North Street. All are listed as having alternatives at nearby (10-36m).

We have 42 days from 30th October to comment. The information, forwarded by yet another person in Fife Council, was not sent out until after 21 November.

Do we wish to comment?

7.4. 1 Greyfriars Garden

From Paull & Williamsons, Solicitors, Aberdeen.

We act for the owners of the garden ground at 1 Greyfriars Gardens, St Andrews and understand that the Community Council have been tending the garden. They had been aware that the garden has been tended for some time and I have discovered that it is yourselves through the local planning department. We want to regularise the position and suggest we enter into a Licence entitling you to continue to tend the garden but with provision that either party can terminate the arrangement on notice to the other.

Please let us know that you will enter a Licence failing which please vacate immediately and confirm to us that you have done this.

This letter and its contents are not contractual.

How do we wish to respond?

7.5. Safety at the Lade Braes

Appendix H: copy of a letter from Alexander Watchman to the Chief Executive, Fife Council.

7.6. Spectrum

"Scotland's magazine for volunteer development": International Volunteers Day 5 December; News – volunteering opportunity; Accessing European Structural Funds; Community Service Volunteers; Bridging the Digital Divide; Driving the volunteer agenda in Europe; A global context for volunteering; Volunteering Abroad.

We are invited to subscribe for £15 – £20pa.

7.7. Transportation Service Maintenance

Martin Kingham (Lead Officer, Customer Response Unit) 01334 412052 or martin.kingham@fife.gov.uk is responsible for the maintenance of bollards, bus shelters, claims, cycleways (on road & off road), ditches and offlets, drainage and culverts, fences and guardrails, flooding, grit bins, gully cleaning, milestones, potholes and patching, road markings, safety

inspections, signs, street name plates, surface dressing, verges and winter maintenance. He should be contacted with any problems under these headings.

7.8. Police Community Newsletter

November edition. Appendix I: Relevant extracts

7.9. NHS Fife Board Meeting

10am Tuesday 16 Dec, Springfield House, Cupar. Coffee and a chat with board representatives from 9.30am. 0845-762-6799.

7.10. SEPAView

Autumn edition: Environmental regulation website www.netregs.gov.uk; Fly-Tipping; Recycling in Oregon USA; SEPA action plans – 4 projects; SEPA's internal environmental policy; Water quality improvements; Organic farming – what difference does it make?; A recycling manager for the Edinburgh Festival; plus environmental news snippets.

8. Reports from Officers

8.1. Chair

8.2. Treasurer

8.3. Secretary

8.3.1. Bus Services Letter [November 8.3.7.] Appendix B

8.3.2. St Andrew's Day Greetings were sent to nine groups overseas who had sent greetings to St Andrews last year.

8.3.3. Future presentations

January Coastal Path: Chris Broome (Ranger Service).

February Iain Smith MSP; Local Plan: Bill Lindsay (Development Service).

March Wind Farm – Clatto Landscape Protection Group (They have sent a couple of data CDs which contain the EIA for the proposed wind farm; available from the Secretary).

8.3.4. Meeting Dates 2004: Burgh Chambers booked: 5 Jan, 2 Feb, 1 Mar, 5 Apr, 3 May, 7 Jun, 5 Jul, 2 Aug, 6 Sep, 4 Oct, 1 Nov, 6 Dec.

9. Reports

9.1. From Committees

9.2. From Representatives

9.2.1. Kate Kennedy Procession Committee Appendix A report by Cynthia Tero.

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 – Kate Kennedy Procession Committee

Report by Cynthia Tero

A Kate Kennedy Procession Committee meeting was held on Thursday 20 November 2003.

A provisional date for the procession was set for Saturday, 17 April 2004.

Discussion covered many aspects of the K.K. procession including lengthening the route taken to include the R. & A. to acknowledge their centenary celebrations, but was dismissed as it was thought the traffic arrangements and time taken would create too many problems.

Various sponsorship ideas were discussed such as including local participants but it was agreed that at present the procession size should remain the same. Primary school pupils are to be invited to design banners to mark various stages of the parade and grooms are to be offered tabards to wear over their clothes. Daffodils are to be planted as soon as possible.

Next meeting: Thursday 15 January at 7p.m.

Appendix B – Bus Services

Letter on behalf of Community Council by Pete Lindsay, to Trond Haugen (Transportation Service), Robert Andrew (Stagecoach).

I write to express the concerns of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council over the state of town bus services in St Andrews.

Since the new time table was adopted community councillors have reported comments from members of the public noting that, depending where they live in the residential areas, either journeys to the centre of town or the health centre – or the return – is much longer than previously and in some cases involves a change of buses. Another problem reported is that services from town centre to the south east start too late to serve those working shop or office hours in the centre and cease too early to be useful to workers returning home in the evening.

Community council feels that there are a number of factors which contributed to the lack of success, despite their utility, of the services which have been and scaled down or removed.

1) Lack of information

– Advertising of services is very poor. The bus companies do not seem to advertise their services. Would-be passengers are expected to know what bus routes are though town by some process of telepathy that tells them when and where to ask for information from the companies, or Fife Council's Transportation Service. Undoubtedly the information is 'out there', somewhere, but it isn't at point of delivery of the service – the bus stop. Where are the route maps, the fare and time tables? Not at the stops.

