

Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010

Proposal to Relocate Madras College

Report on the Consultation

The consultation period ran from 3 November 2010 until 14 January 2011. The period of consultation was extended as a result of a week of school closure due to severe weather. Two public meetings were held on 23 November 2010 in Blythe Hall, Newport and on 24 November 2010 in the Town Hall, St Andrews. Each meeting was open from 2 pm until 8 pm and staff were on hand to explain the proposals. Detailed drawings and text were on display.

All statutory consultees were sent a copy of the proposal.

Care was taken to explain the nature of this consultation and how it differs from the statutory consultation in relation to planning.

Responses were invited and the proposals were available in alternative formats.

Summary of Responses

A substantial majority of the respondents are in favour of the proposal to relocate Madras College on a single site on the North Haugh Campus of the University of St Andrews identified in the consultation.

The responses are summarised as follows:

| | |
|--|------|
| Responses | 1387 |
| Parent/Carers of Madras College | 226 |
| Parent/Carers of Primary Catchment Schools | 156 |
| Pupils of Madras College | 850 |
| Other interested party | 155 |

| | <i>Parent or Carers of Madras College</i> | <i>Parent or Carers of Primary Catchment Schools</i> | <i>Pupils of Madras College</i> | <i>Other interested party</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>%</i> |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|----------|
| Respondents who favour the proposal | 212 | 147 | 729 | 138 | 1226 | 88.4% |
| Respondents who favour the status quo | 14 | 9 | 121 | 17 | 161 | 11.6% |

Individual comments have been scrutinised. Comments relating to a school in the Bridgehead area refer to policy decisions taken by the current administration on the basis of the most effective educational provision for the catchment area based on projected school rolls. Comments relating to the nature of the buildings and provision will be addressed in the design phase, so far as possible and will be the subject of statutory planning consultation.

Summary of comments received

1. The vast majority of comments received during the consultation period were positive about the proposal.
2. Comments received from supporters of the proposal fell into the broad areas.
 - a) Council should avoid delay in implementing the proposal
 - b) concern about the current condition of Madras (both Kilrymont and South Street)
 - c) expression of regret that there was no proposal to have swimming facilities at a new school
 - d) safe walking routes to the new school
3. A small number of respondents did not support the proposal. Comments received from those who did not support the proposal fell into two broad areas:
 - a) A preference to have the council build a new, smaller school to serve the communities around the Taybridgehead; and
 - b) a preference for the status quo and for a refurbishment of one or both of the current buildings
4. A few respondents felt there were inaccuracies in the consultation document regarding the nomenclature used to describe the indicative site of the new school.

Council response to comments received

1. Ref comment (para 2 (a))

The Council continues to work towards a 2014 delivery date for the new school to replace Madras (South Street and Kilrymont).

2. Ref comment (para 2 (b))

The council continues with a programme of maintenance at both Kilrymont and South Street, recognising the needs of the current school population.

3. Ref comment (para 2 (c))

The absence of swimming facilities at the proposed new school is a consequence of the budget available and the cost, both in capital and maintenance, of building a pool. Swimming facilities elsewhere in St Andrews are currently available.

4. Ref comment (para 2 (d))

The council's Education and Transportation Services will develop a "Safer Routes to school" plan as part of the work stream connected to the building of a new school.

5. Ref comment (para 3(a))

Comments regarding the prospect of building a new school around the Taybridgehead area have been the subject of debate for a number of years. Separate discussion of this issue took place in public forums prior to the drawing up of the current consultation proposal. Those discussions informed the Council's decision to proceed with the proposal to build a single replacement for Madras College in the environs of St Andrews.

6. Ref comment (para 3 (b))

Council's preferred option is to build a single new school as described in the proposal. The proposal identifies the additional benefits for pupils and the wider community likely to accrue through co-location with St Andrews University. A co-location represent a unique opportunity to add educational value.

7. Comment (par 4)

This comment relates to the description of the indicative site of the proposed new school as "on the North Haugh Campus"

It remains the Council's view that the description of the site is appropriate and suitable. The consultation offered communities the opportunity to view maps and photographs which clearly outlined the indicative site. It is contended that sufficient information was made available for respondents to take an informal view.

8. Detailed responses, as appropriate, are appended below each letter received. Where correspondence is from an individual the name and address has been redacted.

Appendix 1 contains the report from HM Inspectorate of Education.

Appendix 2 lists the individual comments received and the Authority's response.

Appendix 3 contains the Proposal.

Appendix 1

CONSULTATION PROPOSAL BY FIFE COUNCIL

REPORT BY HM INSPECTORATE OF EDUCATION (HMIE) ADDRESSING EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSAL TO RELOCATE MADRAS COLLEGE

1. Introduction

1.1 Fife Council proposes to relocate Madras College from its current locations at the Kilrymont and South Street buildings in St Andrews to a new building to the west of the sports centre of the University of St Andrews. It is expected that young people would relocate to the new building in time for the start of session 2014/15.

1.2 This report from HMIE is required under the terms of the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*. It has been prepared by HMIE in accordance with the terms of the Act.

1.3 HM Inspectors undertook the following activities in considering the educational aspects of the proposal:

- attendance at the public meeting held on 24 November 2010 in connection with Fife Council's proposals;
- consideration of all relevant documentation provided by the council in relation to the proposal, specifically the educational benefits statement and related consultation documents, written submissions from parents and others;
- consideration of further information on all schools affected; and
- visits to the current and proposed sites of Madras College, including discussion with relevant consultees.

1.4 HMIE considered:

- the likely effects of the proposal for young people of the school, for any other users, for children likely to become pupils within two years of the date of publication of the proposal paper, and for other children and young people in the council area;
- any other likely effects of the proposal;
- how the council intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects that may arise from the proposal; and

- benefits which the council believes will result from implementation of the proposal, and the council's reasons for coming to these beliefs.

2. Consultation process

2.1 Fife Council undertook the initial consultation on its proposals with reference to the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*. The consultation included an invitation for written submissions. There were two public consultation events, which gave parents and other members of the public the opportunity to meet with council officials and senior members of Madras College staff. The consultation events also included displays showing the location of the new school and aspects of its design. These meetings were held on the afternoon and evenings of 23 and 24 November 2010 at Newport and St Andrews, respectively.

2.2 Parents of young people attending Madras College and children attending associated primary schools are positive about the proposal. Almost all those completing written responses were in favour of the council's proposal with many commenting that there should be no delay in its implementation. Many parents are concerned about the current poor condition of the accommodation at the two existing school buildings. While favouring a move to the proposed new building with its modern facilities, they feel that, in the interests of existing learners, it is important that the accommodation at Kilrymont and South Street is maintained in the meantime in as good a state of repair as possible. Some parents regret the lack of a swimming pool in the proposed new campus. A few raised issues relating to safe walking routes to the new building.

2.3 A small minority of parents do not support the council's proposal. There are two main reasons given by those taking a negative view. The first is a preference for the council instead to build a new secondary school to serve the community in the area along the south side of the Tay near the Tay Bridge, including Newport and Tayport. These parents see a main advantage in this alternative being a reduction in the length of time young people from those areas would have to travel by bus to their secondary school. The second main reservation about the proposal is from parents who have a preference for split site education and retaining the status quo. Some of the relatively small number parents arguing in one of these two ways linked their argument to a need for refurbishment of one or both of the existing buildings. A few consultees felt there were inaccuracies in the council's proposal. These related to the location of the new school as set out in the proposal. It is the responsibility of the council to address these alleged inaccuracies in its final consultation report.

2.4 Staff and other stakeholders are positive about the proposal with just under 90% of this group giving written responses being in favour. Staff are particularly positive about the proposal for a single site school, with many arguing that this would be of great value in improving the quality of education and school ethos. A few respondees argued against the council's proposal, giving reasons in line with those already described above in 2.3.

2.5 Children and young people at Madras College and its associated primary schools are positive about the proposal with most of those giving written responses

being in favour (86%). Many commented about the poor state of the existing accommodation and hoped the new building would have better facilities including social areas and toilets. However, a significant minority favoured the status quo. The most commonly expressed reason amongst those taking this view related to a concern that the location of the new building would not allow them to visit the town centre at lunchtime. A few argued for the status quo because they felt that the split site encouraged a degree of maturity as pupils moved from the Kilrymont campus to the S4–S6 experience at South Street.

3. Educational aspects of the proposal

3.1 The council recognises that the current Kilrymont and South Street buildings have serious drawbacks. The separation of the two buildings by over a mile is currently a difficulty in relation to movement of staff during the school day. This will have an increasingly negative impact given the more flexible learning and teaching arrangements envisaged by the council as it implements *Curriculum for Excellence*. The council is of the view that the present buildings are inflexible in configuration and do not provide suitable accommodation for the best learning and teaching approaches, including effective use of information and communications technology (ICT). In particular the council would have difficulty in renovating the South Street complex to 21st century standards.

3.2 The most recent HMIE reports on Madras College have been very critical of the existing accommodation. The 2006 inspection report described the accommodation as unsatisfactory. It commented that the dispersed nature of the school buildings and facilities for sports and physical education had a negative impact on learning and teaching and on the school's capacity to supervise behaviour, due to the need for staff travel. The report commented unfavourably on a wide range of other aspects of the accommodation including facilities for the disabled and security. The 2006 report formally recommended that the council should take immediate steps to remove barriers to learning, teaching and behaviour due to the weaknesses in accommodation. In the 2008 follow-through inspection it was found that progress had been weak in relation to this main point for action, despite some redecoration and improved learner access to ICT. The 2008 report concluded that: "Despite the best efforts of the school, staff travel between sites continued to have a negative impact on pupils' experience. The fabric of buildings and the quality of furnishings, toilets and security arrangements provided a poor and deteriorating environment for learning and required major upgrading". Although there have been some improvements to the Kilrymont building since the 2008 inspection, the nature of the split site provision and on-going deterioration at South Street continue to have a negative impact on young people's education.

3.3 The council's proposal sets out a number of potential benefits for current and future pupils of Madras College. These benefits include:

- provision on a single site of modern, fit for purpose accommodation which will have sufficient flexibility to allow staff to deliver Curriculum for Excellence;
- a building with modern classrooms, including an assembly hall with seating for 500 suitable for school and community use, fully integrated facilities for the school's department of additional support and flexible accommodation in science with a dedicated area for biotechnology;
- improved opportunities for cooperative working with the University of St Andrews due to the situation of the new building;
- improved provision for sports and games. The campus is planned to have a 6-court games hall, gymnasium, multi-activity area and an all weather pitch. All the current sports pitches at Station Park, close to the new site will be retained. Discussion with the University is underway with the aim of arranging access to additional grass pitches during through a reciprocal agreement;
- a school with an improved ethos because the single site will allow senior pupils to have a positive influence on younger pupils by acting as role models; and
- avoidance of disruption to learning during the construction of the new school due to its location on a green field site some distance from the existing school buildings.

Of those young people who currently attend the school only those currently at S1 or S2 are likely to be able to attend the proposed new school, for their S5 and S6 or S6 year respectively, due to the expected completion date. Children currently in P6 and P7 in the school's associated primary schools are likely to benefit from the provision of a new building, as are younger children in those primary schools and others who might attend the new secondary school through placing requests.

3.4 The location of the proposed new site on the west side of the town of St Andrews will have the advantage of reducing the travel time of those young people coming by bus from the Newport, Tayport and Leuchars areas. The saving of time on buses is likely to be around half an hour per day. There will also be a very significant reduction in the need for school buses to be routed through the streets of St Andrews itself. At present some 18 buses travel twice daily through the town centre and through the residential area around the Kilrymont campus. The council has a policy of encouraging walking and cycling to schools and is committed to developing safe routes to the new school. It will be important that detailed consideration is given to any upgrading which might be required to ensure safe routes to the new building and to the Station Park playing field.

3.5 The council considered a number of ideas and site proposals, before reaching a decision on the preferred option. These included consideration of a number of alternative sites around St Andrews, refurbishment of Kilrymont and/or South Street buildings, and the build of a new school to serve the communities close to the Tay Bridge. In reaching the decision to build on the proposed site, the council took into account future roll projections. It decided that a single site school with a roll up to 1500 would benefit young people by enabling staff to deliver in an efficient way

a broad curriculum with extensive opportunities for personalisation and choice. A school of this size would also allow the continuation of a very wide range of opportunities for wider achievement, an aspect of the school identified previously by HMIE as a key strength. The location close to the University campus offers the potential of further enhancing the curriculum and young people's experience.

