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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study area of this report comprises approximately 78 hectares (190 acres) and incorporates the North Haugh located on the western approach to the town of St Andrews in the north-east corner of Fife.

Major development of the site started in the late 1960s to provide new science-focused academic facilities and student residences for the University.

The three main teaching blocks on the site, Physics & Astronomy; Mathematics & Chemistry were masterplanned and designed by the Edinburgh firm of William Holford & Partners.

The most significant building on the site however is the Andrew Melville Hall, designed by James Stirling – a Glasgow-born architect who did not complete any other project of a similar scale in Scotland, yet who was prolific in the post-War period elsewhere in the UK and in continental Europe. Of particular interest are his buildings for the universities of Leicester and Cambridge, although it is his controversial and novel approach to each of his projects that makes him a much-discussed, if not unanimously praised, architect. The Andrew Melville Hall was designed to house 250 students and was intended to be the first block of six identical blocks housing a total of 1,500 students. The completion of the building was beset with a number of setbacks and technical problems led, in part, to the wider project being abandoned.

Andrew Melville Hall is important for its historical, architectural and social associations, and is considered to be of outstanding significance. As a major building by a notable architect, it is demonstrative of Stirling’s experimental approach to design and construction. Nevertheless, it has undergone constant change and alteration – much of which related to the original poor quality construction.

The Wardlaw Wing (originally Westerlee) and the Old Wing of University Hall, along with the Rugby Stand are of considerable significance.

The William Holford & Partners buildings, and two recent buildings, the Gateway Building and the New Bute Medical School are of moderate significance, either as a result of their importance in the historical development of the University (the former) or as a result of their high quality architectural treatment (the latter). In addition, the observatories, pavilion and Kinnessburn House are also of moderate significance.

The study area includes the University sports area and related buildings, and David Russell Apartments and Fife Park. The latter are all considered to be of neutral significance. In addition, the open agricultural area to the west is included in the study area.

This conservation plan provides an overview of the historical development of the site, an assessment of the existing site on a character area basis, followed by an assessment of its overall significance and the significance of its component parts. From this understanding of the place, a set of policies relating to the site has been produced to guide future development, alteration and management of the site.

(Return to Table of Contents)
Figure 1  View of St Andrews and North Haugh from Andrew Melville Hall. S&B

Figure 2  Andrew Melville Hall. S&B

Figure 3  Old Wing, University Hall. S&B

Figure 4  Observatories adjacent to the playing fields. S&B

Figure 5  Biomolecular Sciences Unit. S&B

Figure 6  Distant view of David Russell Apartments and open agricultural land to the right. S&B
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Objectives of the Conservation Plan

This conservation plan has been commissioned by the University of St Andrews Estates Department to inform the conservation, repair, use, management and future development of the Andrew Melville Hall and North Haugh.

This report includes an appraisal of the heritage value of the buildings, an examination of main conservation-related issues and guidelines for the site.

A conservation plan assesses and sets out in summary what is important about a building and its significance based upon readily available information. The information gathered is then considered in an assessment of cultural significance, for the site as a whole and for its various parts, to be summarised in this report with a statement of significance.

The purpose of establishing the importance of the site is to identify and assess the attributes which make a place of value to our society. Once the heritage significance of the building is understood, informed policy decisions can be made which will enable that significance to be retained, revealed, enhanced or, at least, impaired as little as possible in any future decisions for the site. A clear understanding of the nature and degree of the significance of the building or an element of the site will not simply suggest constraints on future action. It will introduce flexibility by identifying the areas which can be adapted or developed with greater freedom.

Based on all of this information and opinion, a set of policies, or guidelines, have been established that will inform the conservation, repair, management and use of the building according to best conservation practice.
2.2 Study Area

The North Haugh is located on the western approach to the town of St Andrews (figure 7).

Figure 7 Current Ordnance Survey map showing study area (shaded blue) in context. Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright [2007] All rights reserved. Licence number 1000 06772, edited by S&B

Figure 8 Satellite view, c2004 showing study area. Google edited by S&B
Figure 9  Site plan showing boundary of study area. A larger version is shown in Appendix II, S&8
2.3 Heritage Designations

2.3.1 Listed Buildings

There are currently three listed building included in the study area: the Wardlaw Wing of University Hall (formerly Westerlee) listed at Category B (HB Number 40920); the ‘Old Wing’ of University Hall also listed at Category B (HB Number 40921); and the University Rugby Football Club Stand listed at Category C(S) (HB Number 50919). The Listed Building Reports are included in Appendix I.

Category B listed building are recognised by Historic Scotland as being buildings of regional or more than local importance, or major examples of some particular period, style or building type which may have been altered.

Category C(S) listed building are recognised as buildings of local importance, lesser examples of any period, style, or building type, as originally constructed or moderately altered; and simple traditional buildings which group well with others in categories A and B.

This report was commissioned in the context of the proposal by Historic Scotland to list the Andrew Melville Hall.

The listed buildings are shown on figure 10.

2.3.2 Scheduled Ancient Monuments

The study area does not include any Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM), nor are there any SAMs in the immediate vicinity of the North Haugh.

2.3.3 Conservation Area

Parts of the North Haugh are included in the Hepburn Gardens Conservation Area, and the site is also on the boundary, but not included in, the wider St Andrews Conservation Area. Figure 10 shows the study area in the context of these Conservation Areas.

2.3.4 Sites and Monuments Record

The Sites and Monuments Record does not hold any consistent data on the North Haugh study area, but the Council Archaeologist states that whilst largely untested, the archaeological potential of the North Haugh is considered to be high.

In summary:

- the area is archaeologically sensitive (based on previous discoveries, the site's location and the character of the area)
- this archaeological sensitivity cannot be accurately mapped without detailed further study and intrusive sampling (ie running evaluation trenches through the area)
- Fife Council is likely to place proportionate and reasonable archaeological conditions on any new development in the area
- archaeological issues are unlikely to prevent any future development but that archaeological considerations, along with a costing for some archaeological work, should be factored into any new development plans for the area.
Figure 10: Site plan showing listed buildings and boundary with conservation areas. A larger version is shown in Appendix II.
2.4 Structure of the Report

2.5 Adoption & Review
This conservation plan should be adopted by the owner, stakeholders, consultants and future users of the site to aid in the sensitive and appropriate development, management and use of the estate.

2.6 Limitations
The only accessible plans for the buildings are held by the University of St Andrews Estates Department, but owing to the technical and practical nature of this archive, relevant material is limited. There is also limited publicly-available photographic archive material of the estate and again little photographic evidence of the interiors.

With regards the Andrew Melville Hall, the wider James Stirling Archive is held by the Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal, and only a limited amount of information is available online. The University Archives, held by the Special Collections section of the University Library is very comprehensive, but although this has been investigated thoroughly it is acknowledged that further relevant material could be found here.

It is possible that further information will become available after the completion of this report. Any new information should be acknowledged by the stakeholders and incorporated into future revisions of the conservation plan.

2.7 Orientation
For the purposes of this report and convenience, the arrangement of the buildings have been simplified to an east-west formation: the elevations facing the A91 are referred to as the north elevations, and those facing Kennedy Gardens, the south. The longer wing of the Andrew Melville Hall is referred to as the north wing. All other directions given are approximate.
2.8 Project Team
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2.10 Abbreviations
A number of abbreviations have been used throughout this report and are identified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Fife Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>National Archives of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>National Library of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCAHMS</td>
<td>Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;B</td>
<td>Simpson &amp; Brown Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoStA</td>
<td>University of St Andrews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 11  Former principal entrance to the Andrew Melville Hall. S&B

Figure 12  View towards St Andrews from the Andrew Melville Hall. S&B

Figure 13  Mathematics Institute (left) and Physics & Astronomy (right). S&B

Figure 14  Kinnessburn House. S&B

Figure 15  University Hall. S&B
Figure 16 General view of the playing fields and Sports Centre. S&B

Figure 17 View of the South Pavilion from the north. S&B

Figure 18 The promenade link in Andrew Melville Hall. S&B

Figure 19 Andrew Melville Hall. S&B

Figure 20 Dining room of Andrew Melville Hall. S&B
3.0 UNDERSTANDING THE NORTH HAUGH

3.1 Introduction

An understanding of how the site has reached its present form will help determine the importance of various elements of the estate, which will then inform policies, or guidelines for management and development. Research was undertaken during the time available for the completion of this report.

The development of the North Haugh is well documented in surviving records which have been extensively investigated. This account brings together the current research, draws some new conclusions from the existing facts and attempts to examine some of the variations in interpretation between them. This conservation plan intends to provide a cohesive view of the historical development of the North Haugh, and aims to be as comprehensive as possible. However, further research will no doubt be possible given its complex history and overall level of significance.

3.2 The University of St Andrews

The following is an edited extract from ‘A History of the University’ published on the University website:

The University of St Andrews came into being as part of the movement which established national universities in many of the kingdoms of Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. About Whitsunday 1410 a school of The first fully organised and endowed collegiate society to be established within the University was the College of St Salvator, founded for the study of Arts and Theology in 1450 by James Kennedy, Bishop of St Andrews. The chief feature of the building was the magnificent collegiate church that still forms the principal place of academic worship in St Andrews. In 1512 the College of St Leonard was founded by Alexander Stewart, Archbishop of St Andrews, and John Hepburn, Prior of St Andrews. This was a "college of poor clerks" associated with the Priory of St Andrews and primarily intended for the education of novices of the Augustinian Order in arts and theology. Finally, in 1537-38, Archbishop James Beaton reorganised an old pedagogy as a seminary for the training of secular priests in arts, theology, and canon law under the title of the College of St Mary.

1 http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/about/HistoryoftheUniversity/, accessed 21-Jan-2011
Such was the form of the academic society of St Andrews at the coming of the Reformation in 1560. In 1579 there was enacted the "New Foundation of the University and Colleges of St Andrews". St Salvator's College and St Leonard's College became predominantly "colleges of philosophy" or arts, while St Mary's College became a college of Reformed Theology. Despite these changes, the colleges retained the residential character imparted to them by their original founders. Of academic developments in a period much interrupted by civil and religious strife the most notable was the foundation of a common University Library in 1612 and of an Observatory, unfortunately short-lived, in 1670.

See also John Geddy's map of c1580: S.Andre sive Andreapolis Scotiae Universitas Metropolitana.

In 1747, during a period of acute depression in the University, the two Arts colleges were combined under one Principal as the United College of St Salvator and St Leonard. The colleges continued to be predominantly residential until the close of the eighteenth century.