It seems there is a 'Hail & Ride' system operating in parts of the residential areas of St Andrews. This was news to community councillors a couple of months back. While it is possible that we are entirely out of touch, we are rather more of the opinion that if the majority of a very varied body of community-minded people are not aware of such a fundamental aspect of life then there may be questions to be asked about how well information about bus services is being disseminated.

Is there an integrated route map of the public transport options (routes, fares) and likely destinations in St Andrews? And perhaps even a well advertised web page, given this is the 21st century?

2) Cost

– For the cost of a bus ride from the Kilrymont area to the centre of town and back (2*70p) a car could park in the centre for 2 hours (just over in fact: 2*60p). Meanwhile the new Megabus service St Andrews-Edinburgh is launched at £1. It is hardly surprising that bus fare in town are seen as expensive; and so services fail because people don't get out of the habit of using the car.

3) Consultation

– What studies and consultations of passengers and potential passengers has there been to determine their needs? Were services cut purely on financial grounds without looking at why they were failing?

In conclusion, we hope that steps will be taken to find a useful replacement for the lost services as soon as possible, and suggest that if the previous company is unwilling then Fife Council might encourage a different company to provide it.

Appendix C – Planning Minutes 10/11/03

By Frank Riddell

1. 11 Queens Gardens. Rear house extension. NC
2. 56 South Street. Alterations to listed walls (arising from an

- already submitted application). NC
3. 10 Priestden Park. Single storey rear extension. NC
 4. 8b Hope Street. Change of use for a flat into a 3 person HMO. NC
 5. 294 Market Street. Display 2 fascia and 3 projecting externally illuminated signs (amended application). NC
 6. 38 Market Street. Alterations and extension to dwelling house. NC
 7. 3 Auchterlonie Court. Single storey extension. NC
 8. 45 Argyle Street. Sun room extension. NC
 9. 78 Lawmill Gardens, Demolish then rebuild new single domestic garage. NC
 10. 60 Largo Road. Extension to commercial garage. NC
 11. Feddinch Mains. Re-application. The committee expressed dissatisfaction with the failure to comply with Scottish Executive circular on EIA 1999 para. 102b which says that copies of the Environmental Statement should be available for purchase in the locality. [Appendix J] The developers only have these available for purchase in Carnoustie – committee decided to draw this to the attention of Cllr Melville. A general letter of objection would be submitted by Dr Goudie raising the effects that the development would have on the infrastructure of the town.
 12. Southfield, Kinnessburn Road. Erect 10 flats, form access to public road etc (includes demolition of existing buildings currently in industrial use). Letter of objection to be submitted by L. Aguilar on the following grounds: loss of industrial site, non-vernacular design, not a designated site for housing, zero housing need.

Appendix D – Petheram Bridge Car Park

Letter of objection by Pete Lindsay on behalf of community council, to Fife Council Development Service.

I write on behalf of the Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council and its planning committee.

While there have been improvements in this version of the plan we regret that these are not sufficient to answer our concerns. We maintain our objections as expressed in response to previous iterations of this application, and add some new points to specific items in this version.

1) Context and Need

This is part of a wider plan for St Andrews, we understand from Scottish Enterprise Fife, and feel it should be considered publicly in that context, not as an isolated application. There has been no evidence put forward publicly to establish an independent need for an increase in car parking capacity at this site.

In the more general context the St Andrews Area Local Transport Plan is now under active consideration. This application pre-empts options that might be considered as part of a whole in that context.

It also impacts on the proposed North Haugh master plan which is to be drawn up in consultation between St Andrews University, Fife Council and local stakeholders in the next few months, we understand.

To quote a previous submission:

In particular we have previously suggested that transport infrastructure in the Station Road / Petheram Bridge / North Haugh area should be considered as an integrated whole in the context of the upcoming Local Plan revision and development of the Area Transport Plan, and the North Haugh master plan. Before these are available an application such as this, publicly acknowledged as it is to be part of a wider plan, is premature.

2) Appearance

The issue of the appearance of the car park area from the approaches has been a particular concern to the town since the original proposals for the building of a car park here. In particular this community council has called for effective screening to be established.

The extensive planting in the current Petheram car park is reasonably successful at hiding what would otherwise be a sterile eyesore from the view of those entering St Andrews along the A91. In view of the sorry history of visual disasters in this area, such as the glass gasometer of the Gateway and the widely-disliked insipid green Biomolecular Science building, great care needs to be taken here.

Very careful detail consideration must be given to the appearance of this visually sensitive 'gateway' site on the outskirts of St Andrews. Even if the vegetation within the body of the car park is cut back and replaced with trees, for a combination, we hear, of ease of maintenance and greater visibility within the car park, the perimeter must disguise and obscure the contents of the parking area from approaches along the A91's current and old routes. Replacing bushes with trees is unlikely to be effective visual shielding at the borders unless the species are particularly short and bush-like. It has been suggested to us that the species listed in the plans are potentially tall-growing with 20-30m being mentioned. If correct this is unacceptable.