3.6 Madras College is a community use school with a substantial programme of classes and events in evenings and weekends. The facilities in the new school are being designed to ensure that the accommodation will fully meet current and expected levels of community use. The new campus will provide enhanced facilities for members of the community. In particular, the improved sports facilities with an all weather pitch will enhance the quality of user experience and the 500 seat hall will be able to be used as a venue for community or University productions and events. An important factor in the reciprocal arrangements currently being agreed with the University is that University use of school facilities will not be to the detriment of school and community use.

3.7 At present each of the two existing school buildings has a swimming pool. However, the pool at South Street has been out of use for well over a year and would require a major upgrading before being able to be re-opened. The council has no plans to do this. The pool at Kilrymont was damaged in high winds early in 2010 and has been out of use since then – it is due to open later in the 2010/11 spring term. It is not planned for the new building to have a pool. In consequence, primary school pupils in St Andrews will no longer be able to take swimming lessons at Madras College. However, the leisure centre in St Andrews has a suitable pool which could be used instead.

3.8 The new building will be designed to be fully secure and to be in full compliance with relevant equalities legislation, and with much better social facilities for young people than at present. In particular, architects have begun to consult with future users, including the pupil council, about the design of a new dining facility likely to encourage young people to take healthy school lunches.

4. Summary

4.1 Young people attending Madras College will benefit from the proposed provision of a new school. Much of the current accommodation is no longer fit for purpose whereas the new building will have secure, well-resourced accommodation designed to promote flexible learning and teaching approaches consistent with *Curriculum for Excellence*. The move to a single campus will remove the very serious disadvantages associated with the present split site and is likely to strengthen the school's ethos as a learning community. Young people will benefit from significantly improved social facilities including dining accommodation. Many of those travelling to school by bus will have reduced journey times. The location of the new school is likely to help encourage joint working arrangements with the University of St Andrews, to the benefit of both institutions. Community users of the new building will benefit from the enhanced facilities.

4.2 Given the major weaknesses in the school's existing accommodation, as highlighted previously in the 2006 and 2008 HMIE reports, and with the consequent adverse impact on current learners, the council needs to consider how to progress the current proposal as speedily as is consistent with a high-quality end result. It also needs to make every effort to ensure that in the period before the school moves into the new building the existing accommodation at the Kilrymont and South Street sites is maintained in as good a condition as possible. It is also important that the council undertake a thorough consideration and development of safe walking and cycling routes to the new school and between the new school and Station Park playing fields.

HM Inspectorate of Education

April 2011

Appendix 2a – comments received

| Comments - Madras Parents/Carers |
|---|
| I do not recognise the need or the educational benefits as promoted by the school. The pupil survey indicated strong support for the split site school and a single school covering ages from 12 to 18 is a very intimidating environment for younger pupils (especially those arriving from small Fife schools) The split site works very well as Kilrymont introduces students to High School whilst South street has a stronger academic feel since all years are taking SQA exams. |
| It would appear that this is a significant and very positive development for the school. Both my children will benefit from the improved environment and facilities. |
| In addition to outdoor sports facilities, I assume every opportunity will be exploited for access to University indoor facilities eg weight room - on an occasional hire basis |
| The existing school buildings are not fit for purpose. It is imperative that the Council moves to create a single-site school as soon as possible. |
| While I support the proposal in principle it is with some regret because had the current School been adequately maintained by FC over the years we would not be in this position now. After nearly four decades the architecture of the Kilrymont building is stunning and stands up well against many modern builds. Sadly, this is overlooked because all most people can see is the state of disrepair. Furthermore, Madras could have been a single site school at Kilrymont long ago had a 'bridgehead' School been built for those unfortunate children/parents who have, for decades, travelled to St Andrews. The new school will do nothing to reduce the carbon footprint in this regard. The paramount issue for me is that the Kilrymont and South Street buildings are adequately maintained for the pupils who are there now and who deserve facilities which are fit for purpose (eg toilet facilities, sports changing facilities etc). I am also concerned about the impact on the Community Use facility which will no longer be in the heart of the community. |
| My only view is that this should have happened long ago. My three children will not benefit from the lovely new school and have all spent their secondary school years in extremely low condition classrooms with torn curtains hanging from the windows, rusty railings etc. Very damaging to teacher and pupil morale. |
| I wish it had been done years ago so my children would have got some benefit |
| That children who already go to Madras receive the best education, a building does not make a school, the teaching has also got to be of a high standard now not in 2014. |
| Current S2s will have to deal with relocation and new curriculum for excellence exam structure in their S5 year. How can they be supported to compete effectively with peers in other schools' |
| This is a disgrace that the recommendation of hmie in 2006 is still at a consultative stage. Children and staff deserve better than this. |
| Over 50% of the pupils are from the bridgehead area. Tayport NEEDS a proper nursery school, primary school & also promised but never delivered sports complex. A combined primary/secondary at the top of the village with sports facilities built in we all can use... You are building more housing & adding zilch to the village infrastructure... How much longer....Tayport & Newport are two separate villages. Put the building at the top of the village & a bridge across the dual carriageway for the nice people of Newport. We don't even have a police 'cupboard' anymore now you've removed that room. Even Dr Who has a police box... Not Tayport !! |
| This development is absolutely essential in order to meet the educational needs of our children. |
| It will be great to see a new school with improved university links, purpose built for today's education in 21st century |
| Why is this not being built on existing site at Kilrymont, knocking down and rebuild? |
| Negotiations should be concluded with university of St Andrews and agreement reached re sport facilities and educational linkages before proceeding |
| As soon as possible please! The initial delivery date has already slipped somewhat and it would be unacceptable to allow any further delays. Myself and several other parents have robustly campaigned for a new school since 2006 and will be delighted and relieved when the |

| |
|--|
| <p>first brick is actually laid. If the 2011 elections result in a change in the political landscape at Fife council I sincerely hope that this will not adversely impact on the progression towards the new school. The children of Fife are depending on you.</p> |
| <p>There is not much of a choice here as the existing Kilrymont Buildings clearly need replaced. It is a pity that the Council rejected out of hand the option of a separate School for the Bridgehead area. I think this was a mistake.</p> |
| <p>Without further delay</p> |
| <p>Both sites at the moment have swimming pools (may not be in use at moment) but there is no mention of a swimming pool at the new site!</p> |
| <p>Having a child at Madras at the moment my main concern is that the current building - mainly the toilet facilities are in such poor condition that I am worried that nothing will be done to rectify the situation due to a move in a few years. The council should still be providing a safe & healthy environment for our children and I hope this will be addressed.</p> |
| <p>The current school buildings and facilities are not of an acceptable standard to educate children in the 21st century.</p> |
| <p>I have had four sons at Madras. The split site causes major problems.</p> |
| <p>I am strongly supportive of the proposal</p> |
| <p>I believe this will be an asset to pupils, employees and local community alike. Win win for all, Reputation of Madras is already established and fantastic couple this with wonderful facilities - huge further draw into the area whilst continuing to provide excellent academic achievements & facilities.</p> |
| <p>I feel the school is too far out of St Andrews, the children of St Andrews will have to walk at least 2 miles to go to school every day. I would much prefer a small Madras school and a Taybrige school built. 60% are bussed everyday it would be more cost effective.</p> |
| <p>Please build as soon as possible! Pupils suffering in sub-standard buildings at the moment.</p> |
| <p>This is a well thought out proposal that will bring significant benefits for pupils so the sooner work begins the better.</p> |
| <p>We'd like to know what provision for swimming there will be. Also that ties to the University won't compromise school activities (e.g. The hall being used by the university rather than the school) with current budget cuts, what might get dropped'</p> |
| <p>Every pupil I have asked prefers the upper and lower school split system although they would like the facilities to be improved and upgraded. Is it the teachers or the pupils who are keen for single site? Kilrymont is a great looking building so is South Street it is such a shame to lose this. Will the education be improved much by this I can only see a loss of identity in a faceless large building which we have plenty of in the North Haugh already.</p> |
| <p>The new site is not part of the current North Haugh Campus and it is deliberately misleading to refer to it as such. The sports facilities are NOT a greatly improved provision as stated in the consultation paper. The proposed development has admittedly more modern but not increased facilities - the sports hall is no bigger than the total provision in the 2 current sites, and the sports field provision is less than the current total provision. The possibility of a reciprocal sharing with the university is unsatisfactory since no guarantees are given, since overall it would not result in any net increase in provision, and since the university are unlikely to want children playing on their high quality pitches. Finally the current proposals would result in the loss of the schools 2 swimming pools. And therefore no dedicated swimming facilities for the school, university or community use.</p> |
| <p>I think it's a great plan. It fits very well with the existing St Andrews environment. Our kids need this school (Put up a facebook page!)</p> |
| <p>The development of a single site secondary school is long overdue and would significantly improve the education offered to children in this area. It is disappointing that children currently have to attend a school that is clearly not fit for purpose.</p> |
| <p>Fife council should make it clear, in an explicit statement, that there is no linkage between the new school and the 1090 houses that are planned under the new structure plan.</p> |
| <p>What about lunch facilities' S1 & S2 should be made mandatory to stay within the school grounds for lunch for safety reason' Can you seat S1 & S7 over lunch period'</p> |
| <p>The sooner it is built the better. Kilrymont road building is falling apart.</p> |
| <p>Having lived in both Wormit and St Andrews, I would much prefer to see two schools, one at the Tay Bridgehead and one in St Andrews. Kids currently spend many hours per week on school buses and I don't think this is either sensible or environmentally defensible. I am also sceptical of the suggested benefits of "closer links with the University". I understand sports</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>facilities will not be shared as originally proposed. I can't see how a school on the edge of the North Haugh has any closer links to the University than the South Street site has the potential to form. It will be further way from many parts of the University than it currently is. I also wonder if many small businesses in town will suffer due to the loss of custom from pupils at lunchtimes.</p> |
| <p>Should be a 2 school solution, with one at the Tay bridgehead. If we do have to have a 1 school solution I support the North Haugh site. As long as NO house building is linked to the proposal.</p> |
| <p>(a) Madras has for years used the split site as a justification for disorganisation and administrative inefficiency. This proposal is another excuse to do nothing for the next five years. The first priority of the Rector should be to put the school in order, not to focus on distant horizons. (b) This proposal offers no benefit for existing pupils. (c) If construction is in prospect, there should be a new school at the Tay Bridge. A unified school for an area this size makes little sense.</p> |
| <p>The new single site school will have a rather large number of pupils of a wide range of ages. (S1/2, say) if the layout and use of space could be such that they had a part of the building that was mostly "theirs" where S4+ pupils had fewer reasons to go, and where S1/2 pupils had most of their lessons. The Kilrymont building is a rather extreme example of this, with many negative implications, but it has advantages too.</p> |
| <p>St. Andrews desperately needs a new school. It is unthinkable that our children now and the ones just born have to be educated in the present decrepit buildings, suffering from its limitations and the inadequacies of the split site arrangements. The new plans are exciting and should be embraced enthusiastically. The school ought to be on the west side of the town to accommodate the majority of its travelling pupils, to prevent congestion in the town centre and where there is land available. No objections to traffic or to the presence of children or to the disruption of the status quo should be allowed to interfere with or delay this vital and long overdue project!</p> |
| <p>A single site school is most certainly the best for St Andrews. However, the concept of a "junior high" should be considered to avoid long and tiring travel for younger children. S1 and S2 at a "Bridgehead school seems a good place to start. I commuted to</p> |
| <p>It has always been a great source of disappointment and concern to us that our children were going to attend a split site school therefore we were delighted to hear about this proposal and give it 100% support. There will be a very positive impact on the e</p> |
| <p>Unfortunately, this will come too late for my children, but it absolutely needs to happen.</p> |
| <p>I believe it would be a more convenient site for the school, all the pupils will be together and it will hopefully improve the congestion of school buses in the centre of the town. It couldn't come quick enough.</p> |
| <p>I believe the split site is more conducive to the elder children's education, through the separation from the younger children and the feeling of achievement as they move to the South Street site. That in it's own way aids in the maturity of the 4th, 5th and 6</p> |
| <p>A new school on a single site is desperately needed. Avoidance of further delays in this considerably long drawn out process is imperative.</p> |
| <p>Get on with it. It has taken 5 years to get to this stage and another 3 years is a long time to wait.</p> |
| <p>I am very impressed with the proposal as described at a presentation in Newport. The location and partnership with the University are excellent. Travel times will reduce for the Tay Bridgehead pupils and there will be benefits to the town by reducing traffic up to Kilrymont and South Street.</p> |
| <p>I am very supportive of the proposal</p> |
| <p>St Andrews and catchments areas need a school fit for purpose.</p> |
| <p>Excellent Idea, not before time. Get moving!!</p> |
| <p>I support replacement of the split site on a single site location but I have reservations regarding the North Haugh Campus of the University of St Andrews</p> |
| <p>Only as the option of a school in the Bridgehead school was turned down</p> |
| <p>I believe that south street could be refurbished; station park retained for sports and a new school built at the Tay bridge head. This would prove cost effective, cause less traffic concerns with school buses and retain Madras heritage</p> |
| <p>The important part of the proposal for me is the purpose built school part.</p> |
| <p>The current split site is detrimental to learning and teaching and it is of crucial importance that</p> |