Figure 21  J Valentine & Co postcard showing University College, Dundee, c1934. UoStA

An important duty assigned to the Commissioners of 1889 was to affiliate the University College founded at Dundee in 1881. The affiliation and partial incorporation of the college in the University was eventually affected in 1897 and in 1898 the Conjoint School of Medicine was established at Dundee. As a result of these and other changes the University now comprised four Faculties – Arts, Divinity, Science (including Engineering), and Medicine – to which degree courses in Education, Dentistry and Law were subsequently added. Women students were admitted to all courses of study in 1892 and halls of residence for their accommodation were inaugurated at St Andrews in 1896 [now University Hall] and at Dundee in 1917. Collegiate residence for men students was revived at St Andrews in 1921 and inaugurated at Dundee in 1946.
An unresolved problem in all these developments between 1897 and 1953 was the constitutional relationship between University College, Dundee and the University in which it had been partly incorporated by the Commissioners on 1889. In 1951 a Royal Commission was appointed with full powers to inquire into this and other related problems and in 1953 the principal recommendations of the Commission received legislative sanction in the University of St Andrews Act of that year.

The Act dissolved the governing bodies of University College and placed its property and endowments in the hands of a reorganised University Court. The two St Andrews colleges, which had retained their corporate status in 1889, were reconstituted as "unincorporated societies of teachers and students". The teachers and students of all parts of the University in Dundee were formed into a third society subsequently designated Queen's College. In the ensuing period the Dundee School of Economics was incorporated in the University and new Faculties of Law, Applied Science and Social Science were established. In 1967, in terms of a Royal Charter, Queen's College became the University of Dundee. The College of St Leonard was reconstituted in 1974 to care for the interests of all postgraduate workers in the University.

3.3 Early Development of the Western Suburbs & the North Haugh

Although the North Haugh had not been developed fully until the University of St Andrews masterplanned the site in the 1960s, the “agricultural potential of the ground and its proximity to the medieval burgh makes it likely that this area has been heavily used by man for centuries, if not for millennia”. Further back in history, the lower ground of the North Haugh, and the ridge along the south side is a consequence of previous higher sea levels, and the ridge having originally formed as a cliff-edge to the sea.

The earliest clear map evidence that shows the study area is the 1854 6-inch 1st Edition by the OS. This shows the North Haugh with a number of drainage channels, draining to the Swilken Burn to the north, suggesting a well-developed agricultural function. On the plateau to the south, the early signs of the fusing of the area now comprising Kennedy Gardens can be seen, although the north-south Parliamentary Boundary continues to bisect the study area. The railway, which had reached St Andrews in 1852 had its terminus to the north of the main road from the north-west.

Unfortunately the OS 1893 large scale town plan only shows a small part of the study area, but it nevertheless demonstrates the growth of the western suburbs, with each villa named prominently on the map.

It is the noted local architect John Milne3 who was responsible for much of the early developments on the western fringes of St Andrews. The Rathelpie plateau, with its fine views across the Tay estuary over to the Sidlaw Hills proved to be an attractive location for the small, but increasing, number of wealthy mercantile families of the town, who sought space to develop appropriately distinctive villas on a quite

---

2 Speirs, Douglas; Fife Council Archaeologist, in email to Simpson & Brown 28-Apr-2011
3 Before his work as an architect in St Andrews, Milne was clerk of works to the Edinburgh architect David Bryce. He was also a town councillor and Bailie.
different pattern to the high-density medieval groupings and mid-19th century uniformity that otherwise characterises St Andrews.

The first villas to be constructed included Kinburn House, now used as the St Andrews Museum, and the manse for the Martyr’s Free Church. Both were designed by John Milne in a distinctive Tudor Gothic style. Also by Milne is the villa originally known as Rathelpie – now Rathmore – built in 1861 but later much altered. In addition, the feuing of the Rathelpie grounds, forming what is today Kennedy & Wardlaw Gardens was masterminded by Milne, and the majority of the villas were completed by the 1880s. Wardlaw House, another Milne villa discussed in section 3.4, dates to 1865, and was one of the largest of all the Rathelpie villas. Jesse Hall and his partner David Henry were other notable architects likely to have been involved in the design of the villas.
Figure 22  Site plan showing development history of the study area and neighbouring buildings. A larger version is shown in Appendix II. S&B
3.4 Early University Buildings

3.4.1 University Hall

The set of buildings that comprise University Hall can be aligned into four main phases of buildings, with the earliest component, the Wardlaw Wing dating to 1865. Originally constructed by John Milne as a private residential villa, Westerlee, the building was purchased by the University in 1947. The principal character of the Wardlaw Wing is its commanding position looking over the North Haugh towards the sea. When originally constructed it would have been a key focal point, breaking forward of the developmental extent of the western suburbs and thus highly visible on the approach to the town by both road and rail.

University Hall itself, or the ‘old wing’ as the original 1895 part is referred to, is a good example of a late-Victorian purpose-built university residence and represents the first development by the University in the study area. Built specifically for female students, its architecture and positioning clearly referenced the earlier villas of Kennedy Gardens and was arguably a sympathetic extension of the Rathelpie plateau suburban pattern. This is not surprising given that the St Andrews architectural practice that designed the original building, Gillespie & Scott built dozens of domestic villas in St Andrews throughout the 1890s, including a number in the Rathelpie area. The same firm went on to win a number of commissions from the University over the next decade.

Less than fifteen years after University Hall was completed the University commissioned the Dundee practice Mills & Shepherd to construct a significant extension, in the form of a u-shaped wing extending to the south-west.

![Figure 23](image)

**Figure 23** 1948 Mills & Shephard proposals to extend the Wardlaw Wing to the south. UoStA

After the purchase of Westerlee in 1947 the University again commissioned Mills & Shepherd to design an extension – designs dated 1948 are held by the Estates Department. This scheme was not built, being effectively superseded by plans drawn up a decade later for what is now known as the Lumsden (New) Wing. As a result, the character of the 1865 villa remained largely intact, with the interiors retaining many areas of architectural detail.

Both the Old Wing and Wardlaw Wing were listed in 1971 at Category B.

The Lumsden Wing – now referred to as the New Wing of University Hall was completed in 1962. This large extension was designed by another Dundee practice, Gauldie, Hardie, Wright & Needham. The University Estates Department holds plans dating to 1958 (figure 24).
3.4.2 Playing Fields Pavilion

In 1904 the notable industrialist and benefactor Andrew Carnegie gifted grounds to the University for use as playing fields, as well as gifting funds to construct a pavilion. The grounds were adjacent to University Hall, effectively book-ending the Rathelpie villa development and allowing the University of St Andrews Rugby Football Club, one of the oldest in Scotland, to move from Station Park.

The pavilion was designed by William Allan Carter.
3.4.3 Rugby Stand

The Rugby Football Club Stand dates to 1934 and was designed by J Young. The building was listed in 2007, being a relatively rare surviving example of a largely-unaltered structure from that period (see Appendix I).

3.4.4 University Observatory

Named after a previous Chair of Mathematics at the University who was an enthusiastic supporter of the establishment of an Observatory in St Andrews, the Scott-Lang building was designed in 1939-40, by the familiar firm of Mills & Shepherd. In the decade after the War, additional facilities were provided with a new building, the Gregory building with the involvement of the Edinburgh firm Carr & Matthew who also produced plans involving the Scott-Lang building. Furthermore, the University Estates Department holds plans for a ‘new dome’ to the Gregory building dated 1857.

The later, and north-most, of the observatory buildings, the Napier building, was designed in 1965 by Gillespie & Scott (figure 28), then in the hands of descendants of James Scott.

Figure 26 The Scot-Lang building. S&B

Figure 27 The Gregory building with Napier behind. S&B

Figure 28 Drawings dated 1965 showing the twin-domed Napier building. UoStA
3.5 The William Holford & Partners Masterplan: Physics & Astronomy, Mathematics and Chemistry

3.5.1 Establishment of the University of Dundee

The foundation of the University of Dundee as an independent institution in 1967 had a major impact on the University of St Andrews, of which it had been a part for 70 years. The seven decades following 1897 were to see the University of St Andrews establish many science and medical facilities at Dundee – as detailed above – units that were going to be lost to the University in 1967. In advance of this date, the University of St Andrews started preparing plans to create replacement facilities in lieu of these, and in the early 1960s a masterplan for the North Haugh was created by William Holford & Partners (figure 29).

3.5.2 Physics & Astronomy and Mathematics Institute

Figure 29 Detail of an early site masterplan showing the proposed arrangement of new Halls and Science facilities. UoStA
These two departmental buildings form the first major development on the North Haugh, and were both designed by William Holford & Partners. Interestingly the majority of the drawings held by the Estates Department, which span the period 1961-69, are floor plans with few elevations. The design process appears to have concentrated on internal layout planning rather than the resolution of the design of the elevations, all of which are relatively plain.

Nevertheless there are details of the Physics & Astronomy building that are worthy of mention. Above the entrance panel is an interesting piece of sculptural artwork, of which the artist and theme is not known. The panel itself comprises the same material as the facing panels at first floor level, and it has been deliberately sized to fit within the repeating pattern of these panels across the elevation.
Figure 32  Composite image showing the Mathematics Institute (left) and the Physics & Astronomy Building (right). S&B

Figure 33  Example staircase within the Mathematics Institute. S&B

Figure 34  Composite image showing central courtyard of the Physics & Astronomy Building, with feature stair and landscaping. S&B

Figure 35  Entrance area of Physics & Astronomy Building showing recent refurbishment. S&B

Figure 36  Example lecture theatre in Physics & Astronomy Building showing recent refurbishment. S&B
In addition, to the south elevation of the Physics & Astronomy Building there is interesting architectural detailing to the exterior of the principal lecture theatre – representing what is arguably the only element of distinctive design, to be found externally. The copper roof and relief panel clearly delineate what would have been intended as the principal entrance to the lecture theatre. It also shows recognition of the fact that this elevation of the building was always expected to be the most visible, with the principal pedestrian route passing by on the road behind.

### 3.5.3 Chemistry/Purdie Building

Also by William Holford & Partners, the Chemistry Building, since renamed the Purdie Building is broadly contemporary with its neighbours to the east. It has, however, quite different architectural treatment, both in massing and use of materials. The block was originally constructed as a double-cruciform block with a low-level block projecting southwards forming the principal entrance. Unlike the Physics & Astronomy Building, the two principal lecture theatres are not expressed externally, instead being sunk down from the higher entrance level following the drop in ground level. The main architectural feature is again a complex copper roof in the south block, although this lights a large laboratory space.