Further; the visual effects of digging back into the hillside by Jacob's Ladder must be carefully modelled and a 'realistic' simulated view from the A91 should be presented to convince the Development Committee – and the public – that there is any benefit in replacing a pleasing soft grassy slope with low bushes

and ground cover plants. It should be noted that grass will not trap and retain wind-blown debris such as car parks seem to generate; we are unconvinced that this will be true of ground cover planting.

As a general point we require that the majority of all types of planting will be native Scottish species suitable for the environment.

Finally and very generally: while the use of formal plant names on plans is essential to avoid confusion and doubt, it would help the lay public assess plans if the common names were also included – few of us are professional botanists or gardeners.

3) Petheram Bridge

The lack of reinstatement of the Petheram Bridge is still a major concern. Disregarding Fife Council's regrettable decision not to enforce the planning condition on the original car park, for reinstatement of the bridge, against itself, it is plain that a means of crossing the A91 is needed for the car park's users to cross safely to access the golf and beach north of the road. This need must be increased by the increase in capacity proposed for the car park. Again, this is a reason for the consideration of transport requirements and implications in the North Haugh area to be dealt with as an integrated body of work, not individual applications.

4) Loss of Path/Right-of-Way from Station Car Park to North Haugh

We are very disappointed that this revision makes no attempt to address this serious problem involving diversion of a possible Right-of-Way along an inferior route.

The proposals show the path which currently cuts across the slope above the present car park, from the Station Car Park to the North Haugh, will be lost in the development. Instead pedestrians travelling to or from the the North Haugh will need to walk around the perimeter path of the car park extension: a less direct route; a far less aesthetically pleasing route, exchanging a higher vantage for a low and possibly car-filled one; and as this route will bring pedestrians into closer proximity with vehicles potentially a less safe one.

The current footpath has been in use for some years and may well meet the requirements for a Right-of-Way. Therefore it should not be rerouted unnecessarily and certainly not along a substantially inferior and arguably discontinuous route.

These proposals do not adequately consider the needs of pedestrians who are not car park users.

5. Pedestrian Provision in the Car Park

These proposals do not adequately consider the needs of pedestrians who are car park users.

A criticism of the existing layout brought up at community council recently and equally relevant to the new layout is the safety concern that there is no provision at most of the parking spaces for users dis- / embarking from their vehicles to use clearly separated footpaths. They are instead expected to walk along the roadways of the car park, sharing them with vehicles driving to or from a space and manoeuvring in or out of the bays.

The assumption that drivers and pedestrians can safely share space is reflected in a new section of footpath shown adjacent to the railway embankment. It connects no other pedestrian areas. We fear that it may encourage people to walk along the roadway to the Station Car Park/Bus Station area, rather than climb up to the footpath along the top of the embankment. This does not seem to be a very safe option to provide, unless of course there is some further as yet undisclosed work that makes sense of such a change. If it is intended for some sort of disabled access option as an alternative to climbing the embankment rather more thought is needed than depositing users on the road access to and from the higher levels of the Station/Argyle St car parks.

6. Boundary Wall Name

We feel that the name set in the boundary wall is too large and prominent, giving a car park a better sign than St Andrews itself. Size and materials need to be reconsidered. It is particularly insensitive in that there is currently no actual Petheram Bridge, as we have pointed out above.

Appendix E – Bus Station

From Peter Milne, Area Transportation Plan Team Leader (East)

Fife Quality Bus Stations Project Workshop on St Andrews Bus Station Monday 15th December

Fife Council has recently appointed consultants WSP, in association with architects Jefferson Sheard, to design and implement the refurbishment and enhancement of the bus station at St Andrews and at four other locations in Fife, following the submission of a successful Public Transport Fund bid to the Scottish Executive.

Fife Council and the consultants are very keen to involve a range of key stakeholders at this early stage in the process to ensure that the designs that are subsequently developed address the key local issues and aspirations of existing and future users of these bus stations.

It is therefore proposed to hold a workshop for key interested parties and user groups on Monday 15th December at Lower College Hall, University of St Andrews. The workshop will

commence at 10.30 and finish at 3.00pm with a sandwich lunch provided.

We are very keen for yourself or a nominated deputy to attend what should be a very interesting, influential but informal event and would be grateful if you could confirm attendance using the slip attached.

I hope to see you on the 15th.

Appendix F – Hospital EIA Scoping response

By Ian Goudie, on behalf of Planning Committee

Proposed St Andrews Community Hospital & Health Centre

Response to the “Scoping Report” for the EIA [Environmental Impact Statement]

I Introduction

Overview

1. We welcome this opportunity to comment on what should be included in the Scoping Opinion on the proposed new hospital. As a Community Council we have been actively involved for the last ten years in the attempt to get a new hospital for the town, and need no convincing of the importance and urgency of that task. Nevertheless, the increasing sense of desperation, after all the many setbacks, is no excuse for lack of clarity of thought. It is clear that an ill-judged decision on the location of the hospital could not only add significantly to the existing problems of the town, but could also further delay the completion of the project.