| |
|--|
| the new single site school is built as quickly as possible. |
| This is a huge opportunity so let's take it |
| The decision needs to be made quickly as the fabric of both current buildings is well below an acceptable standard |
| I was a member of the original Madras School Board team that looked into the options for the provision of a replacement school. We submitted a comprehensive report for Fife Council before the possibility of a joint venture between the Council and University was realised. Even then, the obvious choice was a single-site school on land to the West of the town - refurbishment of the Kilrymont Road or South Street sites was a complete non-starter. A complementary school at the Tay Bridgehead may have been seen as an idealistic solution, but failing that, the new single-site was far and away the prime option. Given the further potential benefits of a cooperative deal with the University, the solution was even better. I hope that Fife Council will not let this excellent deal fall through by either asking an unrealistic amount for the transfer of their land assets or by using other stalling tactics to delay funding. I believe our original study combined with the University offer make for the very best solution that can be achievable in the present climate. Anything else would be a compromise or even a lost opportunity that would miss-serve 50 years of future pupils and parents. |
| I believe this will be an asset to pupils, employees and local community alike. Win win for all. Reputation of Madras is already established and fantastic. Couple this with wonderful facilities & achievements |
| Having the age groups split gives the children an easier school life as they cannot get bullied by children that are much older than themselves |
| A single site school is long overdue for the children of St Andrews. The current facilities are dated and unsatisfactory. |
| Comments – Parents/Carers Associated Primary School |
| Hope there will be good facilities for the arts also. |
| I want to know a lot more information about the plans. I want to know where the school and facilities will be located; the nature of joint facilities sharing; the nature of the sports facilities and how good they will be; how close these sports facilities will be to excellent in standard across the range; access to the site at lower and upper levels; the BREEAM rating that the school will achieve; will the school kids leave the site during the day etc |
| The school at Kilrymont is in a great state of dis-repair and certainly not the environment I would wish for my children to be educated. The building of a new school is long overdue and I hope proceeds without delay. |
| Unsure about exact location of site(s). A map would have been most beneficial. Where is "Langlands B Site" that is/was to be adopted' where is "the field immediately west of the existing university playing fields" |
| The current set-up is wholly unsatisfactory and we look forward to this exciting project |
| Long overdue, the current Kilrymont building is in a pretty dire state and the South Street building cannot adequately accommodate its needs anymore. Makes much more sense to have everyone located in a single site. |
| This is essential and much needed. The sooner the better. |
| I am delighted that a single site school is going to be achieved as I consider split site teaching to have had a major negative impact on learning and it concerned me as a prospective parent and former Madras teacher. |
| The sooner the better, Delay will only be non productive. |
| We note the statement about 'barrier free buildings' there's a need to acoustic separation i.e. Walls between classrooms for some children. Will the DAS have solid walls between classrooms' Can you give us a guarantee that there will not be a padded cell in the DAS, as currently exists on the Kilrymont Campus' |
| Long overdue, can't wait for the work to begin |
| It's a very busy road between Station park and the new school site - will there be safeguards for pupils walking between them. Other than that who can object to a brand new school! It's a brilliant idea! |
| I think this would be of immense benefit to the student and staff as well as the community population! |
| Long time over due Needed We have been waiting a long time for this |
| I noticed no mention of a swimming pool for pupils and community use. Are facilities being |

| |
|---|
| made available elsewhere' I was also concerned about the safety of pupils crossing the A91. |
| It is good to see the emphasis being placed on the provision of assembly, sports and science facilities highlighted here. Additionally, could there be collaboration with the University's Music centre' Also, we would like to see an attractive dining hall with an excellent menu and perhaps mandatory school lunch for S1 to S3 pupils. |
| I have a child in S4, so appreciate that the physical conditions and communication in the school would be greatly improved by it being on one site. |
| A long awaited and much needed proposal. It sounds as if the new school building will offer future pupils excellent opportunity to develop to their full potential |
| Despite the fact that the existing buildings house 2 swimming pools, there does not appear to be any swimming facilities in the new school. |
| Initial plans look good. Let's hope no planning problems and it is ready for Spring 2014, it's long overdue. |
| I strongly support this proposal as a parent of a 6 year old and a 3 year old living in St Andrews. Unfortunately there has been a lot of scare-mongering about this development and I hope the consultation will make allowance for the fact that parents are often much busier, and thus less likely to find time to respond, than those who can make a lot of noise because they are retired and don't want anything to change in St Andrews. |
| With reservations Worried about the location of the single site school being on green fields - outwith the envelope of St. Andrews' An online map would have been very useful. |
| The proposals look excellent and the move can't come soon enough. Drama is a great strength at Madras and it would be wonderful to have a theatre for them to continue to flourish. Canteen facilities are a concern so as to encourage pupils to stay on site all day. |
| Impressed with proposals |
| South Street Madras buildings would make a lovely boutique/outdoor eating area a bit like a mini Covent garden!! |
| The single site at proposed location should be progressed asap. Too much time being wasted lets move it forward for the benefit of our children |
| Would like some more details on financing |
| The proposed single site on the North Haugh is an ideal location for a much needed new Madras College. In particular, the site offers the following benefits: - being located on the west side of St Andrews, it is well placed for pupils travelling to the school by bus, and will avoid the school buses having to negotiate narrow residential streets; - the site offers the potential for working together with the University of St Andrews to enhance the learning experience of pupils, provide enhanced sports facilities, and to possibly link in with proposed University projects, e.g. A proposed biomass district heating system; - the greenfield site offers the potential, if required, for future expansion. |
| This is a much needed facility, although the inclusion of a swimming pool would be preferable. |
| I think this is absolutely a necessary development given the disrepair of the existing buildings and not before time! |
| I am very concerned about the state of the existing school environment and think this new purpose built school should go ahead as quickly as possible. |
| As the St Andrews leisure centre is dated and the pool area poor, this would have been an excellent opportunity to have a swimming rather than leisure pool. Both students at St Andrews University and Madras pupils would have benefited. |
| As a parent of a child who will be moving to Madras College in 2011, I fully support the proposal for a new single-site building in St Andrews. Also, I think that the site selected is the best option out of those available and welcome cooperation with the university. |
| This is a unique opportunity to provide a first class secondary educational facility in Fife |
| My son will be one of the first beneficiaries of a new school and to be honest if I had to send him to Kilrymont or South Street I would seriously consider looking elsewhere. The school buildings are not fit of purpose, the state of disrepair is depressing and a new site with collaborative links to the University can only be a good thing. |
| As a parent of children in classes P1 and P3 at Wormit Primary, I am naturally interested in the Madras development. I wholeheartedly welcome this proposal which I believe represents a great opportunity for the future of education in north east Fife. |
| I believe the proposal for a new single-site Madras College represents a very great improvement over the existing arrangement and strongly support it. It would be a shame if this opportunity for much-needed improved education facilities in north east Fife |

| |
|---|
| I do support the building of the new school; however I think that it would be better to have a choice of Madras or Bell-Baxter for Tayport children. |
| Personally I don't think that senior pupils can have a positive influence on younger kids |
| Parent of two children in catchment area |
| The school should utilise the building and grounds they have currently as they are central to the community - particularly Madras South Street |
| The school should be sited in one of the existing sites which are central to the community. There should be school built in Bridgehead to help reduce traffic and associated CO2 emissions reducing pupils travelling and school day |
| Existing sites are more appropriate for accessing |
| In favour of a single site school at Madras College South Street |
| I would hope that this long running matter will finally be resolved in time for my daughter to benefit from the new school (she's P1 now), the views of a few self-interested whingers like Ms Uprichard should not be allowed to derail such an important project |
| I would support it as there are no proposed alternatives. A Tay bridge head school would make more sense but politically and probably financially it is a dead duck. It would provide a school role at least as big as Waid Academy and perhaps twice as big as Viewforth in Kirkcaldy. School role projections never take into account the numbers of people who will move to an area if it provides a good school. |
| I would like confirmation about access to the new site, and safe walking/cycling routes to school. It's very important to me that my children can walk/cycle safely to the new site, and that there are plenty of pedestrian gates from different directions - |
| I agree with new school but disagree with location |
| This is a unique opportunity to have a secondary school that can really inspire our young people and show everyone that Fife puts education at the top of their agenda. To go on trying to make the existing school with its split site work is unthinkable. This is an exciting project which should bring all of our community together in the single purpose of investing in all our futures. |
| As a parent of children currently at primary school and nursery which feed Madras, I strongly support the proposed new single site replacement. |
| New Madras College public consultation 1. The proposal not to build a new school at the Tay bridgehead is in my opinion unfortunate. It will deprive the communities in the area of their own school and associated cultural and economic benefits. The opportunity of reinforcing a sense of identity in these communities will be lost. Moreover, it is environmentally unsound to invest in a long term scheme which will require transporting pupils to and from St Andrews on a daily basis, wasting fuel, time, money, and increasing road traffic and pollution. 2. If a Tay bridgehead school were to be built, it would mean one of the existing St Andrews sites could be retained and adapted. The original building in south street is category a-listed, one of the most significant in the town and of national importance. The Kilrymont building is category b-listed and an unusual example of local authority school design of the 1960s. I do not accept that the existing buildings are wholly 'inflexible in configuration', or that the south street complex is 'not amenable to renovation to current standards'. I am aware the buildings are in poor condition, which the quote from the hmie report states, but this is the fault of fife council for not pursuing a long term effective maintenance programme. In this context, there should be a commitment from fife council to carry out any necessary structural repairs for the benefit of staff and pupils who will use the buildings meantime, and also to safeguard their capital value on behalf of the public. 3. The original building in south street is capable of internal modification if necessary, provided it does not detract from the character of the building. The additions to the rear have no historic or aesthetic value, and could be demolished and rebuilt to modern standards and requirements. Historic scotland has already indicated to fife council that it considers some additions and internal alterations could be carried out at the Kilrymont building, without detracting from its architectural character. 4. Should the decision be made to build a new school as proposed, the council should be mindful of its responsibility, as planning authority, towards achieving appropriate re-use for the listed buildings. Negotiations for their future use should be undertaken at an early stage to avoid a period of non-use which would inevitably result in damage to the fabric of the structures. I am aware the university is likely to take the original south street building, which in principle seems appropriate, subject to their proposals for it. 5. If a new school is built, a rigorous maintenance programme should be adopted to avoid some of the current problems, and to safeguard the public investment. 6. No mention is made for the provision of a swimming pool to replace the two existing pools. Since |