The Purdie Building uses the same slim cast-stone bricks as found in Physics & Astronomy and Mathematics, but instead of being used as a ‘background material’, where fenestration and pre-cast concrete facing panels are visually layered above, the bricks form the principal element of the elevations. When considered alongside its
greater volume, this flatter elevational treatment renders the block more austere and oddly anachronistic in character.

Again the interiors have been significantly altered as technology and academic demands have changed – this is most notable in the full-height extensions at the end of each wing providing modern ventilation and air extraction. The principal staircase, expressed on the south elevation by the full-height fenestration retains its original character, as does one of the principal lecture theatres.

![Figure 40](image1.jpg) **Figure 40** Sample corridor in the Purdie Building. *S&B*

![Figure 41](image2.jpg) **Figure 41** Principal stair. *S&B*

![Figure 42](image3.jpg) **Figure 42** Refurbished lecture theatre. *S&B*

![Figure 43](image4.jpg) **Figure 43** Original lecture theatre. *S&B*

### 3.6 Andrew Melville Hall

#### 3.6.1 Design Development

It would appear that the overall form of a double-winged block for 250 students was settled upon early in the design stage. Drawings held by the Estates Department show well-developed layouts from 1964 which confirm this. Whilst the overall form is perhaps similar however, the treatment of the floor plan went through subtle, but significant, revisions.

What is particularly interesting about drawings from March 1964 is the early emphasis on the student’s bedrooms – showing the same intention to incline the geometry of the floor plan to give each room a view. However, these early drawings demonstrate that this ‘rotation’ of the student bedroom in the plan was to be at the expense of the central spine corridors, creating extremely unusual and awkward corridors, whilst the study bedrooms all remain a simple rectangle. In the final floor
plan, it is the geometry of the study bedroom that becomes more complex, allowing for more manageable spaces between them.

In addition, between each block of bedrooms (or ‘staircase unit’ as referred to on the plan from March 1964) was to be a change in floor level: each block is shown to be served with its own staircase, as was the case in the final building, but the promenade has a short flight of steps at the boundary between each block. The complexity in section, as well as plan, would have been extraordinary.

The drawings from September of that year give a further hint at the initial generosity proposed for the halls. Two sets of floor plans show the upper floors of both the north and south wings. As with the floor plans from March, regular-shaped bedrooms are shown with complex corridor spaces, further complicated by changes in level between each block. Unlike the March drawings, these floor plans show the full length of each block with one wing, the north wing, being longer than the other – again, as was eventually built. Instead of five blocks of fifty bedrooms however, there appears to be a total of ten staircases (six in the north wing and four in the south), presumably of 25 bedrooms each. The top floor of the north wing was to primarily be set aside for staff and guest accommodation, with both the warden and sub-warden being afforded extremely generous split-level duplex apartments, both with large split-level roof terraces (figure 48).

University Archives

Research in the University of St Andrews Archives alludes to the awkward planning stage of the building, and gives many reasons for its eventual layout.

On the 20th November 1962, a letter from the government University Grants Committee (UGC) was discussed by the University Court session. It informed the University that they were eligible for additional funding for building projects commencing in 1963, chiefly because there seems to have been a government drive to increase the provision of university places. To this end, the Treasury announced the distribution of an additional £5 million to university building programmes, and the letter states that the committee, chaired by Keith Murray, was provisionally prepared to allocate an additional £160,000 for major building work commenced in 1963. The letter requested a note to the UGC, listing proposed building work, and reminding them of “the need to concentrate on schemes which are directly related to the attainment of your 1966-67 student number”.4

The University was already preparing to build on the North Haugh, but at this stage, the site was intended to provide faculty accommodation and not halls of residence. However the need for additional provision of halls is noted in different sets of minutes in 1962 and early 1963, culminating in the decision on the 19th February 1963 to instruct St Salvator’s College Council to provide a report on what new residences should be provided and how many places should be considered.5 The Committee on New Residences was duly established, and they began working on a report. This of course did not relieve the immediate necessity, and in May 1963, the Court instructed that appropriate houses should be bought and converted for student accommodation as they came on the market.6

---

4 University of St. Andrews, Minutes of meetings of the University Court and College Councils 1962-3 (Court minutes) 15
5 Minutes 1962-3 (Court) 50
6 Minutes 1962-3 (Court) 101
"Report of the Committee on New Residences"

The committee produced their report for St Salvator’s College Council in October 1963, and the Council duly met to discuss the findings on the 7th November 1963. The report lays out many principles upon which the new residences were to be conceived, and many details that later became the architect’s brief. The committee of six senior academics, with the Bursar of Residences, resident Architect and a representative of the planning consultants, Sir William Holford and Partners, spent July and August 1963 visiting twelve British universities and inspecting their halls accommodation, and also corresponded with 22 universities in total. They also consulted with the Students’ Representative Council and the Wardens of the Residences.7

The report begins by reiterating the intended expansion of student numbers in the coming decade, and establishes that there are no suitable places of residence for increased numbers of students.8 The report is very clear that the provision of new accommodation should lead the increase in student places in faculties, and not the other way around, because it is argued that living accommodation expands more slowly than that for teaching.9 The tradition of residences at St Andrews is emphasised as “an integral part of the University organism with a vital educational role”, and stresses the social and intellectual benefits of residence living, supported by the findings of the UGC Niblett Report of 1957.10 It argues for the building of large halls residences rather than student houses or purpose-built student flats, though the

---


8 Report of the Committee on New Residences 4. It comments on the decrease in the number of students in lodgings, and the undesirable situation of wealthier students with motor cars residing out of the town.

9 Report of the Committee on New Residences 4

10 Report of the Committee on New Residences 4, 5
increasing development of the former is recommended, especially for mature students.\textsuperscript{11}

There is much discussion of the ideal number of students in a single residence, based on models of social interaction, economic viability, and how many students a single warden of the residence could be expected to know. It concludes that 250 students per residence is a reasonable compromise between the large residences seen elsewhere of 400 students, considered to be too large, and the small existing St Andrews halls of 100. Thus, to accommodate the required number of students, the report proposes four new residences of 250 each, located in a designated area of the North Haugh site (figure 46), and built to a strict time programme (figure 45).\textsuperscript{12}

There is a long discussion on the role, number, accommodation and status of residence Wardens, Deputy Wardens and Sub-Wardens. It is emphasised that the Warden should be an active academic of the University, and unlike the prevailing situation, should be provided with “accommodation on a scale adequate for a married Warden and his family”.\textsuperscript{13} This is to encourage older and married academics to become wardens, and to hold their position for a longer tenure, thereby developing increased understanding of the dynamic of their Residence, and coming to view it as their home rather than a “sufferance”.\textsuperscript{14} The Warden is to have a Deputy, housed in similar accommodation, and four Sub-Wardens housed in single person flats.\textsuperscript{15} Together, it is hoped that these six academics and their families would form a Senior Common Room that would be not only to their own intellectual and social benefit, but to that of the residence itself, with a staff-student ratio of 1:42.\textsuperscript{16} The domestic servants of the residence are to be housed in single rooms similar to those of the students, and there is to be guest accommodation for students’ guests and those of the wardens.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{building_programme_table.png}
\caption{Building Programme table. From “Report of the Committee on New Residences in St. Andrews” October 1963 UoStA}
\end{figure}
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The next sections of the report begin to detail how the residences should be organised in more detail. The case is made for mixed residences, emphasising the social benefits of “rapid maturing of the personality, eliminating ... painful shyness and ... callow stridency of behaviour”. However a degree of separation is assumed, and students are to be accommodated in ten single sex units of 25, grouped in “staircases, or point-blocks, or the like”. It is also emphasised that this arrangement would enable flexibility for the proportion of male and female students in the residence.

The report rejects the use of corridors as “noisy [and] rightly disliked by students as redolent of the barracks and the reformatory”, in line with the Niblett Report recommendations, and preference is expressed for smaller units to increase a sense of individuality and independence. For each unit, a communal pantry, common room and drying room is specified. Communal bathrooms are expected, though it is preferred that in addition wash-basins in all rooms should be provided. All rooms should be single and not shared.

There is a very strong case made for communal dining in a space that can accommodate all students in the residence, along with others with dining rights living in student houses. This is seen as a continuation and strengthening of the St Andrews tradition of dining in hall as a society. A curious space is requested to replace the “old-fashioned large Junior Common Room”; an ante-room to the dining hall, near the main entrance of the residence, presumably intended as a place of meeting, and for the display of notices. Finally, a set of rooms for communal use are listed for each residence including a music room, games room, television room, squash court and library, with a small shop, sanatorium and central stores to serve all four of the new residences.

The report ends with the comment that the requirement to build new residences on the North Haugh “presents the University with a fine chance of gracing St. Andrews with a complex of new buildings of architectural distinction” designed as a single composition. It emphasises that the shortage of time will not allow for the holding of a design competition, and that an architect must be appointed at once, selected not only from Scotland, but beyond.

**Appointment and design**

The Report was widely praised and action was swift. At the next meeting of the Councils on 26th November 1963, a list of potential architects was discussed and the minutes note that the “selection of an Architect was a matter of great urgency”. The list was compiled on advice from Sir William Holford, and after informal approaches, the firms formally met by the committee were the Edinburgh firm of Shaw Stewart, Baikie & Perry, and the three London firms, James Cubitt & Partners, Peter Ednie & Partners, and Stirling & Gowan. There is no record of why these particular firms were selected or why the first three were dismissed. However, at the meeting at Stirling’s London offices, the committee were shown the firm’s projects for Leicester.
University engineering building, a London school assembly hall, and a proposed building for the University of Cambridge faculty of History.\textsuperscript{26} The committee was convinced that there was the capacity and organisational ability coupled with sufficient architectural vision to produce buildings “of the outstanding character the Committee sought”.\textsuperscript{27} On this recommendation, Stirling was duly appointed by the Court on the 1\textsuperscript{st} January 1964.

Given the very pressing need for speed, the Councils recommended to the Court that the usual procedures for decision making, where the Councils would make recommendations for the Court to discuss and approve at their regular meetings, should be abandoned for the sake of speed. The Court agreed that it was sensible for them to be excluded from all detailed discussions, but were to approve final sketch proposals, be notified if the completion date was not going to be met, and if there was any danger of financial overspend.