The timeliness of the EIA

2. Over the last decade we have operated under a number of different administrative regimes in the local health service. Under some of the Health Trusts members of the Community Council have been participants in the process of building the case for the hospital, contributing both ideas and local knowledge to the discussion. At other times, including the present one, we have been held more at arm’s length. We were as surprised as everyone else when last July the Trust’s consultants recommended a different site from that which the previous consultants had backed. For the last four months, we have been wishing to see the consultant’s report, whilst naturally recognising that any sections with commercially confidential information could not be revealed. The failure of the Trust to publicise the detailed case in that time is a matter of concern to us.

3. We therefore welcome the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for this project, since an objective comparative appraisal of possible sites is an integral part of any

such exercise. We are also conscious that the regulations for an EIA imply a rather broad interpretation of the word "environmental", and would urge that full cognisance should be taken of the wider planning implications of the hospital development.

The desirability of consensus

4. Unlike some previous planning proposals in recent years, the principle of this development, that there should be a new hospital and healthcare centre for the town, is not a cause of contention. We would therefore hope that there would be a genuine attempt to get the agreement of the local community on the appropriate methodology to be used in the EIA. PAN 58 (para. 41) says that one of the purposes of scoping is "to provide a means to discuss methods of impact assessment and reach agreement on the most appropriate."

Timescales

5. It is also worth giving some thought to the timescales for the various planning exercises before us at the present time. A serious attempt at an EIA on a project of this size is surely likely to take months rather than weeks, and is therefore unlikely to be ready for submission very much before the point at which Fife Council has indicated that it expects to be publishing a draft Local Plan. Indeed, despite the hard work which has undoubtedly been put in, the hospital project has seen repeated delays up to this point (c.f. Table 16 of the Outline Business Case for a recent illustration), and it is hard to be confident that that will not continue. We would therefore hope that Fife Council will not see this EIA as a reason to wash its hands of the matter, but rather will continue to do its own homework with a view to making appropriate recommendations in the draft Local Plan.

II General Methodological Requirements

6. We have, on an earlier occasion, attempted to indicate the implications of the fundamental point that an EIA, as envisaged by the European legislation, should be a scientific document. Many of these are in such stark contrast to what usually happens in planning matters that we shall repeat them here somewhat more concisely.

The nature of scientific evidence

7. A conclusion can only be regarded as objective and supported by scientific evidence if all inputs are exposed for scrutiny and the methodology is fully specified so that it can be subject to replication by others with suitable expertise. In the case of quantitative results, the values of the raw data or other input variables should be provided so that it is possible for the reader of the ES to reproduce the calculations and reach the same answer. Results not substantiated in this way should be viewed as opinions. PAN 58 (para. 66) says that in an ES

(Environmental Statement), "Conclusions should be drawn from the data, rather than tailored to favour the proposal." The letter from the Planning Division of the SEDD to all Heads of Scottish Planning Authorities (ref PGD/5/12) says in para 19.1 "The planning authority should be prepared to challenge the findings of the ES if it believes they are not adequately supported by scientific evidence."

Referencing

8. The EU's Guidance on EIA, EIS Review, Part B3 says that a good EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) "references all information sources used." More precisely, we would ask that where an argument in the EIS relies on another document, a full reference including the page number should be given. All appropriate steps should be taken to ensure that the interested reader can verify the accuracy of all assertions made.

Computer output

9. Where results rely on computer analysis, appropriate information should be provided to allow the reader to acquire the software and replicate the results. The name, and version number (if any) of the package used should be stated. There should be a full specification of all the input data and of the chosen method of analysis indicating variants selected at any points at which discretion has had to be exercised. Where simulations using random data are employed, the distributional assumptions made should be stated. Science should be used to enlighten and not to obfuscate.

Forecasting

10. The Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 1999 (ANNEX C Part I, para. 4) require a "description by the applicant of the forecasting methods used to assess the effects on the environment". The extent of the historical data provided should also be commensurate with the length of the lead time for which forecasts are offered. Prediction intervals will be needed in order to quantify the uncertainties of point predictions. The methodology adopted should be fully recorded. Where the variable being forecast will be influenced, for instance, by decisions of government, local government or government agencies, there should also be an accompanying statement from the controlling body that the forecast is at least consistent with their current policy intentions.

Survey data

11. Survey data should be accompanied by detailed information on the dates and times of sampling, the sampling scheme and the survey protocol. The submitted documentation should include the raw data obtained, and, in the case of opinion surveys, the questionnaire used. Methods of analysis should be indicated. The reporting of percentages without indication of the

absolute numbers involved is not acceptable practice.

III Imprecision of the Scoping Report

12. We note the argument in the Scoping Report that the likely use of the Private Public Partnership (PPP) route makes it "inappropriate to progress the design of the facilities to detailed level at this early stage", but nevertheless have concerns about the extent to which the resulting vagueness hampers the scoping process being undertaken by Fife Council. We are again mindful of the EU's Guidance on EIA Scoping (Part B2) says that "Whichever organisation is undertaking scoping, it is important that the people involved have sufficient information about the project and the area which will be affected to allow them to identify potential impacts and possible alternatives".