| |
|---|
| the university does not have a pool and there are no published proposals to provide one, i suggest a pool should be an integral part of the new sports provision in any new school. |
| The town needs a new school, but fife council should not be spending, huge sums of money bussing in pupils from Tayport Newport & Wormit and the surrounding area, these are pupils who have no connection to the town. |
| Comments – Pupils |
| I think the school desperately requires modernisation and a single site would be far safer than the current arrangement |
| I am looking forward to going to the new school. Kilrymont is old and not very nice looking |
| Have places to go to lunch good toilets |
| The only problem I feel as a pupil is that the opportunity for options for lunch is taken away by the site but it would be good for the pupils to have a say on the new building. |
| I'd like there to be lots of running around space outside |
| Have a swimming pool and playing fields and better equipment |
| I am a first year pupil and I really want a new school. |
| I want the school to be built quickly. |
| The current schools are in an abominable state-an environment that children definitely shouldn't learn in. |
| This is the school that will be my chance of secondary education, and like my friends I am excited by the proposed new building. |
| I do support the building of the new school; however I think that it would be better to have a choice of Madras or Bell-Baxter for Tayport children. |
| I am in P3 I hope that it is built in time for me. I am very, very looking forward to seeing it. |
| I am in playgroup and my big brother is writing this for me. |
| Do not see any plans for a swimming pool. Feel that this is a very important facility for both secondary school pupils and primary school pupils who currently use Madras Pools |
| Nowhere for lunch |
| Nowhere to go for lunch |
| The two school system works and allows you to focus on exams |
| I think split site is better as it allows the adults to act like adults, rather than sTaying imature as would happen being surrounded by 1st 2nd or 3rd years |
| I do not think we should share our facilities with the university |
| The school works fine the way it is |
| I go to South Street on Tuesday and I love it there and I don't want to be there for just one year |
| Can the building be styled in the late gothic fashion of Cologne Cathedral or Rheims Cathedral |
| I think you can do up the original buildings. The split site is good. |
| I think it would be a good idea to build a new school because it would be more modern and easy to get to |
| I like the proposal of the new school but want to go to south Street. |
| I'd like to have a variety of places to eat |
| I would really like a new school but I would like to go out for lunch and there isn't any shops or supermarkets |
| I would not like to eat at the school cafeteria everyday |
| We have a perfectly good school. It is a waste of money |
| I am really happy for a new school to be built and I know it will be a good school. |
| I won't be there when it's finished so there's no point in caring |
| Will there be other places to go out for lunch' |
| Should provide free busses |
| Well I can't exactly say much since it's going to happen anyway |
| I don't think there is any point |
| No ugly additions to the building |
| I believe that the school will be very full because its first to 6th years |
| We need new school because this school (Kilrymont) is falling apart |
| I won't be going into 6th year |
| Make a good assembly hall with a good stage with good music equipment |

| |
|---|
| Yes is senior have their own area and we are allowed to go out for lunches |
| The old school is in very bad condition |
| New toilets |
| I would like nice toilets |
| Because this school is really old and falling down |
| I don't think it would be good for lunches (going out) |
| Places to go out for lunch |
| I would rather go to South Street because it is a nicer building and there are lots of good shops near South Street. |
| Desperate need of new toilets |
| I would like a new school with lots more equipment |
| I would really love a new school. With more facilities and equipment (I am so excited for the new school) |
| It will be cool and nice |
| We're fine where we are |
| Build it fast |
| We would be to far away from facilities |
| The six different years should always be separated into S1, S2, S3 and S4, S5, S6 |
| I think bullying will go up and why change something that's worked for years |
| However, other things are needed, I would like to see improved bus routes, on hat club and the worlds biggest bouncy ball |
| This is a brilliant idea |
| The atmosphere differ and good south street attitude would be lost |
| I believe the new site should be split to minimize bullying between older and younger pupils |
| I would agree with the new placement if pupils were allowed to go to town for lunch, but they can't therefore i disagree |
| Too far away from town - no more freedom for break and lunch |
| It's a waste of time and money. Use the money to help with the existing schools instead |
| Build a swimming pool |
| Build a lift |
| No due to the fact that you can not go to town for lunch therefore meaning you have to buy lunch at a boring cafeteria - boring)not bothered about the school, not here to see it) |
| I do not think that we do better with split schools but it's not my choice. They should build up the two schools and make them better. |
| Clean working toilets please |
| Working bathroom |
| It will be just as poorly planned and built as the extensions to south street as well as the entire Kilrymont building. Within a decade it will be unfit for purpose |
| I'm disappointed as we were supposed to be in the school by now |
| I have enjoyed my time here. Don't change it |
| The separation of students allows seniors more freedom and a better learning environment |
| The pupils should be allowed to experience south street magicness and the school should just refurbish south street |
| Keep split site refurbish only |
| I like south street, leave it alone |
| The 3rd years will lack an important part of their growth and development |
| I want a good canteen and old fashioned design of school, lockers for all pupils, better chaining, pool and gym |
| Good canteen area better changing rooms to attract more people to do |
| Please put a quad in the new building |
| Separate areas of school for 1-3 yrs and 4-6 yrs |
| So long as south street kept |
| So long as south street is kept |
| I think yes because it would be easier |
| I think yes because then it would be much easier |
| Cool |
| We have a perfectly good school here and its a waste of money building another school |
| You will get bullied |

| Comments – Other Interested Parties |
|---|
| The spilt site poses numerous problems both socially and economically. The single site will promote better education. |
| My only concern is what happens to the support staff at the current buildings (janitors, cleaners & catering staff). |
| Given current condition of buildings and split site, urgently required. |
| This is a superb proposal that will meet the needs of the local community for a long time to come. Let's get the project completed as soon as possible. |
| A single site for pupils must be given the utmost priority. |
| Long overdue. |
| This makes good sense on many issues like travel and transport, school management, pupil management and ability to educate effectively within an establishment. |
| New build absolutely imperative. Existing buildings, particularly Kilrymont campus, health risks. |
| Why are you having further consultation' please just get on with it. |
| As a former teacher at Madras and as a parent of two children who were educated at Madras, I am delighted that the council has agreed to build a new school on a single site. I also welcome the possibility of closer links with the university. |
| As a teacher who has worked in the school for over 20 years, I know how the split site affects pupils and staff and it will be wonderful not to have to travel between buildings. |
| Now that the case for a Tay bridgehead school is no longer sustainable, this is the only show in town. Co-operation with the university could prove a revolutionary and exciting development. |
| Yes, excellent idea. |
| The south street building is unsafe, decrepit and in an inappropriate condition. The new school needs to be built as soon as possible. |
| I fully support a single site school in St Andrews. |
| Particularly welcome the scope for joint working with the university. |
| It is important that access to the new school is from the main road to Guardbridge and not via Hepburn gardens, which is already too busy. |
| Great opportunity to use the land and available assets of the campus. |
| The children need a new school with better facilities and this site seems the ideal location. |
| The educational advantages for the pupils and transport and environmental benefits to the community must be regarded as paramount and the proposal is the only way forward on these bases. |
| The new school is needed urgently and the proposed site provides a unique opportunity to develop links with the university of St Andrews. |
| We desperately need a school which is fit for purpose on a single site. Teaching and learning will be so much more enjoyable, productive and beneficial for all. |
| The present facility is in a dreadful state of disrepair and does not meet the requirements of the modern curriculum. |
| The present Madras College is falling apart and is totally unfit for purpose and has been for some time... Both sites are crumbling before our eyes... And it's openly a question of time before something extremely unsafe happens... (Electrified swimming pools and roof blowing off aside!) The place is a disgrace and shouldn't be used to educate children |
| Absolutely without reservation. |
| The benefits to teaching and learning and the community life of the school would be very significant. |
| I am head of the art department at Madras College and it is crucial that we secure a single site in the near future for our pupils. |
| As a St Andrews university graduate and one who often uses the path between David Russell apartments and the north haugh, I think a new school situated adjacent to this path would be detrimental to the university campus. The ground there may be required for further development by the University at some time and should be left available for that |
| Wrong description, should be langlands. Size of site seems excessive. What happened to previous proposal incorporating university sports centre to the east of current proposal' has education committee approved this site' when' |
| Please ensure the school will have enough space and facilities to provide the pupils with the |

| |
|--|
| best possible educational experiences now and for the future. Please do not cut costs but make this both a flagship and a benchmark for quality. |
| As a teacher at Madras College I am only too aware of the great problems caused by having a split site school. This has been condemned by hmie as unacceptable. |
| Pupils from Newport, Tayport, Wormit area have to leave home at 07.45 to go to a school in St Andrews instead of a local school |
| There are overwhelming reasons to have schools at both Tayhead and St Andrews for educational (smaller schools) and minimisation of carbon usage. The statement that 60% of Madras pupils are bussed in says it all. The movement of pupils around Fife by bus to a single school in St Andrews is unacceptable. In addition, I cannot see any benefit of the link with the University apart from some potential sharing of sports fields. This is trivial compared other considerations. |
| There are overwhelming reasons to have schools at both Tayhead and St Andrews for educational (smaller schools) and minimisation of carbon usage. The statement that 60% of Madras pupils are bussed in says it all. The movement of pupils around Fife by bus to a single school in St Andrews is unacceptable. In addition, I cannot see any benefit of the link with the University apart from some potential sharing of sports fields. This is trivial compared other considerations. |
| I feel the shared site would be daunting for younger pupils and more vulnerable pupils. |
| A single site on a new build at the edge of town would help with traffic movements and enable Madras to provide a 21st century education with modern facilities, instead of the substandard facilities it has at present. |
| Two new schools is the best solution. |
| As an ex Madras College pupil that left in 2006, I fully support this. |
| Madras College needs to have a single site with a purpose built school to realise the potential recognised in the last report & a real partnership with the universities an opportunity for something educationally quite special. |
| 1. The proposed site is too remote from where Madras pupils from St Andrews live, and will entail extra bussing costs to the council and additional car mileage by some parents, increasing the school's carbon footprint. 2. A better solution is to use the South Street site for a single-site Madras because its central location is accessible to all in St Andrews, having first built a Tay bridgehead school to reduce pressure on Madras and Bell Baxter, while substantially reducing the carbon footprint of secondary education in this part of Fife. 3. Any educational advantages derived from working with the University can be achieved independently of where Madras College is located, and could be extended to secondary schools not based within St Andrews. |
| I consider a school in the bridgehead area essential since the majority of pupils live there. The Madras College suitably renovated would then accommodate local pupils easily |
| A split site school is a campus school; senior campus at South Street and Junior Campus at Kilrymont Road. This is in keeping with St Andrews as a University town. Where links to ALL university departments, not just sports, will be easier for the pupils, rather than stuck out on the outskirts of the town. Both schools have swimming pools, the new school does not. Also, IF £50 million has been ring fenced then it would be better spent on renovating the existing, purposely built schools. Thanking you. |
| In favour of single site school on the low site of north haugh - not the high site which is called langlands |
| In favour of a school in lower north haugh or as the majority wish a new school at bridgehead and a refurbished Madras south street |
| In a school every pupil should be known and valued. If houses are 500 and assemblies etc. Are in houses 1000 will be unknown. For discipline names must be known. A depute asking an S6 their name when trying to ascertain if they are in the correct place is not satisfactory. The school will be further from the University library a facility that is often used. The Arts buildings are in the town centre. One all weather pitch is the status quo. New builds I have been told by teachers have smaller lab space. Two smaller schools would serve the community far better as St Andrews pupils could walk to a town centre school or cycle and similarly for the Bridge head community. At Forum 5 held in Tayport it was very clear many wished for a school. One parent was adamant he did not want his child on a bus that could crash, as one did recently in Aberdeen. Unexplained absences should decrease as pupils will be known. Buildings are not everything a caring, supportive environment is. |

| |
|--|
| Excellent proposal, will provide the standard of school required to enhance learning |
| Too many children are bussed to St Andrews. A school at the Taybridgehead would give pupils a shorter journey, cost less and give reduced CO2 emissions. Community use could give the area facilities not available at present. The St Andrews area pupils could be accommodated on the South Street site and this could be rebuilt or refurbished behind the A listed quad buildings. |
| It is imperative that there is a new single site school in or near St Andrews |
| The north haugh single site campus would provide the best secondary education available to the current Madras College catchment on both curricular and extra-curricular grounds. |
| Split schools are better |
| Split sites are much better to split maturity and independence |

Appendix 2b

Letters received and responses by Fife Council

Letter 1

Name & Address redacted

Education Service Area Office
Fife Council
County Buildings
St Catherine Street
Cupar
KY15 4TB

Dear Sirs

School Consultation (Scotland) Act 2010
Proposed new Madras College, St Andrews

I refer to the above consultation.