Stirling worked up proposals between January and the end of March 1964, and presented his sketches, a model and a masterplan to the Committee on New Residences on the 30\textsuperscript{th} March 1964. The Councils were subsequently presented with similar material on the 7\textsuperscript{th} April 1964, when Stirling was again in attendance to answer questions. The proposals were greeted with enthusiasm and Stirling was instructed to proceed with working up the proposals for presentation to the Court. The only reservations were over the proposal to build two of the halls on the upper site, as it was agreed that this was not ideal for the future growth of the estate, and the committee, and subsequently the Court, expressed a preference for further building to occur to the west. When the Court met on the 21\textsuperscript{st} April 1964, they approved the layout of halls 1-4 on the lower site, and authorised Stirling to proceed with drawings.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{plan.png}
\caption{Plan showing intended footprint of the residences, 20\textsuperscript{th} March 1964. North is to the bottom. Presented to the Committee on New Residences on the 30\textsuperscript{th} March. What became Andrew Melville Hall, is shaded and labelled ‘T’. UoSIA}
\end{figure}

There were concerns expressed by Professor Stibbs, the Professor of Astronomy, about the effect of the new halls buildings on the University observatory, located to the south of the proposed site. He queried the proposed height of the buildings and

\textsuperscript{26} Minutes 1963-4 (Councils) 40. The school assembly hall is in Camberwell.  
\textsuperscript{27} Minutes 1963-4 (Councils) 40
was assured that the buildings would follow the contours of site and that the roof line at the top of site would be no higher than the tree tops. He raised the problems of light pollution from cars and the halls themselves, requesting that windows in the south-facing façades be blinded at night by curtains “lined with aluminium-impregnated fabric”.28 His final concern was with exhaust gasses from any boiler house and requested that it be sited as far from the observatory as possible. It is unclear from the minutes to what extent his concerns affected the designs, but his final comment that one of the access roads to the halls should sit half way down the slope, thus cutting through each of Stirling’s ranges was dismissed out of hand, as this “would destroy completely the concept of an integrated group of Halls of Residence – a concept which the Council regards of being of vital importance”.29

On the 23rd November 1964, more detailed proposals were submitted to the Council’s Committee on New Residences. Stirling commented that he had now overcome the previous difficulties associated with the chevron and finger layout, referring to the planning challenges of study bedrooms and circulation spaces, in relatively constricted footprints. In the initial proposals, the study bedrooms along the sides of each range appear as rectangular, with the remaining jagged, polygonal spaces between them filled with staircases and corridors (figure 47). Stirling rationalised this space in later plans by changing the shape of the bedrooms, shaving off 90˚ corners on the inner faces, making the rooms themselves polygonal, rather than the space in between, which was described as a “straight spine”, carefully avoiding the term, corridor (figure 49).30

![Figure 47 Proposed outline plans, extract, August 1964. Note in the wings the square study-bedrooms and polygonal circulation spaces. The plan on the right shows the entrance level, with its anteroom as requested in the 1963 Report, and the kitchens. The plan on the left shows the dining room, with service at the top and High Table at the bottom in the bay.](https://example.com/figure47)

Stirling also pointed out the “establishment of and full exploitation of gallery circulation on a single level corresponding with that of the main entrance”, subsequently referred to as the promenade, again avoiding the term corridor. He demonstrated that the

---
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30 University of St. Andrews, Minutes of meetings of the University Court and college councils 1964-5 (Council of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard and St. Mary’s College minutes) 25
designs accorded fully with the brief, presumably based on the Report of the Committee on New Residences:

i. 250 study bedrooms
ii. Accommodation for Warden, Deputy Warden
iii. 4 Sub-Warden’s sets of rooms
iv. A guest/sick suite of two double and two single rooms
v. 12 domestic staff bedrooms
vi. Refectory for 300
vii. Kitchens
viii. Senior common room
ix. Ancillary accommodation specified

However, no comment is recorded in response to Stirling’s “reduction of staircases to one per fifty rooms (or thereby) instead of one per twenty-five” which contradicts the Report of the Committee on New Residences of a year earlier. This requirement was stipulated on the grounds of accommodating male and female students separately in flexible small units, with their own communal facilities, to emphasise students’ individuality and independence. By reducing the number of staircases, the design was undermining this key factor in the committee’s social and functional ideas for the new residences. However, as the change goes unmentioned in the Minutes, it must have been agreed that the advice of the committee’s own Report was to be ignored for the sake of design or economy.

There was some discussion over the appropriateness for penthouse accommodation for the Warden and Deputy Warden, and “strong views were expressed on both sides”. However, the location was accepted as the most appropriate, probably on architectural rather than social grounds. This discussion seems to reflect a difference between the vision of the Report in its stipulation for provision of married quarters for the Warden and Deputy, and its realisation which was clearly thought too luxurious.

Figure 48 Proposed plans of Warden and Deputy Warden’s flats, September 1964, before revision to polygonal rooms and rationalised circulation spaces. The Warden’s flat to the right has three bedrooms whereas that of the Deputy Warden to the left has only two. It appears that the roof terrace gardens are communal. UoStA

Monk, Stirling’s quantity surveyor, optimistically advised the committee that the plans would fit the budget allowed by the University Grants Committee (UGC) allocation, but commented that they should allow 4.5% in excess of their current limits for increases in building costs in the coming years. The committee considered

31 Minutes 1964-5 (Councils) 25
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33 Minutes 1964-5 (Councils) 26
that savings could be made in the design without reducing the number of bedrooms. Surprisingly, they asked Stirling to have a cheaper second scheme with reduced dining provision, again in direct contradiction to the emphasis on collective dining in their own 1963 *Report*.\textsuperscript{34}

![Figure 49 Proposed plans of promenade level, November 1964. Note in the wings the now polygonal study-bedrooms and rationalised circulation spaces. This plan shows music rooms, a games room, television room, library, guest rooms, Sub Wardens’ rooms, domestic staff dining room, and garages, all as requested in the 1963 Report. UoStA](image)

It was also agreed that the completion date of the beginning of October 1967 was feasible, and that if the UGC agreed, the second hall of residence could be begun in extension of the current contract and completed by the beginning of October 1968. The Court subsequently approved the drawings and agreed that the Council’s committee would now act independently unless serious problems arose.\textsuperscript{35}

One arose almost immediately, and the Court was obliged to become involved. In August 1965, Chancellor of the Exchequer announced funding restrictions that postponed the start date to March 1966, making completion for the beginning of October 1968 impossible.\textsuperscript{36} However, after much argument and an approach by the Principal himself, the decision that the funding restriction would apply to what was then known as Residence I was rescinded, and the UGC gave authorisation for the designs to proceed to competitive tender in February 1966. Optimism was again expressed that completion would be achieved by the beginning of October 1968.\textsuperscript{37}

Tenders were received from five contractors, ranging from £496,310 16s 1d and £553,144 16s, all of which were significantly in excess of the UGC grant allocation of £393,000 even with the addition of Monk’s 4.5%.\textsuperscript{38} Even after deductions for furniture and equipment, covered by a separate grant, garage provision reduced and variations made to wall specifications, the figure remained in excess at £463,566.\textsuperscript{39}
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This figure it was hoped would be accepted by the UGC as reasonable, especially given the high cost of importing labour into St Andrews.

On the 16th May 1966, the UGC rejected the tender. The committee was faced either with abandoning the whole project, which would destroy the plans for University expansion and cost £40,000 in existing fees commitment, or a re-submission to reduce the tender by £20-30,000.40 There was significant time pressure as the already reduced tender acceptance period expired on the 20th May, four days from the date of this meeting on the 16th.

How the tender was reduced is not recorded in the Minutes, but a list of alterations dated April 1967 is present on a drawing of 1966. £25,000 was trimmed off the tender figure, from £469,066 to £444,166, which was accepted by the UGC by mid August 1966 with two conditions.41 The first was the sharing of the refectory of Residence I with the students of Residence II, effectively halving the dining provision for the two residences. It was accepted that this would lead to general self service, and that formal meals in hall would have be served in two sittings. Furthermore, in revising the kitchens, the committee decided that the domestic servants’ dining room would have to be cut, and that in compensation, they would be provided with a common room in the space allocated for Residence I’s library. It was asserted that a better library and common room would be included in the design for Residence II.

Figure 50  Proposed plans of promenade level, February 1966. Note the block of text dated April 1967, following the rejection of the tender by the UGC. It lists alterations to this plan, including substitution of cheaper poured concrete for more expensive pre-cast panels in certain areas, alterations to the arrangement of the kitchens, the omission of external staircases, ramps, and paving of paths. UoStA

The second condition of the UGC was that subsequent residences would have to be cheaper than Residence I. This point had already been conceded by the committee in its meeting in May when they commented that circumstances would demand the abandonment of the original concept of a single and repetitive composition for the

40 University of St. Andrews, Minutes of meetings of the University Court and college councils 1966-7 (Council of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard and St. Mary’s College minutes) 8
41 Minutes 1966-7 (Councils) 9
residences, and that residences II-IV would have to bear “no more than a family resemblance to No. 1”.42

These conditions eroded almost to the point of ridicule the committee’s seemingly long-forgotten 1963 Report, with its stipulation for 250 students in a single residence, the principle of collective dining at the heart of residence life and identity, attacked here for a second time. The generous provision for servants accommodation and a library, lauded as a social centre and “a civilising step”, had been cut.43 The “fine chance of gracing St. Andrews with a complex of new buildings of architectural distinction”, designed as a single composition, was lost. However, the committee had no option but to accept these conditions, and contract work finally began on 22nd August 1966.

3.6.2 Completion

The new halls of residence finally opened in 1968, although it is well known that remedial works to the building continued for many years after. There is a significant amount of archive material held in the University Library referring to ‘arbitration’ – presumably between the client, the University, and contractors.

It seems unlikely however that blame was laid at the door of the architect, as Stirling was commissioned by the University to design a new Crawford Arts Centre in the early 1970s, centred on the smart early-19th Century villa which remains today in University use. The scheme was later abandoned however in favour of a scheme by John Ferrier44.