13. Section 2.4 of the Scoping Report is unhelpful in specifying what is envisaged. It indicates that even the boundaries of the site displayed in Figure 2.2 should be viewed as indicative. Even given that flexibility, it seems scarcely surprising that a building of 10,000 m² gross external area should occupy less than two thirds of a 2.4 hectare site. Bearing in mind the comment in PAN 58 (Para 25) that the EIA process "rarely proceeds in a simple linear fashion", we would consider that further clarification of the proposal should be sought before a final Scoping Opinion is issued.

IV The Planning Background

14. Section 3.2 of the Scoping Report indicates that ES will consider the implications for the proposed hospital of not only the Development Plan itself, but also supplementary planning guidance that may be used as a material consideration in any planning decision. The latter category should certainly include both the Strategic Study on the town and Tyldesley's Landscape Assessments. The former of these was based on wide consultation and is the most recent authoritative statement of the views of the local community on the future development of the town. Consideration should also be given to documentation on Green Belts, including the boundaries recommended for a St Andrews Green Belt by Tyldesley.

V Consideration of alternative sites

The main issue for the ES

15. PAN 58 (para. 69) says "It has always been good practice for the ES to report on the alternatives considered by the applicant and it is a requirement of the 1999 Regulations." Jones Lang LaSalle list site selection as item 8 on their draft list of 13 sections for the ES. The Community Council would wish Fife Council to ensure that this item receives the attention that it undoubtedly deserves. With some applications the major requirement is to justify the need for a development of the given type. Here there is no dispute about the principle:

everyone is keen to see a hospital and healthcare facility go ahead, and so site selection is the major issue, which should form the greater part of the ES.

The need for accurate history

16. Para. 3.3 of the Scoping Report indicates that the assessment "will revisit past site selection exercises". Given the divergence in the recommendations from the Health Trust's different consultants, we would see this as important. Indeed the previous report (less any material that remains commercially confidential) should be included as an appendix rather being subject to selective editing. The same paragraph of the Scoping Report also makes reference to "local interest groups which were consulted in the selection process". The ES should indicate who has been consulted and when. For our part, we do not recall being consulted by the present consultants before the decision had been taken.

General comparative approach

17. The methodology should include a precise statement of the site requirements, and a careful and fully justified evaluation of how far each candidate site meets each requirement. The same criteria should be seen to be applied to each site, and with an equal degree of rigour. Where problems are identified with a site, the extent to which they could be overcome or mitigated should be specified and an approximate indication given of any ensuing costs. There should be a clear distinction between inherent properties of a site and considerations of its likely availability.

Quantification where possible

18. Numerical data should be provided where this is feasible. For example, in considerations of accessibility, it should not be hard to quantify approximate numbers within a specified walking or cycling time of the site, taking some cognizance of gradient. It is also unlikely that the demand for GP services is uniformly spread across the town. Again a rough quantification, perhaps based on postcodes, should be possible without breaching patient confidentiality.

Telecommunications

19. Given recent controversies, proximity of candidate sites to telecommunications masts which might affect sensitive medical equipment should also be considered.

VI Environmental impact of the development

20. We note the statement in para. 2.4 of the Scoping Report that "The Hospital is likely to be developed utilising a nominal two to three storey structure comprising basement, ground and two upper storeys". This will come as a surprise to many local residents, contrasting as it does with what we had previously

been led to believe. It also underlines the need for rather more effective means of assessing the visual impact than the usual photo-montages. In our experience a reasonably competent professional can prove anything with illustrations of this type. Much more effective is the use of scaffolding – even if it needs to be of an indicative height over an indicative area at an indicative location within an indicative plot. The ES could then give both a scientific assessment of the experiment, together with a report on the public's reaction. The exercise would be more informative still if it were carried out, with the landowners' consent, on all the candidate sites. Similarly appropriate on-site simulations are needed to assess the visual impact, both for the hospital and for the healthcare centre, of (a) the undoubtedly substantial car parking required, and (b) the necessary nocturnal illumination of these buildings and the associated access roads and car parks.

VII Consequential effects of chosen site

21. The EIA (Scotland) Regulations 1999 (para 85) say that "In addition to the direct effects of a development, the ES should also cover indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects". Such effects also need to be investigated for each of the alternative sites, for however much one might wish to divorce planning decisions about the hospital from wider planning considerations, to do so is to fly in the face of reality.

22. Perhaps the most serious of the likely consequential effects of site selection is the extent to which the construction of a hospital and healthcare centre in the particular location will set a precedent for development in the area. The implications of such development should be realistically explored. For the peripheral sites the implications for the Green Belt are of particular concern. The consequences of the choice of site for trading patterns in the town also need consideration. The new health centre will clearly be a major point of activity in the town, and the likely differing impacts on the peripheral supermarket and the town centre shops require attention.

VIII Traffic

23. The Scoping Report indicates that a Traffic Assessment (TA) will be prepared in accordance with Scottish Executive guidance. The implication of the draft table of contents for the ES is that this would be purely focussed on the Jones Lang LaSalle's preferred site. Whilst we therefore base our detailed comments on that assumption, we again, however, note that a more informative ES would result from a TA that took an overview of all the candidate sites.