Fife Council's consultation paper *New Madras College Proposal Paper* does not appear to satisfy either legal requirements about consultation or the requirements of the Scottish Executive's relevant statutory guidance. Moreover the paper contains factual inaccuracies. Please refer to the enclosed paper.

I support the construction of a new school or schools for the madras College catchment area.

However, as the Council's consultation paper does not appear to satisfy legal or statutory guidance requirements and as that paper contains factual inaccuracies, I do not support the construction of a new Madras College at North Haugh/Langlands, at least at this time.

It seems to me that the way forward is for the Council to publish a corrected proposal paper, under section 5 of the above Act, which does not include inaccuracies and which meets the requirements of both the law and the relevant statutory guidance.

A corrected proposal paper would allow the consultation to be undertaken on the proper footing; that is on the basis of a proposal paper which satisfies the requirements of both the law and statutory guidance and which does not include inaccuracies. This would enable a decision to be taken on best information and minimise any risk of a subsequent challenge to the decision.

I look forward to receiving a substantive response to the points in the enclosed paper in due course. In the interim please acknowledge receipt of this letter and the enclosed paper and confirm that the issues and points raised in the enclosed paper will be considered by the Council.

Yours faithfully

Name Redacted

Schools Consultation (Scotland) Act 2010
Proposed new Madras College, St Andrews

Madras College, St Andrews is the top performing secondary school in Fife and is one of the leading state secondary schools in Scotland. In 2008/09 about 75 per cent of pupils left Madras College for Further Education or Higher Education.¹ Fife Council's consultation (*Madras College – Site Consultation*) is about its proposal to build a new Madras College on a single site at Langlands (not *North Haugh*), St Andrews.²

Madras College is currently located on two sites (South Street and Kilrymont) which are about one mile (not *1.5 miles*) apart.³ In September 2009 the Madras College pupil role stood at 1,530. Madras College is a non-denominational school serving St Andrews and the settlements of Tayport, Newport, Wormit, Gauldry, Balmerino, Leuchars, Guardbridge, Strathkinness, Kingsbarns and Largoward. Newport, for instance, is about 10 miles from St Andrews.

In April 2008 Fife Council's Education & Children's Services Committee requested that no proposal for a fourth secondary school in the North East Fife area (at Tay Bridgehead) be included in the Council's April 2008 – March 2011 School Estate Management Plan. Clearly that plan should be the subject of a review at this time.

In April 2008 Fife Council estimated the maximum projected school roll for Madras College in the period 2015 – 2025 at around 1,350 pupils (occupancy rate 75%).⁴ In August 2009 that figure was adjusted to about 1,500 pupils.⁵ The *Proposal Paper* does not refer to the planned school capacity, but it is understood to be for 1,700 pupils.

As the school building is no doubt intended to have a lifespan of about 50 years it appears that consideration ought to be given to the position in the longer term and, in particular, the housing strategy in TAYplan (the Strategic Development Plan) to 2032. That plan indicates (at 9.9 of the *Major Issues Report*) that development pressures will be directed away from St Andrews presumably to other settlements (such as Newport/Tayport/Wormit) in North East Fife. This may result in a changing pattern of demand for school places.

Recent media reports suggest that RAF Leuchars may close. If it does, the required capacity for any new school will have to be reconsidered.

References

¹

<http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/scottishschoolsonline/schools/leaverdestinations.asp?iSchoolID=5426537>

² <http://www.fife.gov.uk/topics/index.cfm?fuseaction=consult.display&subjectid=204D62AE-A91C-4D7C-A910EF4A1BE2CB9D&objectid=07CA59AF-08E0-CE5F-26463EF0E096696A>

³ Fife Council, Children's Services Committee 11 January 2007; Appendix 1 *Madras College, St Andrews – High Level Description of Options for a Single Site Campus* at 1.1.1.

⁴

http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife_council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BF4D0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00F7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers

⁵

http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife_council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BF4D0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00F7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers

According to the Madras College website the proportion of pupils from St Andrews has dropped to one-third with the remaining two-thirds (not 60 %) bussed daily.

Madras College is also a “community use” school and its facilities (such as the swimming pools at both sites and the sports facilities at Station Park) are available for community use outwith the normal school day – including at weekends and during holiday periods.

The HMIE May 2006 and March 2008 reports state that *the quality of accommodation is unsatisfactory*; that the school’s disperse accommodation has negative impacts; included as one of the four main points for action taking *immediate steps to remove barriers to learning, teaching and behaviour due to weaknesses in accommodation* and that the fabric of the buildings etc required *major upgrading*. However those reports did not recommend building a new, single site, school.

Fife Council has failed to carry out a comparative assessment of the two options it had identified for a new school on a single site, namely a new school at (a) Kilrymont or (b) Langlands before deciding on the preferred location (*Langlands B*) at Langlands.

Fife Council has produced its *New Madras College Proposal Paper*. It is simply consulting on the option of whether or not there is support for a new school at Langlands (not the approved *Langlands B* site). It does not, for instance, set out the Commercial Agreements and Planning risks associated with the consultation proposal.

Consultation – legal requirements

The courts have stated that any proper consultation must:

- be undertaken at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage;
- include sufficient reasons for particular proposals, and give adequate time, to allow those consulted to give intelligent consideration and an intelligent response; and
- result in the product of consultation being consciously taken into account when the ultimate decision is taken.⁶

The consultation is being undertaken at a time when Fife Council’s requirements for a masterplan process (involving extensive consultation with the local community, local elected members, statutory consultees, and other interested parties and its approval of a single masterplan for *St Andrews West produced by the development interests within the Strategic Land Allocation area*) have not been initiated and have not been satisfied.

A masterplan (a) is an *appropriate means of ensuring that development is carried out in the best interests of St Andrews*; (b) would assess matters such as the best line for the A91 link road and location of the where the link road should tie into the A91 and the location of the proposed new (secondary) school); and (c) should *ensure that new development is well-integrated with the existing town and will represent a sensitive and appropriate town expansion*.

Fife Council’s *New Madras College Proposal Paper* states that: *Safe routes to the new school through St Andrews will be considered and developed as part of the*

⁶ See, for instance, <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/1999/1871.html>

master planning process. That paper does not indicate that a safe route across the A91 to Station Park will also be considered.

In September 2010 a request for a screening opinion request was made by Fife Council which indicates a proposed development site of 16.53 hectares including land at Langlands, North Haugh and Station Park, St Andrews for the proposed new Madras College. In October 2010 Fife Council appointed a Project Design Team for that proposed development. The statutory consultation commenced on 3 November 2010. This, and comments attributed to councillors, suggests that the Council has predetermined the proposed location of a New Madras College on *St Andrews West* or, at the very least; the product of this consultation will not be consciously taken into account before a decision is taken.

If that is the case, the consultation is not a proper, lawful, consultation.

Statutory consultation

The Schools Consultation (Scotland) Act 2010 requires consultation about school relocation proposals. The Scottish Executive has issued statutory guidance on that Act (see below).

The current consultation was authorised by Fife Council's Education & Children's Services Committee at its meeting on 30 September 2010.⁷ That consultation, which commenced on 3 November 2010 and which closes on 22 December 2010, seeks views about whether or not:

I support the replacement of the existing split site Madras College with a new, purpose built school on a single site located on the North Haugh Campus, University of St Andrews.

Fife Council's New Madras College Proposal Paper

The consultation was approved by Fife Council at a time when a screening opinion request was made for the 16.53 hectare site referred to above. In addition Fife Council appointed a design team to work up the design of the proposed development of that site before the consultation commenced. Part of that site and an access off the A91 are shown in an indicative *St Andrews West Development Framework Diagram* in the relevant Finalised Draft Local Plan. That location has not been the subject of public consultation. The proposals in the indicative *St Andrews West Development Framework* in the Finalised St Andrews & East Fife Local Plan 2009 are not the same as those considered by the Fife Council's Planning Committee in September 2010.

Consultation - general points

The proposed location is not the location approved by Fife Council's Education & Children's Services Committee on 12 November 2009. The site approved by that Committee on that date is *Langlands B*.

The proposal is not for a new (secondary) school *on the North Haugh Campus, University of St Andrews*. The proposal is for a new (secondary) school on Langlands within *St Andrews West*.

7

http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife_council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BF4D0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00F7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers

The proposal is for a new (secondary) school on Langlands and in particular on agricultural, greenfield, land owned by the University of St Andrews and tenanted by a farmer. It appears that some of the associated infrastructure (including access roads and parking facilities) is located partly in the countryside and partly on the North Haugh.

Scottish Executive's statutory guidance

In 2010 the Scottish Executive published relevant statutory guidance.⁸

The consultation period in the Scottish Executive's statutory guidance is to include 30 days of term time not including school holidays or any other days when the school is not open to pupils. Having regard to the *in service days* of 18 and 19 November 2010 and the school closures due to inclement weather in the week commencing 29 November 2010, it appears that the 30 day requirement has not been satisfied in this instance.

Reason(s) for proposals and alternative option(s)

Education authorities must prepare a *Proposal Paper* (including an *Education Benefits Statement*) and the Scottish Executive's statutory guidance provides that:

In considering what material to include in the proposal paper (in addition to the educational case set out in the EBS) an authority may wish to explain what has given rise to consideration of the matter being consulted on and why it has decided upon the particular proposal set out for consultees. If appropriate, it should also give details of other options considered but rejected (in the case of rural school closures this will have to be done as part of the process – see page 8 for more detail).

Fife Council's *New Madras College Proposal Paper* does not provide sufficient and adequate details to comply with this statutory guidance.

HMIE did not recommend a building a new school. If the appropriate way forward is to build a new school, Fife Council has failed, for instance, to articulate why options for (a) a new school on the Kilrymont site; (b) a new school both at Tay Bridgehead and St Andrews which would provide an opportunity to minimise bussing of pupils to school; or (c) a new school at Tay Bridgehead or elsewhere (for instance the former Paper Mill site at Guardbridge which has recently been acquired by the University of St Andrews) within the area currently served by Madras College have been rejected.

Clearly there are greater costs associated with the acquisition of a site and providing infrastructure and services to a greenfield site than the costs associated with a serviced site already in Fife Council's ownership and there are greater risks to the delivery of the project.

Reasons and evidence for stated educational benefits

As indicated above, education authorities must prepare an *Education Benefits Statement* and those authorities must:

consider both current and future pupils of the school, current and future users of its facilities and also to explain how the authority intends to minimise or avoid any adverse effects of the proposal. It must also include its reasons for

8

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Education/Schools/Buildings/changestoschoolestate/consultationguidance/Q/EditMode/on/ForceUpdate/on>

reaching the views which it sets out regarding the educational benefits. Reasons should be supported by evidence to assist consultees in their understanding of the envisaged educational benefits.

Fife Council's *New Madras College Proposal Paper* does not identify any adverse effects of the proposal. This omission is surprising not least given that paper states that *the viable options for Madras College* identified both *advantages and disadvantages*.

A new school is not required to secure educational linkages with the University of St Andrews and vocational opportunities with Elmwood College.

As indicated above there is more than one option for a single site school which is modern and fit for purpose and can deliver other benefits outlined in the Proposals Paper.

It appears that Fife Council considers that the unique educational benefits of the preferred *St Andrews West* location are:

- co-locating with the University of St Andrews; and
- the possibility of the use of some of the University's grass pitches at Langlands (with the University having reciprocal use of Station Park).

The Proposal Paper fails to describe both the context of, and what educational benefits can be derived from, co-locating with the University of St Andrews. The context is that in Spring 2014 the only closer co-location with the University than can currently be said to be the case with existing sites is co-location with University Halls of Residence (David Russell Hall and Andrews Melville Hall) and the University's Sports Centre including the grass pitches at Langlands.