3.6.4 Contemporary Descriptions of the Building

The following text, written by James Stirling, is an extract from the catalogue accompanying RIAS Drawings Collection exhibition of his work in 1974. It provides invaluable reference to the original design intentions of the building:

The new buildings for St Andrews University are in the north of Scotland where there is no local building material (not even bricks) or workmen (who have all come south). The problem was how to erect a battery of student residences as a continuous building process over a period of six or seven years. The only method which seemed possible was to design a kit of precast concrete elements to be manufactured elsewhere. These are taken to the site where they are lifted directly off lorries by mobile cranes and placed onto the building without touching ground. The factory is in Edinburgh, about eighty miles south of St Andrews. Each building is assembled from a range of precast wall and floor units and there are about thirty-two different moulds which will be re-used for the later buildings. The first building is expensive but the cost should be more economical with the later residences and the overall cost could be similar to that of traditional buildings.

There are 250 students in each residence (both sexes) and the students’ bedrooms are positioned in the fingers which are pointed towards a magnificent view of the North Sea and the Scottish mountains. The non-repetitive accommodation (i.e. dining hall, games rooms, etc.) is located in the web where the fingers join. There is a glazed promenade level about halfway up the building and, from this, internal staircases give access up or down to

42 Minutes 1966-7 (Councils) 9
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the students’ rooms. This promenade is the main artery of circulation and is intended to be the major element of sociability. Off the promenade and adjacent to the staircases are lay-bys containing seats and vending machines. In these areas it is hoped that much of the social life in the residence will take place and, in using the promenade on route to their rooms, every student will inevitably come into contact with everyone else. On the floors above and below the promenade the staircases give onto short, unpleasant corridors (deliberately narrow and under-lit) to the students’ rooms. Sometimes it is necessary to design unpleasant spaces in order to increase the usage of areas where activity is intended. There was an elementary problem of identity inside the internal staircases – at what level does the promenade occur? – how to know when to get out. To help visually locate, large circular holes were cut into the walls of the staircases at promenade level; not an inside/outside window in the normal sense, it is therefore different from the rectangular windows used elsewhere. The sexes change with each staircase though I don’t think the University realise that, as fire exits were required onto the roof, it should be possible for the students to cross over at night unseen. The student’s private room is obviously the most important accommodation in the building and every room has a window angled like an eye towards the view. The angling which is a displacement of the room articulates its position on the façade and therefore, even with a very structurally motivates scheme, we have maintained as fundamental the expression of the most important accommodation.

"Recently, Stirling has extended his design method into prefabricated concrete and plastic. The St Andrew residence for University students makes use of concrete load bearing walls which delineate each student’s room and set up interesting zig-zag patterns. But the organisational clarity remains the same. This scheme is organises around a circulation ‘deck’ midway up the building which unifies the whole scheme and acts a place of meeting, sort of a linear agora which overlooks the social activities outside. Students watch each other and are on display as they walk around the deck. Concerts, soccer, picnics, sunbathing take place in the landscaped area between the two legs of the building."

The significance of the meeting areas to the promenade was underlined by The Observer who commented in 1970 that:

"The promenade is the only route to the other student stacks and to the world outside and three large portholes have been slotted into the internal wall to help students realise they have reached this important level. The promenade has indented lay-bys fitted with bench seats and Stirling visualised this modern cloister and viewing gallery as a meeting area."

Another interesting contemporary discussion took place between the architectural critic and commentator Charles Jencks and James Stirling in the Architectural Association Quarterly in 1972, primarily concentrating on apparent metaphor in the architecture:

"Dear Sir,

Charles Jencks is all balls (AAQ, Summer 1972) if he thinks the St Andrews Residence was designed to look like a ship, anymore than a crotch. Locals have always nicknamed our buildings i.e. Leicester engineering – the waterworks; Cambridge History – the Glasshouse;"

---

45 Jencks, Charles; quoted in the 2nd edition (1976) of the catalogue for the RIBA Drawings Collection exhibition on James Stirling, 1974; p53
46 Hillman, Judy; The Observer colour supplement; 31-May-1970; quoted in the 2nd edition (1976) of the catalogue for the RIBA Drawings Collection exhibition on James Stirling, 1974; p55
Oxford Residence - the multi-storey garage; St Andrews Residence - the battleship; and Jencks is equally banal in using this ‘significance’ for his architectural historicism. I have always considered myself more a neo-classicist than an art nouveauist.

Yours

James Stirling” 47

As a counter-response Jencks supplied the following:

“Dear Sir,

James Stirling loses his argument in the first five words (AAQ, Fall 1972) when he accuses me, metaphorically, of being ‘all balls’, not only because there is more to my… anatomy than that, but really because he, like so many modern architects, would like to suppress all… metaphors and pretend they aren’t there. His reference to St Andrews Residence as a ‘crotch’ has more significance than he would like to admit, and as he cannot deny, (because I and another witness were there) at least one girl resident was highly distressed at having to enter the building ’between its legs’.

Charles Jencks” 48

It would appear therefore that the building was controversial from the very beginning.

3.6.5 Alterations to the Building

A number of alterations have been carried out to the building, both to the interior and exterior. Many of these were related to early remedial works, but other changes have been the result of changing needs of the residents and changing statutory requirements such as fire regulations and HMO regulations.

One of the earliest changes to the building was the alteration of the rooms at the end of each wing at the promenade level. Two common rooms were created using the partitioned-off ends of the promenade, the existing lounge areas in the lay-bys, and the bedroom of each of the sub-warden flats. The living room/kitchen and bathrooms of each of the flats were converted into a sewing room in the south wing and a music room in the north wing. This explains the awkward arrangement of the rooms today as they incorporate both the regular geometry of the promenade and the unusual shape of the bedrooms.

In 1979 further changes were made with a further lay-by being altered, this time to form an additional television room. Drawings held by the University also show an extension to the ‘central catering unit’ – extending the single-storey wing to the north-west.

Problems with heating the building are confirmed with drawings dating to 1986 showing a completely new approach to heating the building with a new boiler house being constructed on the south side of the central block and central heating system being installed throughout. Discussions with staff suggest that the heating system has been replaced no less than three times in the short history of the building49.

There are a number of internal alterations that have been carried out that are not shown on any drawings held by the University. These include the significant alteration to the windows of the promenade, whereby an inner leaf of glazing was

47 Architectural Association Quarterly; Vol.4, No3; 1972
48 Architectural Association Quarterly; Vol.4, No4; 1972
49 Discussions with staff on site visit, 21-Dec-2011
installed – it is likely that the original windows were extremely draughty and this alteration would have made a considerable difference to comfort levels of the building users. It is also likely that the change was required for safety reasons as the window projected from a bench-level upstand. Nevertheless, the additional glazing did alter one of the most interesting characteristics of Stirling’s original design.

Another undated change is the installation of glazed lights to the coffered ceiling in the main refectory. Again this change would appear to have been made to improve the thermal performance of the original rooflights, but the space has been compromised as a result. Further changes, in particular the addition of doors along the promenade and at the base of the grand stair have been necessary as a result of fire regulations – the date these additions were installed is not currently known.

The most recent significant alteration has been the conversion of the lay-bys on the promenade level into communal kitchen areas, with drawings dated 2001 held by the Estates Department. This has been necessary as the catering provided is for 19 meals per week, leaving students to self-cater for lunchtimes at the weekend, and to allow students to self-cater out of hours.

The building has undergone a number of alterations and it would seem that further changes are required to bring the building up to current standards, in particular HMO regulations imposed by Fife Council. Raising expectations of students is also a consideration, with expected levels of thermal comfort, quality of bathroom provision and communal areas all needing to be addressed.

3.6.6 Contemporary Comparators

There are three contemporary projects that have particular relevance to the understanding of Andrew Melville Hall: James Stirling’s projects at the Universities of Leicester, Cambridge & Oxford.

Designed in conjunction with James Gowan, the building was completed in 1963. According to Jonathan Glancey, The Guardian’s architecture critic, the building “remains a shock to the system, a radical design that went against the grain of the genteel modernism that had seeped into these islands like a white mist from the 1930s”50. It is listed by English Heritage at Grade II*

The History Faculty and Library at Cambridge, 1964–7, was possibly one of Stirling’s most controversial buildings – not least with the building users. Having narrowly avoided demolition in the 1980s it is now listed at Grade II.

One of the more popular buildings from this period of Stirling’s work is Queen’s College Oxford’s Florey Building, a halls of residence for students at the College. Just as Andrew Melville Hall was orientated and constructed to take advantage of the views over the North Haugh, the Florey Building was constructed to afford each resident with views over the adjacent river. The focus on corridors, rather than stairs, being the focus point for students also fosters a sociable atmosphere, which is popular with students and highlights another similarity with Stirling’s concerns at St Andrews. It is listed at Grade II.

Collectively, these three buildings are known as Stirling’s ‘Red Trilogy’51 – a consecutive set of university buildings that share some characteristics and design details with each other and with the Andrew Melville Hall, but are nevertheless
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51 Berman, Alan; Jim Stirling and the Red Trilogy - Three Radical Buildings
distinct examples of Stirling’s architecture. Like with Andrew Melville Hall, each of the buildings is site-specific and reacts to the demands, and opportunities, of each site: for example the multiple entrances to the History Faculty Library being a consequence of its location at a junction of many pedestrian routes, or the previously mentioned river at the Florey Building.

A common theme with all of these projects, and one that will be understood in the context of Andrew Melville Hall, is the issue of major maintenance issues that are directly related to their novel and complex design. As Glancey suggests: “sadly, many of Stirling’s early buildings – including Leicester, the History Library at Cambridge, and the Florey Building for Queen’s College, Oxford – were shoddily built.”

3.7 Later Buildings

3.7.1 Physical Education/Sports Centre

Designed by the Newcastle-Upon-Tyne firm of Williamson, Faulkner-Brown & Partners between 1967-69, the building is situated to the north of the University Playing Fields on the higher ground behind New Hall. It provides facilities for both University students and staff and the general public.

The same architectural practice went on to complete the new University Library behind North Street in 1976 (as Faulkner-Brown Hendy Watkinson Stonor).

3.7.2 Greenhouses (Demolished)

The date of construction of the greenhouses is uncertain - but they date to between 1966-7 and 1974-7 as they are shown on the OS map series of the latter date. The greenhouses, along with surrounding service yard, were used by the Estates Department to maintain the surrounding grounds. The greenhouses were demolished to allow for the construction of the Library Store (see 3.7.8).

3.7.3 John Honey Building - Computer Science Centre

Also designed by Williamson, Faulkner-Brown & Partners, the single-storey wedge-shaped computer science building was completed in 1971, with plans held by the University for the showing planning approval by St Andrews Burgh Council in 1970.