IHT Guidelines

24. In seeking best practice, we would also commend many of

the guidelines laid down by the Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT). Nonetheless, as the Scottish Executive has recently highlighted in its Guide to Transport Assessment in Scotland, the notion that a development should be deemed acceptable if the percentage of extra traffic generated is sufficiently small is fundamentally flawed. Considerations of road and junction capacity are always likely to be more pertinent, and this is particularly so in the St Andrews context.

Project specification

25. IHT Guidelines, para. 2.2.1) say that "Prior to the commencement of the production of a full TIA (Traffic Impact Assessment), a scoping study should be undertaken to enable the developer and the highway authority to agree on the key aspects which the TIA should address. The scoping study should set out details of the data to be collected, the area of analysis, the methodology to be adopted and the years of assessment". It would indeed be a positive move if a clear statement of the proposed programme of work for the traffic consultants were circulated to all the EIA consultees for comment.

26. As we implied above, this necessitates a much more detailed specification of the project. The details required here are not ones that are dependent on the outcome of the predicted PPP process, but rather are inherent in the nature of the facilities being provided. The probable numbers of staff involved in providing each of the patient services needs to be specified, together with their likely working hours, and an indicative breakdown into numbers working on site or visiting in the community. Information is also needed on the numbers and mobility of administrative staff working in the NHS Trust Accommodation. For the GP practices and each of the patient services provided by the hospital a specification of the hours of operation is required, together with the numbers of patients who will use each service. It must also be recognised that demands for services may vary considerably over time. If long-range forecasts of demand are being made, appropriate demographic time series will also need to be extrapolated.

Modal choice

27. Trip origin data for the patients is also clearly needed, together with a reasoned assessment of modal choice. For GP services for St Andrews patients, useful survey data on modal choice should be obtained based on the current health centre in Pipeland Road. If indicative data from databases is employed, full details should be provided so that the comparability of data from other locations can be judged. A number of recent major developments have obtained planning consent on the basis of travel plans which made totally unjustifiable assumptions about the extent to which their clienteles might "go green". It is important if we are not to exacerbate the existing traffic

problems of the town that traffic assessments are based on what is likely to happen rather than what is hoped might happen.

Specific concerns

28. Baseline data on existing traffic flows within St Andrews is obviously needed, as are realistic assessments of road and junction capacity. In particular, the implications for Lamond Drive should be thoroughly investigated. Here the data should include not only the present flows, but also make comparison with the situation prior to the fatal accident which preceded the traffic calming measures. Loadings on Scooniehill Road also merit serious attention. Some of the traffic survey work done in St Andrews has been of very poor quality: a reliable TA consultant is a necessity.

Paramics Model

29. If the TA consultant, perhaps in collaboration with Fife Council, assesses the likely effects of the proposal on traffic flow using the Paramics Model, the general considerations on computer output, given above, are pertinent. The reader should be provided with all the necessary information to replicate the results of any simulations that are quoted in the EIA.

Evaluation

30. Fife Council's Scoping Opinion should include a statement on the way in which it intends to evaluate the TA. It is evident from the European documentation that some countries require evaluation of EIAs by independent bodies. We typically see close co-operation between applicants and Fife Council on traffic matters, particularly in the provision of data and in the use of the Paramics model. It is not acceptable to have people assessing the relevance and pertinence of information which they have themselves provided.

IX Presentation of the Environmental Statement.

31. PAN 58 (para. 74) indicates that the Main Text ES should not generally exceed 150 pages, though para 73 envisages the need for additional appendices. For our part, in view of what the Scoping Report calls the "sensitive St Andrews environment", we see length as a lesser concern than the need to address all the issues and present full justifications. Nonetheless both we and the public would appreciate the Non-Technical Summary, required by PAN 58 (para 78).

X Feedback

32. Finally we would again commend to you Para B5.3 of the EU's Guidance on EIA Scoping which says "Whichever method of consultation is employed it is important to... ensure that the views expressed are taken into account, and are seen to be taken into account, in planning the environmental studies and

preparing the EIS, and that an explanation is provided if recommendations are not followed."

Appendix G – North Haugh

From Tony Clements

Problems with Barriers on the North Haugh Site – Summary

(Note: the full text and dates of all e-mail messages has been supplied if any/all of these are required. My contact with the University on this matter has been entirely through e-mail.)

I raised the following points on August 5th in an e-mail to David Loudon:

Over the past several months – probably about 2 years now – the university has seen fit to erect barriers to various parts of the [North Haugh] site, especially to the area where there is a pond. This barrier is quite flimsy and so gets broken down quite regularly only to be reinstated again.

Now there is a new, and even flimsier, barrier (again broken down) seemingly to deter people from taking the steps behind Andrew Melville.

Why are these barriers there? Especially the second which has no real role except to irritate people.

I then asked a few related questions. In brief these were:

1. Who owns the land and what rights if any do the public have on the North Haugh site?
2. Who (within the university) has the right to exercise restrictions [on the public use of the North Haugh site]? In particular, I asked if that was David Loudon himself. (This question was to ensure I was directing my queries to the correct person.)
3. Where can I find a complete list of such restrictions, policies etc?
4. How were such restrictions made known to the public, eg. through the press etc?
5. Why in the case of the two barriers were notices not attached explaining why they were there?

[Note: the second barrier was removed a couple of days after this e-mail.]