There is no guarantee of the other proposed adjacent uses, particularly given the significant infrastructure required and the difficulties in delivering such infrastructure in the current economic climate (see, for instance, see the report *Infrastructure Funding Delivery Model* considered by Fife Council's Planning Committee at its meeting held on 23 November 2010).⁹

The indicative *St Andrews West Development Framework* in the relevant Finalised Draft Local Plan shows the proposed secondary school site being adjacent to Employment Uses (predominantly University Science Park). Even assuming the delivery of Employment Uses the delivery of such uses will, presumably, depend on funding from the sale of new houses in *St Andrews West*. If so, it is anticipated that such delivery will be much later than Spring 2014. If the proposed new school proceeds and is completed by Spring 2014 it will (other than being co-located with University Halls of Residence and University playing fields) sit in isolation for years.

Would it, for instance, be better to locate the school at (a) Tay Bridgehead and seek educational linkages with the University of Dundee and the University of Abertay and educational linkages and vocational opportunities with Dundee College? or (b) the former Paper Mill site at Guardbridge (recently acquired by the University of St

9

<http://www.fife.gov.uk/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication.pop&pubid=591DAEB6-B65B-6CBB-FE1C4D033CAD44EA>

Andrews) which allows for co-location and educational linkages with the University of St Andrews and vocational opportunities with Elmwood College?

It is understood that co-location of itself does not deliver educational benefits. What is required to deliver those benefits? What is the evidence to support co-locating with a University delivers educational benefits? Does the delivery of benefits not depend on the individuals as opposed to the mere fact of co-location? Will any educational benefits of co-location only be demonstrated if more than the current 75 per cent of Madras College pupils depart for Further Education or Higher Education?

Securing the use of University grass pitches is uncertain and presumably must be prejudiced by the University's commercial arrangements with, for instance, Dundee United FC which uses the University's grass pitches for training.

As regards community use the *Proposal Paper* refers to ensuring that provision is available to meet our full current and future community demands. However, that cannot be achieved. For instance, a swimming pool is available at both South Street and Kilrymont for community use. The new proposals do not make any provision for a swimming pool. Moreover, University use of Station Park will restrict potential community use of that facility. The potential loss of facilities for community use is not referred to in Fife Council's *New Madras College Proposal Paper*.

In addition the *Proposal Paper* does not mention restricted opportunities for those living in Madras College catchment settlements such as Newport/Tayport/Wormit for community use of Madras College facilities.

Improving educational opportunities

The Scottish Executive's statutory guidance also states that:

In preparing the EBS, authorities will want to set out how a proposal will improve the quality of the curriculum and create positive environments for more effective learning and teaching better matched to the needs of learners. The EBS should focus on how the proposals will improve the depth, breadth, coherence, relevance, challenge and enjoyment provided by the curriculum. It should also demonstrate how opportunities for greater personalisation and choice in learning and improved progression will enhance children's experiences. This will include the use of information and communications technology (ICT) and arrangements for assessing and planning learners' progress. It will also be important to highlight the impact of the proposals on the overall ethos of the school, including the care and welfare of pupils and their personal and social development. A key aspect will be to ensure that the proposal improves equality of opportunity for all within an inclusive educational experience, in the widest sense, for pupils and achievement, and for interdisciplinary learning and beyond.

Other potentially relevant issues in connection with educational benefit in some cases may include the condition and suitability of the school buildings and facilities (and where a proposal would involve pupils moving from one school to another, the relative condition of both), changing patterns of demand for school places if there is a growing mismatch between supply and demand, and the travel and transport context and implications of a proposal if for instance they would impact differently on pupils' broader social experiences and opportunities to participate in and benefit from out-of-hours learning. Financial and budgetary considerations may also be relevant in situations where disparities in the costs of the delivery of education may have

grown, to the detriment of the greater good, at least to the point where an authority considers that they require to be reviewed.

Fife Council's *New Madras College Proposal Paper* does not provide sufficient and adequate details to comply with this statutory guidance.

One of the factors highlighted in the Council's *Proposal Paper* is transportation. That factor is clearly not determinative but it clearly is important. However the Council's *Proposal Paper* fails to consider factors such as:

- the roads around Kilrymont are on the public bus route network and South Street is also on the public bus route network;
- the educational disbenefits of around two thirds of the total number of students being bussed including travelling time and restricted opportunities to participate in out of hours school activities (particularly for those living in settlements up to around 11 miles away);
- the cost of transportation and whether that cost (over a period of years) might be better used to provide capital assets (the recurrent expenditure on bussing pupils according to report to the 20 April 2008 meeting of the Education and Children's Services Committee is £780,000 per annum);
- the traffic impacts of the proposed new Madras College at Langlands such as the impact of pupils travelling by car via roads leading from Strathkinness and Largo Road via City Road to Langlands and the impacts on traffic coming to and departing from St Andrews as a result of a new access off the A91; and
- whether such a new access might prejudice the future provision of a rail link to St Andrews.

Asset Management Implications

Asset Management Plans are also relevant. The Scottish Executive's statutory guidance provides that:

Where such plans do exist the proposal paper would be an appropriate place to make reference to how the proposal under consideration fits into this wider authority planning.

The *Proposal Paper* fails to address asset management implications. For instance, the cost of managing and maintaining the existing school sites which would become redundant and in particular managing and maintaining the category "A" listed buildings at South Street and the category "B" listed buildings at Kilrymont.

References

www.ltscotland.org.uk/scottishschoolsonline/schools/leaverdestinations.asp?iSchoolID=5426537

[www.fife.gov.uk/topic/index.cfm?fuseaction=consult.display&subjected=204D62AE-A91C-A910EF4A\)BE2CB9D&objected=07CA59AF-08EO-CE5F-26463EF0E96696A](http://www.fife.gov.uk/topic/index.cfm?fuseaction=consult.display&subjected=204D62AE-A91C-A910EF4A)BE2CB9D&objected=07CA59AF-08EO-CE5F-26463EF0E96696A)

Fife Council, Children's Services Committee 11 January 2007; Appendix 1 *Madras College, St Andrews – High Level Description of Options for a Single Site Campus* at 1.1.1.

http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife_council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BF4D0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00F7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers

[http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife-](http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife-council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BFD0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00F7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers)

[council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BFD0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00F7-](http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife-council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BFD0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00F7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers)

[D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-](http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife-council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BFD0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00F7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers)

[18505D39B3244421#Papers](http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife-council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BFD0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00F7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers)

See, for instance, <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/1999/1871.html>

[http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife-](http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife-council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BFD0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00f7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers)

[council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BFD0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00f7-](http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife-council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BFD0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00f7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers)

[D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers](http://www.fife.gov.uk/fife-council/index.cfm?fuseaction=events.orgdisplay&orgid=60304273-A856-11D6-BFD0002A5349AC9&pageid=27323C99-65BF-00f7-D5CA78C602143047&servid=C2A5893D-B7AF-D9D5-18505D39B3244421#Papers)

[http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Educatin/Schools/Buildings/changestoschoolestat](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Educatin/Schools/Buildings/changestoschoolestate/consultationguidance/Q/EditMode/on/ForeUpdate/on)

[e/consultationguidance/Q/EditMode/on/ForeUpdate/on](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Educatin/Schools/Buildings/changestoschoolestate/consultationguidance/Q/EditMode/on/ForeUpdate/on)

<http://www.fife.gov.uk/publications/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication.pop&pubid=591DAEB6-B65B-6CBB-FE1C4D033CAD44EA>

Response to points raised in letter 1

1. Your point (your footnote (1) is noted.
2. Your point (your footnote (2)) is noted with the comment that the consultation presentation showed clearly the indicative site for a school. Additionally, local understanding of Langlands could confuse respondents since this was previously the name of a primary school situated below the Kilrymont campus of the current Madras College. It remains the Council's view that the indicative site, "on the North Haugh campus", is an appropriate and suitable description when combined with the indicative location as represented on the map provided. It is contended that there is sufficient information for respondents to take an informed view.
3. The description of the distance between the split sites of Madras College as 1.5 miles apart is reasonable given the curtellage of each site (your footnote 3).
4. The proposed paper deals with the creation of a single site school to replace the current split site school. Future detailed work of school design will deal with the matter of capacity/occupancy and this will be a matter for consultation under planning legislation (your footnotes 4 and 5).
5. Your comments regarding a possible changing demand for school places are speculative but are also noted.
6. Your comments regarding the possible closure of Leuchars Airbase are noted.
7. The proportion of pupils bussed can vary from year to year. It is reasonable to use the figure of 60% as indicative.
8. Your use of quotations from HMIE reports on Madras College is noted. For information, HMIE are not enabled to recommend the building of a new single site school.
9. Your comments on planning risk, commercial Agreements and site comparison are noted. These aspects are in the domain of planning legislation and will be dealt with via that route.
10. Your paragraphs headed Consultation – Legal Requirements are noted. The points therein more reasonably sit within planning legislation.
11. Your paragraphs under the heading "Statutory Consultation, Fife Council's New Madras College Proposed Paper Consultation – General Points" are noted. On description of the indicative location, I would refer to comments under (2) of this letter.
12. Your paragraph headed "Scottish Executive's Statutory Guidance". The consultation was formally extended to 14 January 2011 for the reasons outlined in your paragraph.
13. In your paragraph headed "Reasons for Proposals and Alternative Option(s)" you quote from statutory guidance. Our view is that it was not appropriate to

revisit those options considered previously since decisions had been taken by Council at committees previously. Those earlier discussions were the subject of public meetings at that time.

14. In your paragraph headed "Reasons and Evidence for Stated Educational Benefits" you comment that no disadvantages are contained within the proposal. Our view would be that the proposal seeks to overcome the very real disadvantages of split site schools and that by comparison the proposal resolves disadvantages rather than creates them.
15. Your further comments under Community Use are noted. Regarding swimming, provision will continue to be available within St.Andrews. On Station Park use, use by individuals who are not school pupils is community use per se. Our general position is that provision for community use, rather than being to the detriment of the community will be an enhancement on current availability.
16. In your paragraph headed "Improving Educational Opportunities" you comment that the proposal paper provides insufficient detail. It is our contention that the proposal paper summarises the improvements in educational opportunities.
17. You comment on transportation. The majority of pupils currently bussed will find a reduction in journey time under the proposals. Transportation issues will form part of consultation under planning legislation.
18. The current assets at the two sites comprising Madras College are at the root of this proposal's preparation. The plan to create a single site school is part of the Council's wider capital planning programme which is already in the public domain.

Letter 2

From Strathkinness Parent Council

Parents Council
Strathkinness Primary School
3 Church Road
Strathkinnes
Fife
KY16 9XR

Madras Consultation
Education Service Area Office
County Buildings
St Catherine's Street
Cupar
Fife
KY15 4TB

9 December 2010

Dear Sir/Madam

Madras College – support for new build on the North Haugh campus

I wish on behalf of Strathkinness Primary School Parents Council regarding the proposed redevelopment of Madras College.

We polled Strathkinness parents by mailed questionnaire on whether they preferred a new build to the west of St Andrews or redevelopment of the Kilrymont site. The overwhelming majority (88%) of those who responded (at least three-quarters of the parent body) was in favour of replacing the existing split-site Madras College with a new, purpose-built school on a single site located on the North Haugh campus at the University of St Andrews.

We therefore request that this support is formally taken into consideration as part of the current consultation exercise.

Yours sincerely

Chair, Strathkinness Primary School Parents Council

Copies to:
Cllr. Frances Melville, Fife Council
Cllr. Robin Waterston, Fife Council
Madras College Parents Council

Letter 2a

Rebecca Trangove
Chair, Strathkinness Primary School Parents
Council
3 Church Road
Strathkinnes
Fife
KY16 9XR

Education Service

John McLaughlin
08451 555555 ext. 450398
John.mclaughlin@fife.gov.uk

Your Ref:
Our Ref: JMCL/MS

Date: 22 April 2011

Dear Rebecca

Madras College – support for New Build on the North Haugh Campus

Thank you for your letter of support for the Council's proposal. The formal consultation report will shortly be available for public scrutiny. Your letter and this response will form part of that report, with your personal information redacted.

Yours sincerely

John McLaughlin
Area Education Officer (North)

Letter 3

From Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council

10 Windsor Garden
St Andrews
KY16 8XL

Education Service Area Office
County Buildings
St Catherine Street
Cupar
KY15 4TB

Dear Sir/Madam

Madras Consultation

The Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council supports the principle of replacing the existing split-site Madras College with a single-site school. We indicated, however, in para. 31 of our submission of 7 January 2010 on the Finalised St Andrews and East Fife Local Plan 2009, that we did not intend to comment on the choice of site for the school prior to any formal application for planning consent. Having discussed the matter again, we have decided to adhere to that position.