3.7.4 Fife Park

Built in in 1972, Fife Park consists of 42 terraced houses, each comprising six individual study bedrooms with communal kitchen. The architect of the development is unknown, but it is possible that the St Andrews practice of Cunningham Jack Fisher Purdom who designed the adjacent David Russell Hall blocks, and who were involved in a number of other University projects were involved.

---

Planning permission was granted in 2009 for redevelopment of the site (figure 52). This includes an initial phase of new residential blocks to allow for decanting of the existing Fife Park houses to allow for their demolition without loss of overall accommodation. Once complete, the redeveloped ‘New Fife Park’ will house a total of 772 students – a marked increase on the 252 accommodated in the existing buildings. The architects are Halliday Fraser Munro who also designed the new David Russell Apartments (see 3.7.10).

![Figure 52 Site plan showing proposed redevelopment of Fife Park. UoStA.](image)

3.7.5 *Science Units*

Designed by Wheeler and Sproson of Kirkcaldy, plans are held by the University dating to August 1983.
3.7.6 **New Hall**

New Hall opened in 1993 and currently provides over 500 en-suite bedrooms in both catered and self-catering accommodation. The four-storey building was designed by Wheeler & Sproson and is arranged around three enclosed courtyards which sit asymmetrically on either side of a projecting single-storey central block housing communal dining and recreation facilities. Glen L Pride describes the building as “sprawling” and suggests “a hint of the penitentiary, accented by ‘guard towers’ and wrought-iron enclosures.” 53
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3.7.8 Centre for Biomolecular Sciences Building

![Figure 55](image1.jpg) General view of the Biomolecular Sciences Building. S&B

Designed by Boswell Mitchell & Johnston, the BMS Building opened in 1998 and was formally opened by the then First Minister Donald Dewar in November of that year. It abuts the Purdie Building to the north, enclosing the northern courtyard. Although the building can be argued to have dated remarkably quickly (perhaps even being so when completed), it received fairly positive reception, with the updated edition of the RIAS Architectural Guide stating that “its colour cladding with bold curves and projections shock, but show vitality.”

3.7.9 Gateway Building

![Figure 56](image2.jpg) General view of the Gateway Building. S&B

Designed by Davis Duncan Harold, the Gateway Building was not originally built as a University building, but was constructed by the private firm St Andrews International Ltd in partnership with the University who owned the land. The building was intended to be used as a visitor centre and private clubhouse, with a museum space provided for the University. The project suffered financial problems and although largely completed in 2000, did not open for business. The building stood empty until 2004 when it was purchased by the University who altered the building for use by the School of Management.

Prior to construction starting, in 1999, “desk-based assessment and field evaluation was commissioned... The field evaluation included trial trenching and a resistivity survey. The field evaluation revealed human remains in the form of two graves located c 0.7m below the current ground level; these remains were excavated.”

Conversations with the architect David Harold, formerly of David Duncan Harold, revealed that at a later stage in the design process, the firm was asked to look at possible ways to develop westwards from the Gateway building. This work was
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commissioned by Scottish Enterprise Fife who saw the opportunity to locate technology businesses, start-ups and business incubators on the site. The conclusion was that the building could be extended westwards as a series of pavilions facing the A91. These could be linked with bridges or an extension of the terrace. It was also noted that there was an overall strategic masterplan for the site produced by RMJM, at the request of Fife Council.

David Harold is now at Halliday Fraser Munro who designed the David Russell Apartments and are the architects for the redevelopment of Fife Park (See 3.7.10).

3.7.10 David Russell Apartments

Designed by Halliday Fraser Munro, David Russell Apartments were completed in phases between 2003 and 2006, and formally opened by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown, in February 2007. The accommodation is primarily arranged in apartments of five single study bedrooms with self-catering facilities.

The current development replaced the earlier David Russell Hall blocks which date to 1971. These were designed by the St Andrews firm of Cunningham Jack Fisher Purdom. This consisted of 21 three-storey split-level blocks arranged symmetrically on a north-west to south-east axis. The arrangement focused on a central communal building that was topped with a distinctive spire. One identical block was built by the same firm next to Southgait Close in the centre of St Andrews which was demolished in the 1990s.

3.7.11 Jack Cole Building – Computer Science

The Jack Cole Building was completed in 2004 and was formally opened by the First Minister Jack McConnell the following year. The building was recently described by the architectural commentator Miles Glendinning as “excessively low” and “flimsy”.

3.7.12 Library Store

Constructed on the site of Estates Department greenhouses, the recently completed (2009) library annexe was designed by the multi-disciplinary firm James Barr.
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3.7.13 Medical and Biological Science Building/New Bute Medical School

This is the most recently-completed building on the North Haugh and was designed by the Edinburgh practice Reiach and Hall. The building continues the theme of enclosed collegiate courtyards, and further emphasises the trend towards the re-orientation of the North Haugh to the north-facing frontage. Designed in the distinctive “restrained modernism” of Reiach and Hall, the building has met with great acclaim, and is arguably the most successful architectural addition to the North Haugh since the completion of the Andrew Melville Hall. The building was a finalist in the RIAS Andrew Doolan Award for Architecture in 2010, as was the practice’s earlier Arts Faculty building for the University in 2008.

3.7.14 Biomedical Sciences Building

Figure 61 CAD view showing new Biomedical Sciences Building currently under construction. UoStA

Figure 62 General view showing the Purdie Building (left) with the Biomedical Science Building under construction (right) and the 1983 Science Units in the foreground. S&B

---

Ibid.
Currently under construction is an extension to the existing Centre for Biomolecular Sciences (figure 62). This is a three-storey laboratory building that has been conceived as a further wing from the east end of the Purdie Building. It will be linked to the existing Centre for Biomolecular Sciences via a link bridge.

3.7.15 Energy and Innovation Centre

Also designed by Boswell Mitchell & Johnson is the Energy and Innovation Centre, which was granted planning permission in late 2009. This will mirror the Biomedical Sciences Building in that it is a new four-storey wing projecting from the west end of the Purdie Building. The proposal met with some criticism from the St Andrews Preservation Trust who were critical of the overall design and argued the development was "another example of the piecemeal development which the University of St Andrews is carrying out at the North Haugh", yet the design clearly completes this ‘block’, and further establishes the building line to the north.

(Return to Table of Contents)
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4.0 CHARACTER AREA ASSESSMENT

Figure 63 Site plan showing character areas of study area. A larger version is shown in Appendix II. S&I
4.1 Character Area 1: Land to West

This is an area of open parkland which is surrounded by tree belts to the north and south. The land at the centre is generally flat and contains substantial pond. The ground rises to the south towards some fields at the head of the bank. To the west there are views into a tree covered estate.

The tree belt to the north against the main road into St Andrews from the north west A91 provides effective screening and coniferous belt although vehicles and vehicle noise are still evident.

Along the eastern edge are mounds of soil, possibly from excavation works carried out for the construction of Andrew Melville Hall. At the north eastern corner is an area of woodland which surrounds a University Estates Department service yard. At the north west corner of the site is a flat triangular area with an informal grouping of apparently specimen trees, generally about 20 – 30 years old. The western boundary is an estate wall about 2m high built of rubble stone with semi-circular roughly hewn copes.

The condition of the land is fair. A man-made pond has been created.

The character is of open, tended mown grass. The pond is attractive, and from map evidence would appear to date from the mid-1980s. The character to the north-western triangle is of a meadow with medium sized trees. There is a change in ground use between mown grass and untended grass along the line of a ditch to the north-west of the pond. There is also a grassy bank along the western end of this ditch.

The setting of this area is not particularly visible apart from the estate quality of the land to the west.

It was originally intended that other Andrew Melville Hall blocks would be set within this character area. The character of this area does suggest an empty landscape left ready for development which has never occurred.

Views out from this area are relatively restricted. To the south there is a dip at the horizon but this does not give views towards further countryside. The roofs and outlines of halls of residence buildings are visible in the distance. Views in other directions are restricted by trees. The view eastwards is into character area 2 and comprises a group of buildings with Andrew Melville in the foreground and the rambling architecture of New Hall placed centrally within the view. The skyline in this eastwards view, however, includes University Hall with its Scots Baronial outline.

Views into this character area are very limited. The view from the main road has been deliberately blocked by a belt of coniferous trees.

Recommendations

The recommendations for this area are that it could sustain more development. This need not be a copy of the design that James Stirling originally intended for it. However, some of the elements of Andrew Melville Hall would need to be repeated in order to form a harmonious transition between Andrew Melville Hall and this character area. These characteristics would be building height, the way the building sits on and into the hill, the general orientation of the buildings, colour, and complexity. It would not be necessary or desirable to copy the detailing of Andrew Melville Hall but the presence of large and soon to be listed building does suggest
that the design of the new building within this character area might reflect the scale and layout of James Stirling’s original scheme. The larger trees in the area to the north-west should be retained. A full survey should be undertaken to establish the species, character and value of the trees in this area.

4.2 Character Area 2: The North Haugh

This is a large character area which occupies the main part of the lower level of the north Haugh site. To the eastern edge is the line of the former railway track passing from Leuchars to St Andrews. The embankment for this railway track still survives. To the south is another bank which runs along the full length of the site.

Along the northern part of the site is coniferous planting which screens the site from the main road, except at its eastern end. The northern part of this site is largely taken up with car parking set within mown grass banks and mounds. The southern part of this site is a band of buildings with Andrew Melville Hall and New Hall to the west, and University departments in the eastern part. The one building which does not fit in with this general arrangement is the Gateway Building. This building was built as a separate speculation and then bought by St Andrews University.

Generally, the buildings form a broad curve of developed area. When originally built it was intended that the buildings would face towards an access path or road at the head of the bank to the south. This original intention is now nearly obsolete. The main doors of the University departments still face south but most of the access is now from the car parks to the north. New Hall has its main access to the north and it turns its back on the original access arrangement. Andrew Melville Hall is now approached from the north. Its architecturally audacious main door to the south remains, although only as a fire escape.

The area has a pleasantly open character, particularly in the northern part. The character of the buildings is not so successful. Andrew Melville Hall was intended to set architectural standards of quality across the whole group. Subsequent buildings are not to the same standard and the lack of visual planning and a number of ad hoc alterations to new buildings across these band of buildings has led to a general untidiness across the whole area.

Two of the better buildings in character area terms are more recent ones. The extension to the medical block by Reiach & Hall which has recently been completed is a high quality building. It responds well to the earlier parts of the building that it is attached to and it forms a strong architectural edge at the eastern end of the building group. This building sets a new standard for future development across the whole North Haugh site.