I had no reply. Two weeks later I e-mailed again and received a brief e-mail back stating that holidays had prevented an earlier reply and that I would receive answers within two weeks.

On 2nd September, I had a further e-mail from David Loudon. Briefly, his 'answers' were:

1. I was asked to consult Ian Wright, Secretary to the Court (which I proceeded to do).
2. No answer.
3. No answer. I was told: "You may wish to know that the exercising of dogs and other pets is not permitted on our estate."
4. No answer.
5. No direct answer. I was told that the main barrier was there as "an enclosure to control the swans during breeding season".

'Answer' 5 simply raised further questions which I e-mailed back:

1. What are you controlling the swans from doing? Clearly you must be referring to the young swans and then only before they can fly. So, presumably, you are keeping them from wandering onto the road. Perhaps you could confirm this, i.e. that you are enclosing the entire area to prevent the young swans (before they can fly) from wandering onto the road.
2. Why, if you "erect an enclosure to control the swans during breeding season" do you not remove the enclosure once that season is over. You routinely and very efficiently did this with fences that were erected for the Highland Games – they were removed within days after the Games were over – so why not with this fence which has now been in place for some two years or more?

Since these dates and despite several e-mails to both Ian Wright and David Loudon I have had no further answers to any of these (now) seven questions except the first when Ian Wright e-mailed (28th October):

The University does own much of the North Haugh land. If you wish further information about land rights over this particular area, you may apply to our solicitors, Murray Donald & Caithness, or to the Registrar of Sasines in Edinburgh.

I am in the process of following this lead.

On 5th November David Loudon wrote:

I refer to your most recent message and write to advise you that Mr Ian Wright, Clerk to the Court will be dealing with your issues from now on.

and correspondence was ended by Ian Wright (22nd November) with:

With reference to your email of 19th November, I have nothing to add to my previous email communications with you and now regard this correspondence as closed

I believe two direct issues are raised.

- The policy of the University with respect to North Haugh – I still do not what this is – and, in particular the barriers that have been erected.
- Why the University refuses to supply answers or (question 1 apart) information as to where these answers may be found.

I hope therefore that the Community Council may use its good offices to persuade the University to provide proper answers to the entirely reasonable questions that I have raised.

Appendix H – Lade Braes

From Alexander Watchman, copy of letter the Chief Executive, Fife Council.

Safety Maintenance Lade Braes Walk St Andrews.

It is obvious to me that the Lade Braes Walk at the North end near to Hallowhill St Andrews is being neglected by the council, there is a serious accident just waiting to happen, at a part near to and between the two wooden bridges, the pathway at that part is flooded with water and mud, which causes adults and children, to walk along the top of the retaining wall of what appears to be sand bags, twelve inches wide.

Yesterday Sunday; I was walking along that part of the Lade Braes, with my six year old granddaughter, she ran ahead of me, in front of her were two children, I saw them balancing themselves along the edge of the footpath at the river, my granddaughter did the same.

When I caught up with them I then saw the reason was that that part of the path was covered in mud and water the only dry part was the sandbagged edge. I had to do the same.

I then realised the danger to children, the river was in spate and a few feet deep at that part a child could easily fall into the river from walking the edge, the fall is at least five feet to the river bed.

On Monday morning 17-11-03 I telephoned a Mr Osmond, at Cupar 01334 412822, who said he would contact the Foreman for the Area and telephone me back. Meantime I telephoned Councillor Jane Ann Liston, whom I thought was my councillor but apparently Shiela Black represents my ward. Mss Liston said she would notify my Councillor.

Mr Osmond telephoned me back, (he could not have been more helpful;) to say the Foreman, would attend to this matter as soon as possible.

I am very concerned about this matter as the footpath is well used by children going to school and adults out for a walk or walking to Town.

Appendix I – Police Community Newsletter

Crime Statistics for October 2003 (2002 in brackets)

Oct-03	Dom HB		Vandalism		Theft		BoP		Assault	
	Rep.	Det.	Rep.	Det.	Rep.	Det.	Rep.	Det.	Rep.	Det.
St Andrews	0(0)	0 (0)	28 (11)	4 (0)	23 (35)	1 (4)	12 (7)	10 (7)	5(7)	3 (5)

Community Sergeant – David Latto:

In an effort to be more accessible to the public it is my intention for Community Officers to hold Police Surgeries in Safeway, St Andrews; The Co-op Cupar; and Anstruther; and to address the needs of Newport Section I am in discussion with Tayside Police to hold joint surgeries in Tesco in Dundee. It is our intention to hold these surgeries in December on the lead up to Christmas and full details will be published in due course.

As the darker nights are with us I want to take this opportunity to remind everyone to ensure that their homes are secure and that lights are left on. As it gets darker during late afternoon many people are still at work. This makes it easy for the opportunist thief to identify homes, which are not occupied. Please advise members of your communities that 'Timer' light switches are available from PC John Steele at a reduced cost. He can be contacted on 01334 418745.

Appendix J – Environmental Impact Assessments

By Gordon Pay, on behalf of Planning Committee, to Cllr Frances Melville, Chair, East Area Development

The planning committee of the St Andrews Community Council has become concerned about the recent notices for planning applications with environmental impact assessments placed in the press by Fife Council. These do not seem to be in line with the Scottish Executive Circular 15 1999 on environmental impact assessment.