Yours faithfully

Ian Goudie
Chair

Letter 3a

Mr I Goudie
Chair
Royal Burgh of St Andrews Community Council
10 Windsor Garden
St Andrews
KY16 8XL

Education Service

John McLaughlin
08451 555555 ext. 450398
John.mclaughlin@fife.gov.uk

Your Ref:
Our Ref: JMCL/MS

Date: 22 April 2011

Dear Mr Goudie

Madras Consultation

Thank you for your letter of 22 December 2010, in which you expressed the support of the St Andrews Community Council for the principle of building a new single site school to replace the existing split site Madras College. I note your separation of the Education Service consultation under the terms of the Schools (Scotland) Consultation Act 2010 and separate consultation under the terms of relevant planning applications.

Your letter and this response will form part of the Final Consultation Report.

Yours sincerely

John McLaughlin
Area Education Officer (North)

Letter 4

From The St Andrews Preservation Trust

THE ST. ANDREWS PRESERVATION TRUST LIMITED

Registered Office
4 Queen's Gardens
St Andrews, Fife KY16 9TA
Tel: 01334 477152

Education Services Area Office
County Buildings
St Catherine Street
Cupar
Fife
KY15 4TB

21st December 2010

Dear Sirs,

Public Consultation Regarding the Proposal to Provide a Single Site School to Replace the Current Split Site School at Madras College.

I enclose the Preservation Trust's response to this consultation.

You will note that the Trust, while strongly supporting improved secondary education provision in St Andrews, does not consider that the current consultation exercise provides sufficient information on this proposal, or alternative methods of providing these facilities.

Consequently it is impossible for respondents to come to an informed view on the merits of the single option being proposed.

Yours sincerely

David Middleton
Planning Policy Convener

St Andrews Preservation Trust Limited

Response to the Consultation on the Proposal to provide a single site school to replace the current split site school at Madras College

The Preservation Trust strongly supports improved facilities for the present school pupils at Madras College and accepts the educational benefits of ending the current split site arrangements.

We are not convinced however that the present proposals will best meet the needs of the school population, as the paucity of information provided within the consultation documentation presents significant problems for those wishing to respond constructively.

In order to provide an informed response, much more detail about the educational and social benefits likely to accrue from the proposals is required, together with information on any alternatives considered and the reasons why these have been rejected. The consultation as framed leaves respondents to either oppose or support the one proposal on offer and this is entirely unsatisfactory.

The emerging Local Plan states that there will be public consultation as the site selection for the school proceeds. This planning consultation has not taken place and the educational consultation seeks to pre-empt this process indicating that the school site has been pre-determined.

In this regard we would draw attention to the decision of the Public Services Ombudsman in cases 200801197 and 200801300 reported to the Scottish Parliament.

We also note that the site, subject of the consultation, which is mainly on agricultural land, is not the Langlands 'B' site on the University Sports Grounds approved by the Education and Children's Services Committee at their meeting on 12th November 2009. In addition, the description of the site in the consultation documentation as being "on the North Haugh Campus, University of St Andrews" is inaccurate and misleading. We believe that only part of the access road could be properly described as being on the North Haugh and that no part of the site is on the existing university campus.

Given these serious problems, we cannot regard the present consultation as being a sound or credible basis on which to seek public opinion, and therefore regard it as being fundamentally flawed.

Since the approval of the Langlands 'B' site by the Education and Children's Services Committee, one of the major reasons given for the selection of this site has changed. It is understood that the University will not now be providing indoor sports facilities and that this aspect of shared use is no longer a factor in the site selection, and that this decision will incur extra capital costs.

A further issue is that the "co-location" presented as an important factor for the selection of the Langlands 'B' site is significantly undermined by the new site's relatively distant location from any university teaching facilities.

In addition, any perceived "co-location" benefits for pupils would in any case be likely to be experienced only by the most senior form(s).

Given that the reasons given for the selection of the Langlands 'B' site have changed significantly since last appraised, and the site also changed, the Council has a duty to reconsider these new circumstances.

This re-appraisal should be undertaken by the council using best value criteria for its own legal responsibilities, not those of any other organisation. It is clear from the above that these original decisions require to be revisited in the light of significantly changed circumstances.

Additionally, the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 to be implemented in January 2011 will place onerous responsibilities on the Council to reduce its carbon emissions by 40% by 2020, and require it to take account of this legislation in all decision-making. There is no information in the consultation documentation how this requirement has been taken into account, or explanation of the statement made to councillors and the general public that the new school will be carbon neutral. This statement is clearly wrong when the school as currently planned will be carrying the emissions burden of bussing two thirds of the pupils to the school on a daily basis over the notional forty year lifetime of the school.

Additional information is required if the public and local organisations are to be enabled to come to an informed decision on the merits of the consultation proposal. There are:

1. Given the statement that the projected numbers of a single school serving the current catchment area would be over 1500, and that these numbers are said to be required to offer a full curriculum to pupils, how can the academic success of a school such as Eastwood High School – the best performing school in Scotland – be achieved with just over 1000 pupils?
2. How can a small school like Waid Academy, operate so successfully – instanced by sending one of the highest proportion of pupils in Fife schools to University?
3. What account has been taken of the likely increased numbers of pupils in the senior forms as a result of greater numbers of pupils staying on at school due to the economic situation, and in the longer term, the raising of the school leaving age?
4. What account has been taken in terms of present and future secondary school provision in North East Fife given the proposals in the Strategic Development Plan (Tayplan) that the Tay bridgehead will be the main centre for new house building in North East Fife and confirming the Fife Structure Plan statements that after 2026 development will be directed away from St Andrews?
5. The new school will be designed to provide for community use. How will a comparable level of community facilities be provided for Tay bridgehead residents?
6. How will the 66% of pupils who require to be bussed to school be able to benefit from extra-curricular activities, including sport, in the same way as pupils resident in St Andrews?
7. Have the effects on academic performance and general wellbeing of Tay bridgehead pupils resulting from the extension of the school day by an average of approximately one hour been assessed?

8. What is the assessed fiscal cost of bussing this number of children to school over a notional 40 year life of a new school in St Andrews?
9. What is the assessed carbon cost of bussing this number of pupils over the lifetime of the school? Has this been considered in the context of the climate change implications which these pupils and their successors may have to contend with in the future?
10. If the fiscal cost of bussing was applied instead to education resources, including teaching of specialised subjects, would this compensate for the stated limitations in the curriculum of two smaller schools?
11. Is it not possible for two smaller schools in reasonable proximity to each other to share specialised subject teaching staff and facilities for those pupils requiring this, rather than requiring large numbers of pupils to travel daily?
12. What perceived social, rather than educational benefits might be achieved by having two smaller schools based in communities such as Tay Bridgehead and St Andrews? Would those pupils who require to bus to school suffer social disadvantage compared to those who do not?
13. Has a phasing programme, which involves the building first of a Tay Bridgehead school and then utilising the current St Andrews school facilities to accommodate a reduced number of pupils while the refurbishment of existing premises to modern educational standards takes place, been considered?
14. What are the implications for the current Madras buildings and land assets at Kilrymont and the town centre, and have these been taken into account in the costings of various options?

We would note that the Scottish Statutory requirements relating to this consultation – The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 – requires councils to meet specific standards during educational consultations. This act requires consultations to:

1. Be undertaken when the proposals are at a formative stage.
2. Include sufficient reasons for particular proposals.
3. Give sufficient time for those consulted to give intelligent consideration and an intelligent response.
4. Provide information on how the authority intends to minimise or avoid the adverse effects of the proposals.
5. Consider both current and future users of the school facilities.
6. and in its final decision show that the result of the consultation has been taken into account.

The Preservation Trust submits that the majority of these requirements have not been met in the current consultation exercise. We consider that persons responding to the consultation have not been sufficiently informed to provide an intelligent response, and that information on the assessment of the possible alternative is significantly absent.

The consultation exercise does not, in our opinion, meet the statutory requirements noted above. We consider that it has no validity and should therefore be withdrawn and re-issued together with an evidenced based assessment of all the options which have been considered, accompanied with detailed information on the areas noted above. Unless a consultation takes place without pre-emptive decisions having been taken, it cannot be regarded as a genuine consultation which enables respondents to form an informed view and influence the outcome.

We consider that this is the appropriate stage to undertake a rigorous assessment of various possible solutions in order to take forward a scheme for the creation of the first class secondary educational facilities fit for the 21st Century. This desired outcome cannot be achieved by the current exercise.

David Middleton
Planning Policy Convener

21st December 2010

Letter 4a

Education Service

To: The St Andrews Preservation Trust

John McLaughlin
08451 555555 ext. 450398
John.mclaughlin@fife.gov.uk

Your Ref:
Our Ref: JMCL/MS

Date: 22 April 2011

Dear Sir

MADRAS COLLEGE CONSULTATION

I refer to your letter of 21 December regarding the consultation proposal to provide a single site school to replace the existing split site Madras College. This consultation, under the terms of the Schools (Scotland) Consultation Act 2010, seeks to test the views of the community on the principle of the building of a new school at an indicative site co-located with the University of St Andrews.

1. The naming of the site as “on the North Haugh campus”, and the provision of indicative locations on maps provided respondents with sufficient information to take an informed view on the proposal.
2. The consultation did not offer a further discussion on the building of a separate school around the area of the Tay Bridge. This issue was the subject of discussion at earlier public meetings and a decision was taken by the council regarding this option.
3. Your comments regarding co-location benefits are noted. Your perception that co-location benefits are likely to be experienced only by senior pupils is inaccurate. Benefits will be experienced by all pupils, by students at the university and by the wider community.
4. Your points regarding climate change legislation are noted. These matters do not form part of our obligations under the Schools (Scotland) consultation Action but sit more easily in the planning consultation process.
5. You raised 14 (numbered) points under additional information.

These points revisit the issue of the creation of a school to service the communities around the Tay bridgehead. This issue has been the subject of previous discussions and does not appear within the Consultation proposal since it was an option which was rejected some time ago.

6. On page 4 of your letter you note 6 requirements of the relevant Act. Under the terms of the Schools (Scotland) Consultation Act 2010, an element of discretion is provided in the provision of details of other options considered but rejected. The Council's position is quite clear and has been stated at other democratic forums. The consultation document refers to the work of reviewing all viable options.

The purpose of this consultation is to test opinion on the preferred option of co-location on the indicated site on the campus of St Andrews University at the North Haugh.

It should be noted that, had the preferred option been to build at the Kilrymont campus, there would be no requirement to consult under the terms of the Schools (Scotland) Consultation Act 2010.

Thank you for taking the time to make extensive comment on this proposal.

Your letter and this response will form part of the Final Consultation Report.

Yours sincerely

John McLaughlin
Area Education Officer (North)

Letter 5

From A Parent

Birchwood, Blebo Craigs, Cupar, KY15 5UF

Madras Consultation
Education Service Area Office
County Buildings
St Catherine's Street
Cupar
Fife
KY15 4TB

3 December 2010

Dear Sir/Madam

Madras College – support for new build on the North Haugh campus

I write, as the parent of one child at Kilrymont and one at a feeder primary, in support of the proposed redevelopment of Madras College.

I very strongly believe that the educational needs of North-East Fife's children, both now and in the future, would be best served by a modern, single-site school with all the facilities necessary for a 21st-century education. Given that the Council has already decided against building a secondary school in the Tay Bridgehead area, and that large numbers of children will therefore continue to be bussed to St Andrews, the proposed site as the North Haugh is by far the better option with reduced travelling time for the children, and less heavy traffic in the town centre. The opportunity to share facilities with the University is very positive, for the school and the community it serves.

Fife Council now has an opportunity to build a new Madras on one site that will serve generations of North-East Fife children well, offering them the quality of amenities that are being provided elsewhere in Fife.

I am therefore strongly in favour of replacing the existing split-site Madras College with a new, purpose-built school on a single site located on the North Haugh campus at the University of St Andrews.