The Gateway Building stands to the north of the main band of development. It was possibly intended to act as an object building within the open landscape but its main face is the curved part to the east and north. It is a surprisingly successful design because it forms a clear built statement which becomes visible as an introduction to the North Haugh and to the University in general where the tree belt ends in views from the main road.

The Purdie Building (chemistry) and New Hall are less successful architecturally, either in themselves or as a group. The extension to the chemistry building introduces materials and detailing which look out of place in this setting. It is essentially urban architecture which does not respond well to the open character of
the land that it faces. The New Hall building fails in a different way, being a very large building which is built of a number of small parts. It is an amorphous and unfocussed design. To the north are a series of shallow gables and blocks over the common areas at the main entrance. The building materials – concrete tile roof and blockwork walls – do not respond well to the open setting.

There is a stark contrast between this essentially conservative architecture of New Hall and the forward looking, complex and inventive Modernism of Andrew Melville Hall. Both buildings are set against trees. The gaps between the main accommodation blocks and the common room blocks of Andrew Melville Hall allow a much more attractive profile.

There is very little visible in the surrounding setting of this character area. There are generally bands of trees around the north and south boundaries. Further east there is some setting to the south with a row of stone built substantial houses with mullioned windows, tall chimneys, and in some cases, extravagant Baronial detail along Kenendy Gardens. These houses are set at the head of the bank and form prominent view closers when seen between University buildings.

The main views out from the character area are from the head of the bank along the southern edge. The views to the north from the south eastern corner are important because they provide views towards the Firth of Tay.

This corner of the site is particularly important because it is the access point for the main pedestrian links between the North Haugh site and the centre of St Andrews. On approaching the site the pedestrian sees some of the best views on the site over the University buildings and over the Old Course Club House, and obtains distant views to the north.

The most important view into the site is looking eastwards from the main road. This view, as one approaches St Andrews, comprises the outline of the centre of St Andrews in the distance with the Gateway Building becoming prominent in views across playing fields beyond the eastern end of the main screening tree cover.

The view to the north is an impressive one with the hills in Angus in the distance. In the foreground is the car parking area surrounded by grassy edging, beyond is the Old Course Clubhouse.

To the east of Kennedy Gardens, at the south eastern corner of the site, is the ground around the St Andrews Museum. This is hidden in views within the character area by a two metre high wall. There is relatively little impact between the St Andrews Museum buildings and any of the buildings on the North Haugh site.

The views from Kennedy Gardens, the flat roofs of the physics and astronomy, and mathematics building are at eye level. The service storey of the medical building cuts through the distant horizon.

The lower buildings between mathematics and chemistry have flat, light grey, roofs. These are much more prominent because they are on low buildings and so take up a larger area visually. There is an opportunity here for taller buildings.

The overall impression of this character area is of confident, contemporary University buildings within a setting largely given over to car parking. This is a good initial impression for the University and for the town of St Andrews, although the impression is weakened as other buildings further west come into view.
The landscaping around the car parking areas has been carefully considered and designed.

The views north-south between buildings and the built strip towards individual houses on Kennedy Gardens should be retained but this does not inhibit development up to the same height as the gateway building between the maths building and the chemistry building.

Initially, the buildings appear to have been built as pavilions within the landscape with their main entrances facing towards the access route to the south. This has led to a “ragged” series of backs to these buildings facing north where some buildings extend further north than others. The development so far has failed to produce a consistent building line. Subsequent development has filled in some of these back areas but only recently has development begun to create a group or line of buildings which is as strong as the original line of the buildings facing south was intended to be.

Although still a pedestrian route, the route along the south edge of the site has become the back of the buildings. Despite some prominent architectural details, such as the maze like sculpture clasped between two copper clad buttress forms on the south edge of the lecture theatres of the Physics & Astronomy Building and the copper clad angular roof form on the chemistry building the main impression of these buildings is now to the north.

**Figure 64** Upper part of lecture theatre and entrance expressed with copper roof and relief panel. S&B

*Recommendations*

The recommendations for this character area are to find a way of exploiting its best characteristic – the quality of the Andrew Melville Hall and the Biomolecular Sciences building, and the views from the site – in a way which addresses its poorer quality – the variable standards of design in the developed band of buildings to the south and an uncoordinated appearance between buildings. This is possibly at its most stark to the west between urban, glass clad extension of the Chemistry Building, to the Post Modern New Hall. The contrast in appearance, positioning on the site and architectural quality is also stark at the western end between New Hall and Andrew Melville Hall. There is little that can be done about this unfortunate contrast.

Elsewhere, improvements can be made to the north sides of the North Haugh buildings by further development. Development could help to emphasise the edge of the built strip. The buildings within the built strip are too closely placed to give the impression of isolated architectural elements within parkland. The southern edge of this character area is fully developed land.

If the original intention is that the university buildings should appear as either isolated pavilions within a green landscape, this intention has been now irretrievably lost by development and extensions around the original buildings. Future masterplanning based on the concept of pavilions within green space would no
longer be relevant to the existing pattern of development. Masterplanning is possibly more likely to be successful as groups of buildings massed together to respond to the way that the developed strip has become rather than its original intention.

![Figure 65](image)

**Figure 65** Upper part of lecture theatre and entrance expressed with copper roof and relief panel. S&B

Development should be similar in height to the Gateway Building and the new medical block by Reiach & Hall. These blocks also set a suitable design standard for materials and design character set by these buildings. Development should form a new, stronger, edge to the north. The area to the north east of New Hall could be developed, including developing over the common areas to form a stronger edge in this area. Development on the site would help to hide New Hall and provide greater emphasis to Andrew Melville Hall at the western end of the line of buildings across the southern part of the character area.

Development is possible to the west or south of the gateway building without detracting from its significance or the significance of the campus. At a later stage than the main design, Davis Duncan Harold were asked to look at possible ways of developing westwards from the gateway building. This was commissioned by Scottish Enterprise Fife. It was intended to locate technology, businesses, start ups and incubation of business on this site. The aim was to sponsor and encourage high tech businesses. The response was that the building could be extended westwards as a series of pavilions with the main face towards the A91. Although it would be difficult to extend the whole face of the west side of the Gateway building, it was considered feasible to link a series of bridges into this side. The terrace could be extended across the north side of the new development.

4.2.1 **New Hall**

This is a long building, generally four storeys high, built of blockwork with concrete tile roofs. Along the southern edge are the main blocks of halls of residence. These blocks have four storey blocks projecting northwards.

In the area to the north are low pitched roofed single storey blocks which contain the dining hall and other social areas of the halls of residence.

The main south block is symmetrically arranged around a boiler chimney. The main decorative element are low pitched dormers like pediments and the circular tops of semicircular fronted stair towers at the northern end of each block.
The condition of this building appears fair. There is some staining on the block work. Some efflorescence is forming at joints.

The building is not particularly good in appearance but is apparently a well used and successful halls of residence in terms of its comfort and function.

**4.2.2 Purdie Building (Chemistry)**

This building comprises a rectilinear group of blocks. The original block contained a strong east-west block which has had a block added to extend it northwards. To the south are generally two storey blocks with lecture theatres. The main eastwards block is four storeys high plus a plant storey. A metal clad building for ventilator plant has been added at either end of the main east-west block. Most of the original architectural intent is in the south blocks and includes a copper clad bay, the main entrance which has a porch standing on columns, and a copper clad roof over seminar rooms with multiple angles.

A new block has been built across the north side and a further block is currently being constructed across the eastern side. The north block is faced with glass and light brown block work.

The aesthetic qualities of the chemistry building are relatively minimal. The aesthetic qualities of the extension are possibly misjudged and too urban for the setting.

The condition of the building is apparently fair.

The context of the building is that it has its main entrance to the south. There is a further entrance at lower level to the eastern side of the south block which faces onto a rectangular area of grass with some parking.

Some extensions and alterations are possible to this building without affecting the overall significance of the site.

**4.2.3 St Andrews New Technology Centre**

This is a brick built, single-storey building. It has a grey felt roof and brown/purple brick walling material.

This is a relatively cheaply built construction used as offices.

Its context is University buildings to the east and west, and a further single storey building to the north. The building is of neutral, possibly negative, significance.

Redevelopment is possible, even desirable, on this site.

**4.2.4 Computer Science Building**

This is a building built of purple brown bricks. It has an advanced fascia on the north side and horizontal ribbing. The fascia is supported by columns which are detached from the main block of the building.

The building is wedge shaped in plan. This building has considerably more architectural intent than the building to the south of it. However, in terms of the entire North Haugh, the site could accommodate a taller building.

**4.2.5 Jack Cole Building School of Computer Science**

This is a relatively recent, two storey building with rendered walls and a mix of metal and timber cladding. It has a variety of contemporary mannerisms but little overall coherence. The entrance is modest and faces south near the south west corner.
The side facing north is the purest side. The building looks small in comparison with its neighbour to the east.

Redevelopment of this building is desirable because it could strengthen the built edge facing the parkland to the north.

**4.2.6 Mathematics Institute**

This is a three storey building with rendered walls. It was built in the late 1960s and has groups of windows generally arranged in horizontal bands. It is connected to the physics building with a curving bridge.

The entrance to the building is from the south with a bridge connecting to the front entrance which is in the middle of the three storeys. Above the door is the original sign “Mathematical Institute”. This south side is more artistically composed than the other sides with a series of vertical panels containing the windows on the top storey and divided by concrete aggregate faced panels. The ground floor has horizontal bands with small horizontal cast stone blocks.

The building remains in its original use. It is a quadrangle. There is some planting in the central garden.

The context of the building is generally car parking. It is set on the level below the main approach which is over a bridge from the south. South of the building is a terraced area which is shared with the grander entrance to the physics and astronomy building. It is possible that a similar building was intended to the west so that the mathematical institute would have been sat as a pavilion flanked by larger buildings to either side, although this is not shown on any drawings. This sort of relationship between the buildings is still possible if the technology centre were redeveloped.

The condition of the building seems to generally be fair. The roof was not inspected.

**4.27 Physics and Astronomy**

This is a large building built around quadrangles. This form has been continued with the construction of the medicine and sciences building to the north and north east.

The main original front faces south west towards a courtyard in front of the mathematics building. The walling material is small cast stone block of light fawn colour. This type of block has also been used for retaining walls around the stairs and paths to the south west in the area which is used to access the original front door.