This quite clearly states (para. 102) that the notice must give an address in the locality where copies of the statement may be obtained. There is no doubt this means to buy one.

Recent notices have given addresses in Glasgow, Carnoustie and somewhere in England. It would be difficult to argue that these are in the locality.

In talking to Fife Council their initial position when this was pointed out was that it was still consistent with the intention behind the circular and that the statements could be obtained by post. It seems obvious that when the circular was written the authors would have been aware of the ability to obtain items by the postal service and therefore the intention was quite clearly that copies should, in addition, be available in the locality for people to go along in person and obtain. It even suggests in para. 108 that planning authorities and applicants may wish to consider whether these copies should be held at the authority's offices, and whether the authority's staff should collect any charges for those copies on behalf of the applicant.

These are controversial applications which may attract a number of objections, it may be that one of these is that Fife Council (which is responsible for the notice) has not followed the correct procedure.

On another point, since the full statements can be in a number of senses difficult to access (they can also be large and technical), it may be a good idea to keep under scrutiny whether the non-technical summary (which it is encouraged should be published as a separate document and made available free of charge) is an adequate basis for a member of the public to, at least, make an initial assessment on.

Appendix K – Planning Minutes 22/11/03

By Penny Uprichard

Present: I Goudie, F Riddell, R Douglas, G Pay, P Lindsay, P Uprichard.

Feddinch – the closing date for objections etc. is 20th December, not 1st December.

Hospital – IG has sent in a Scoping Report on the hospital. [Appendix F] There was a message from Austin Cooke that it would be formally included in the submission. The Committee would like to know the estimated number of patients and number of staff expected to be in the hospital.

1. Kwiksave – display double sided internally illuminated free standing advertisement. N.C.
2. Headon – Southfield, erect 10 flats. OBJ. LA
3. 5 Crawford Gardens – conservatory extension. N.C.
4. R & A – install replacement windows and alter windows at the clubhouse. Rear access door to be replaced. N.C.
5. 12 Cairnhill – erect dormer extension to dwelling house. N.C.
6. 84 Bruce Street – install replacement windows. N.C.
7. 77-83 North Street – internal alterations to listed building (University Registry building). N.C.

8. 1 Abbotsford Place – re-roof lean-to, rear extension of dwelling house with slate, and install roof lights. N.C.
9. Police Station, St. Andrews – formation of access ramp/steps, incorporating hand rail OBJ RD
10. 4B Bell Street – alter and extend shop (move glazing out to the level of the shop's neighbours). OBJ PL
11. 1 Union Street – PM's – internal alterations to listed building N.C.
12. 59 Hepburn Gardens – erect double domestic garage. N.C.
13. 40 Scooniehill Road – erect 1.8 metre boundary fence. N.C.
14. Physics Building – siting of liquid nitrogen vessel. N.C.
15. 4B Bell Street – change of shop and two storey conventional extension to office, to form two flats. OBJ PL
16. Yorkston Hotel, Argyle Street – satellite antenna. N.C.
17. 110 North Street – alterations to boundary of dwelling house, form opening to instal gate. N.C.

Correspondence

Date	from	subject	pass to
??/11/2003	SEPA	SEPAview newsletter Aut 03	
06/11/2003	NHS Fife	Annual Report	
06/11/2003	East Area Services Committee	Agenda 12/11/03	
06/11/2003	Lady Haig Poppy Factory Edinburgh	Wreath invoice	AS
08/11/2003	SMP Playgrounds	Playground Equipment	
08/11/2003	Scottish Natural Heritage	Scotland's Future Landscapes discussion paper	IG
08/11/2003	Cllr Sheila Black	Flowerbeds at Fire Station	
08/11/2003	Gravity Engineering	Sports equipment	
08/11/2003	Police	Community Newsletter Nov 03	
08/11/2003	Fife Council	Performance results 03	
10/11/2003	Fife Fire & Rescue Service	Annual Report 03	
17/11/2003	Scottish Civic Forum	AGM 6 Nov	
17/11/2003	Scottish Civic Forum	Scottish Parliament Day 25/11	
17/11/2003	Police	CCTV Advisory Group	

17/11/2003	NHS Fife	Patient focus conference 2/12	
18/11/2003	Alexander Watchman	Lade Braes Safety – to Fife Chief Exec	
18/11/2003	Community Services	Tentsmuir/Eden Liaison meeting 20/11	
20/11/2003	St Andrew's Week	Launch party invite	
24/11/2003	Volunteer Development Scotland	Spectrum Newsletter Nov/Dec 03	
24/11/2003	Cupar Locality Manager	Community Notice Boards	
24/11/2003	Development Services	Removal of BT Pay Phones	
27/11/2003	Transportation Services	St Andrews Bus Station	
27/11/2003	Finance & Asset Mgement Service	Community Councils Insurance certificate	Treas
28/11/2003	Fife NHS Board	Board Meeting, Cupar, 16 Dec	
29/11/2003	Paull & Williamsons, Solicitors	1 Greyfriars Gardens	