Yours sincerely

Name redacted

Letter 5a

Name & Address Redacted

Education Service

John McLaughlin
08451 555555 ext. 450398
John.mclaughlin@fife.gov.uk

Your Ref:
Our Ref: JMcL/MS

Date: 22 April 2011

Dear Name redacted

Madras College – support for New Build on the North Haugh Campus

Thank you for your letter of support for the Council's proposal. The formal consultation report will shortly be available for public scrutiny. Your letter and this response will form part of that report, with your personal information redacted.

Yours sincerely

John McLaughlin
Area Education Officer (North)

Letter 6

From Council Employee

Address Redacted

16th December 2010

Dear Ms Rennie

MADRAS COLLEGE – SITE CONSULTATION

I refer to the education consultation on the above matter. This is not a response to the consultation – it is an expression of concern about the procedure involved.

1. The consultation consist of only one statement – “*I support the replacement of the existing split site Madras College with a new, purpose built school on a single site located on the North Haugh Campus, University of St Andrews*” – yes/no. It is not possible to say that you wish to support a single site school elsewhere, or two schools.
2. The proposed site is not on the North Haugh. The North Haugh runs from Andrew Melville Hall to the new medical building. The suggested site is considerably higher, and is some distance from the North Haugh. This is misleading, because a number of people might be happy to see the school located on the North Haugh.
3. The University of St Andrews does not have a ‘campus’. The University buildings are across the town, from David Russell Hall in the west to the Garry Building in the east.

In my view the inaccuracies in this single statement consultation render it invalid. A new consultation should be initiated. I should be grateful for an early response to this letter.

Yours sincerely

Name redacted

Ms L Rennie
Support Officer, Fife Council,
County Buildings, Cupar, Fife KY15 4TA

Letter 6a

Name & Address redacted

Education Service

John McLaughlin
08451 555555 ext. 450398
John.mclaughlin@fife.gov.uk

Your Ref:
Our Ref: JMcl/MS

Date: 22 April 2011

Dear Name redacted

Madras College: Consultation

I refer to your letter expressing concern about the consultation procedure undertaken regarding the provision of a new single site school to replace the existing split site school.

You raised three issues:

1. The single statement contained in the consultation seeks to test the views of the community on the Council's preferred option. Since this option is potentially a major change to current provision it is appropriate to consult under the terms of the Schools (Scotland) Consultation Act 2010. The consultation document provided summary information on earlier activity which led to the selection of site at the University as the Council's preferred option.

Prior to the consultation meetings were held in St Andrews and in Newport where the issue of provision at the Tay bridgehead was discussed.

2. The description of the indicative site as "on the North Haugh Campus, University of St Andrews" was referred by the provision of maps which showed the preferred location of the proposed new school. The Council is content that sufficient information was provided on the matter of location to enable respondents to make an informed decision.
3. On your point (3), the comments on point (2) above also apply.

With your permission, I would like to include your letter and this response in the final consultation report. I would, however, redact name and address. I would ask you to confirm or reject your consent to this approach.

Thank you for your contribution to the consultation.

Yours sincerely

John McLaughlin
Area Education Officer (North)

Letter 7

From

Madras College Parent Council

Address redacted

The Manager
Education Service Area Office
Fife Council
County Buildings
St Catherine's Street
Cupar
Fife
KY15 4TB

14 December 2010

Dear Sir

Madras College – Support for New Single Site School on the North Haugh

The Parent Forum and Parent Council of Madras College have discussed the replacement of the existing split site school buildings on many occasions. This is our formal submission to the consultation process.

The membership of the Parent Council unanimously supports the present proposal to replace the existing split site Madras College with a new, purpose built school on a single site located on the North Haugh Campus of the University of St Andrews.

Given the deteriorating state of both existing buildings and the consequential negative impact on the learning and teaching environment, the Parent Council is also determined to ensure that the proposed timetable for completion and occupation of the new Madras College in 2014 is achieved.

I look forward to hearing the results of the consultation exercise.

Yours sincerely

Name redacted

Chairman
Madras College Parent Council

Copies to:

Cllr. Frances Melville, Cllr. Robin Waterston, Cllr. Bill Sangster, Cllr. Dorothea Morrison, Cllr. Tim Brett, Cllr. Maggie Taylor, Cllr. Ron Caird
Sir Menzies Campbell QC, MP
Iain Smith MSP

Letter 7a

Name & Address redacted

Education Service

John McLaughlin
08451 555555 ext. 450398
John.mclaughlin@fife.gov.uk

Your Ref:
Our Ref: JMcL/MS

Date: 22 April 2011

Dear John

Madras College: Support for new single site school on North Haugh

I refer to your letter of 14 December 2010 on behalf of the parent council of Madras College.

Your letter and this acknowledgment will form part of the Final Consultation Report.

Yours sincerely

John McLaughlin
Area Education Officer (North)

John McLaughlin, Education Officer, Fife Council
By Email

(02/11/2010) Lorraine Rennie – general – Consultation – Madras College – Site Consultation

From : [email](#) address redacted
To : [email](#) address redacted
Date : 11/2/2010 1 :18 pm
Subject : general – Consultation – Madras College – Site Consultation

Enquiry Details : As a former pupil of Madras I hate to think the state of both buildings as it is 28 years since I left Kilrymont school and both buildings but I know there is not the pupil no. now. I have a three year old son who will be attending the new school so I am aware that we need the best possible because you want value for money but also some thing that last. Just look at the age difference of the two builds that you are replacing and university want the south street building but Kilrymont will just need flatend and houses my only concern is distance form town centre for shops too get income and the area pupils will be wandering through.

Contact details redacted

Letter 8

Name & Address redacted

12 May 2011

Dear Mr McLaughlin

MADRAS COLLEGE – SITE CONSULTATION

Thank you for your letter of 22nd April 2011, in reply to my letter of 19th January 2011, about the education consultation procedure. Unfortunately I do not feel that your replies provide answers to my concerns. I am disturbed that over the last year it has taken months to get answers to letters on this subject, and it has been almost impossible to get accurate answers.

1. I do not believe this consultation conformed to the Schools (Scotland) Consultation Act 2010, nor was it compliant with other school consultations in Fife.
2. You refer to *'the provision of maps which showed the preferred location...'* My point is that the maps did not show the North Haugh, and that *'the preferred location'* is not on the North Haugh. The recent report to the Policy Finance and Asset Management Committee referred to *'access to the school site from the North Haugh'*. Clearly therefore the site is NOT on the North Haugh. The one-sentence consultation was misleading and cannot be considered valid.
3. The reference to the University *'campus'* was an inaccuracy, as stated in my original letter – it seems extraordinary that a single sentence could contain two misstatements.

I am happy for you to include my letter and your response in the final consultation report, provided that this letter is also included. I also wish to point out that to the best of my knowledge Fife Council has no authority to redact any information apart from signatures (but not printed names), email address and telephone numbers. I recently asked an official at Victoria Quay about this, and he said that there is no legislation which requires redaction of information in planning matters. I should be grateful if you would confirm that, apart from the above three items, no other information will be redacted from responses which are published with the final consultation report. When will the report be published?

Yours sincerely

Name redacted

Mr J McLaughlin,
Fife Council, Rothesay House,
Glenrothes, Fife KY7 5PQ

Background

Madras College serves an area of some 180 square miles in North East Fife, providing secondary education and community use. The most immediate driver for the construction of a new, single site school for Madras College is that the accommodation is split over two separate sites, 1.5 miles apart. They are inflexible in configuration and the South Street complex is not amenable to renovation to current standards. Neither is the school 'fit for current purpose' in terms of teaching and learning accommodation or ICT capability.

In the HMIE report of May 2006, the accommodation is described as unsatisfactory with the recommendation "to take immediate steps to remove barriers to learning, teaching and behaviour due to weaknesses in accommodation." In the follow-through report of March 2008 the following comment is made. "The fabric of buildings and the quality of furnishings, toilets and security arrangements provided a poor and deteriorating environment for learning and required major upgrading."

The project team reviewed all viable options for Madras College, and identified the advantages and disadvantages. From this appraisal, the project team confirmed that the option for the redevelopment of the school would best be achieved in partnership with the University of St Andrews. Fife Council, Education and Children's Services Committee decided that Langlands B site be adopted as the preferred location for development of a new build Madras College. Subsequent detailed negotiations between Fife Council and the University of St Andrews have defined the site for the new school as the field immediately west of the existing university playing fields.

Proposal

It is proposed to provide a purpose built, single site establishment which will meet the educational needs for the 21st century. The scope of the new school will include the full educational provision currently provided in both campuses including the Department of Additional Support presently housed in Kilrymont Campus. This educational development also captures the synergy of co-location with the University of St Andrews, to both parties mutual benefit.

The school will comprise all of the normal indoor facilities associated with a new secondary school including its own indoor sports. The school will have its own all weather pitch immediately adjacent but no new grass pitches will be provided. By mutual agreement, the school may access the university's grass pitches during the normal of school day and the university will similarly have access to the school's own pitches across the A91 at Station Park.

The school will be designed by an external design team. Due to the extended discussions on the site for the new school and taking into consideration the optimum time for the school to relocate to the new site the anticipated delivery date is Spring 2014.

Educational Benefits

The new school will bring the 2 campuses together onto a single site and provide modern, fit for purpose accommodation and facilities to meet the educational needs

of all pupils for the 21st century. Co-locating with the University of St Andrews provides additional opportunities for cooperative working to the benefit of both institutions.

The pupils affected will be current S1 and S2 pupils of Madras College and all pupils in our associated primary schools. They will all benefit from modern, purpose-built accommodation and furnishings in a barrier-free building.

Curriculum for Excellence encourages cross-curricular working and the new school will be designed to give flexibility in the delivery of the curriculum and to support our faculty structure.

Classrooms will be light and airy with full IT capability. Labs will be modern and a mix of accommodation in science will provide spaces to balance practical and theoretical work with a dedicated area for biotechnology.

Sports accommodation will consist of a 6-court games hall, gymnasium, multi-activity area and an all weather pitch. In addition we will retain all our sports pitches at Station Park, a short distance away. Negotiations with the University of St Andrews may result in our use of some of their grass pitches during the school day and their reciprocal use of Station Park. This is a greatly improved provision from our current accommodation.

The Department of Additional Support, currently housed at our Kilrymont Campus will be fully integrated into the new school, providing scope for pupils to be integrated in mainstream classes at all levels, or supported in purpose-built accommodation as appropriate.

An assembly hall capable of seating an audience of 500 is part of the design brief. This will allow full assemblies of each of our three school houses as well as providing an excellent venue for productions, either school, university or community based.

We are in discussion with the University of St Andrews over educational linkages and with Elmwood College over vocational opportunities.

Bringing the school together onto a single site will improve ethos among pupils, allowing senior pupils to have a positive influence on younger years by providing role models, currently difficult to provide due to our split site.

Madras College is a community use school with a substantial and varied programme every evening and weekend. The facilities in the new school are being designed with this in mind and we will ensure that provision is available to meet our full current and future community demands. As a result, community users of Madras College will enjoy all the benefits of modern, purpose built facilities.

As the new school is to be built on a green-field site some distance either of our existing buildings, there will be no disruption to learning caused by the construction.

Transport

Currently in excess of 60% of the school population arrive in school by bus. These 18 buses have to be routed through centre of St Andrews and along relatively narrow roads around the Kilrymont campus. The location of the new school will allow re-routing that will dramatically reduce the impact of school buses through St Andrews.

Safe routes to the new school through St Andrews will be considered and developed as part of the master planning process.

Consultation

The consultation period will run from 1 November until 17 December 2010. Notices will be placed in local newspapers, primary schools, nursery school, libraries and local council office. In addition Madras College, cluster primary and nursery schools will publicise the consultation process in newsletters. Information will be displayed in each establishment and the use of e-mail to parents will be used where it exists. This paper will be made available at Education headquarters and on its website. The paper will be made available to any person requesting a copy, and reasonable steps will be taken to amend the format to make it accessible to all.

There will be two public meetings; Tuesday 23 November 2010 in the Blyth Hall, Newport and 24 November 2010, St Andrews Town Hall. Each meeting will be open to the public between 2 pm and 8 pm.

All statutory consultees will be given relevant notice.