The building is built in the bank to the south where it reduces to one storey at the back of the lecture theatre. The original landscape context for the physics building generally remains relevant.

The original south west entrance continues to be used as the main entrance. The medicine and life sciences building sets a new arrangement with its main door facing north towards the central spine road through the North Haugh.

The interior contains the lecture theatres, foyer and social areas. Some original elements survive, such as the original stairs, together with lockers and cupboards in some of the main corridors, and an oddly contrived arrangement of padded partition walls at the entrance to Lecture Theatre B.

The building has considerable problems with insulation and ventilation which must be addressed if it is to have a sustainable future. There are also considerable issues with the external cladding system which will need to be addressed.
4.2.8 Medical and Life Sciences Building

The new medical and life sciences building is the same basic height as the physics and astronomy building to which it is attached, but it has a further storey height plant volume on its roof. The medical sciences building forms a further quadrangle with the original front of the physics building. It is a new and elegantly designed building with a well resolved architecture of horizontal windows and bands at the level of each floor. The design of the secondary buildings, such as bin stores, gates and structures within the courtyard, is also well handled. This building is both the school of medicine and the school of biology.

The building appears to be in good condition.

The context of the building has been carefully handled. To the east is a car park with good quality landscaping, and to the north is also car parking but shaped in a curving form relating to the Gateway Building to the north.

4.2.9 Gateway Building

A drum shaped three storey building with a basement level not generally expressed in the main views from the north and east. The building presents a curving facade towards the roundabout and is the most prominent building on the site. It has a good visual relationship with the new medical school to the south. The medical school forms a strong planar response which contrasts with the cylindrical form of the gateway building.

The building is clad in stone and has some horizontal bands of windows. It is a good example of a particular late 20th century style derived from Post Modernism. Its overwrought quality is attractive and is a foil to the subtle and understated quality of the newly constructed medical school. Apart from the drum shape, the building has fins which contain staircases. These staircases are cleverly detailed. The west and south faces are the least important in this design. This might suggest that these sides could sustain further development. The west side of this building could be increased in an extension. To the south there is an opportunity to construct a building between this building and the buildings or sites for buildings between the chemistry and medicine.

The building is used as offices, rooms for student study, a cafe, museums, and exhibition rooms. Although not entirely designed for this purpose, it has found a suitable use.

The context of the building is mown grassland to the east and north. To the north east is the roundabout, and the vehicle entrance to the North Haugh site. There are three terraces in a circular form in front of the building which extend the architecture of the building into the landscape. To the west is a terrace which is not used and a function room at lower level. There is an opportunity for development on this site immediately to the west of the Gateway Building.

The least attractive side of this building is to the south. This means that it has a different orientation to the other buildings. The inconsistency of orientation of the buildings on the North Haugh site is a substantial contributor to the general confusion and incoherence of planning across the character area.
4.2.10  **Andrew Melville Hall**

**Description**

Designed by James Stirling, the Andrew Melville Hall is a V shaped building with two accommodation block and communal accommodation, such as dining room, upper and lower common rooms at the central point of the “V”.

The principal entrance to the building was originally intended to be from the west at the highest level. There is a small sweep with a driveway and at entrance porch which was the top of a corridor/stairway which descends to the levels below. The porch is cleverly detailed with columns externally becoming columns inside but with the internal columns surrounded by glazing. There are well established trees around the porch which suggest that the way that the rest of the building is hidden in these views from the south is intentional.

The building is only a quarter of the scheme as intended and the access would have continued across the higher ground behind the buildings, presumably with similar low key entrance.

The building is built at the foot of the bank with the top of the bank being the same height as several levels of accommodation. The lowest levels are part basement to the east. The building steps up in four major level changes to the highest area of accommodation at the west ends of the residential blocks.

The exterior facing is generally concrete in panels with diagonal ribs. In the main accommodation block elevations the ribbed panels are dominant with only the service blocks to the west and the parapet being in flat faced cast concrete. Each of the bedrooms is expressed as an angled block with its larger window facing northwards towards the view of the sea.

The building is orientated towards views to the north towards St Andrews Old Course and the Firth of Tay beyond.

The windows were aluminium framed and have a light matt grey colour. All of the windows to the students’ accommodation bedrooms have been replaced but with a frame which is possibly quite similar to the original colour. The size of the frame is probably broader and this has led to a slight coarsening of the architecture. Around each frame is a black band, now a plastic material but possibly originally painted timber.

The main access level is the third level up from the east end. This is the level where the main stair arrives at a foyer at the south west corner of the plan. Throughout the inner faces of the V shape this level is expressed differently to the rest of the accommodation blocks with a corridor. The columns have the same glazing outside them as the entrance. An important part of the architecture of the building is in the difference in elevational treatment between the linear and close rhythm of the vertical glazing bars compared with the rigid concrete panels above and below set at an angle to the main structural plane of the architecture.

Above the glazed corridor there is a flashing which is possibly zinc or possibly copper.
Figure 66  General view. S&B

Figure 67  North wing viewed from roof of south wing. S&B

Figure 68  Elevation of north wing. S&B

Figure 69  Interior of promenade. S&B

Figure 70  Interior of promenade. S&B

Figure 71  Typical view from upper level. S&B
The angular nature of the concrete panels is further complicated by the window panels being set on a different angle to the wall planes. The smaller window to each bedroom is set on the line of the structural plane of the wall, while the larger is cut as a chamfer off the angled plane projecting out from the wall. The two windows are placed next to each other, for adjacent rooms, so that they appear as one glazing unit set into each internal angle.

This rhythm of angled windows is powerful architecture and is the strongest and most characteristic element of the building. When seen from the north, the impression is of a great extent of windows facing the viewer. The view from the south west and south east is the opposite, with most of the windows hidden and the concrete panels being the dominant characteristic.

The roof surfaces are not seen generally. They are not seen from higher ground to the south where they are hidden by parapets.

The interior of the building focuses on the foyer area and the porters lodge, which is at the western end of the north wing. At this point, the principal access corridors are visible in both wings, together with the stairs up to the dining room and beyond to the original entrance bridge. This is the access point for common room, dining room, and senior common room. Within each wing there are blocks of bedrooms like tenements reached by individual stairs. In the north wing there are three individual blocks and in the south wing two – blocks A and B. The stairs are expressed to the principal corridor by cast concrete screens with large circular windows. Between the stairs were recesses for common areas which have now been glazed in to form kitchens.

Within the central part of the north part of the V, also at corridor level, is an internal triangular porch which is a later addition. This forms the storm porch for the north door which leads down some shallow steps along a path towards the car park to the north.

These principal corridors give the main internal character of the building and have the same significance as the exteriors. Doors have been introduced across them.

At the eastern end of these corridors study rooms have been created in areas formerly occupied by bedrooms. The study room in the north wing has a small library.

In the stairs most of the original detail remains. The stairs are cast concrete and are independent from the walls next to them. The original tubular handrail and balustrade detail survives, but mesh panels have been attached in order to meet contemporary safety standards. The stairs have walls built of concrete block with the joints pointed flush and painted. The doors continue the circle motif, originally with two circles per door, although some have been replaced with a single upper circle. Although denied by Stirling, this circle motif suggests a “nautical” theme which, along with the ship like quality of the two main blocks, has led to the building being nicknamed ‘the battleship’. This reference is a post design interpretation and the use of strong geometric forms is more likely to be from the influence of other architects such as Louis Kahn. The student bedrooms are complicated in shape – a rhombus – but simple internal design with recesses for cupboards. There are fitted cupboards to all rooms except the guest bedrooms.

The main character of the central building is in the glazing with slightly chamfered sides, and in the views northwards.
The dining room has retained its original furnishing and has its kitchen and servery to the east. The southern part, by far the majority area, has a deeply coffered ceiling rising to a grid of lightwells. There are striplights set within each coffer.

In the bedrooms the main lighting seems to have been by a bedside or desk lamp socket, and a strip light set above the cupboard unit.

The building has been altered internally. Almost all of the alterations are additions to the original structure which leave the original building visible. There have been some alterations to student rooms and bathrooms, and more alterations are proposed. The significant areas are the corridors. These have been altered by the addition of double doors which stand open, a service duct in the ceiling, the glazing in of the recesses to form kitchens, and by the installation of a glazed screen within the original projecting outer glazed screen. The colouring of the painted concrete of columns, ceilings and the walls in the stairs has been altered many times during the life of the building and is now generally off-white. The original colours are not known.

The lobbies at the north and south west doors are also alterations. It is possible that the division of the main stair down from the original entrance to the south to the foyer was also an alteration, although the detailing suggests that it would have been a relatively early alteration.

Around the foyer area is vertical butt-joined timber panelling which seems to be largely original and complete. The same is the case in the dining room. The main alteration to the dining room has been the introduction of glazed panels close to the lower edge of each of the coffers. This has been done to improve heat retention.

All of these alterations, although visible, change the overall character of the building relatively little and do not hide its original architecture. The alteration which most compromises the original architectural design is the insertion of glazed lights into the coffered ceiling of the dining room.

Use

The building is used as a hall of residence. It is used in a similar way to the original intention. There have been some alterations to the original staffrooms to provide more student accommodation. Originally the warden, deputy warden, cook and other staff lived in the building but their flats at the highest levels of the accommodation wings to the south have been converted to provide further accommodation for students. The guest rooms are also now used for full time student accommodation.

Condition

The condition of the building is fair but with some fundamental problems that will need to be addressed. The roof is now covered with a long-lasting, bituminous based membrane. Each of the angular projections from the accommodation blocks has its own triangular roof. This is expressed with a vertical band on the front face. This is now also covered with a bituminous material like sarna, although the original material was probably a metal cladding with seams, such as lead, zinc or stainless steel.

The exterior walls are faced with large concrete cladding panels cast with diagonal ribs. These cladding panels are reinforced concrete. The direction of the diagonal ribs changes for each level of cladding. It means that the water staining does not form a single diagonal pattern across the building which would have been more disfiguring than the current staining. Most of the panels are stained from rainwater washing.
over the panels and causing darker streaks. The ribs on the concrete panels have guided the streaks into a diagonal pattern. This pattern of staining does not look attractive and does not enhance the building, as it might do in a building faced with stone, but neither is it particularly disfiguring. In several places the front face of the concrete cladding has spalled away to reveal rusting reinforcement bars behind. In these locations, the reinforcement bar seems surprisingly close to the surface. This might be an error when the panels were cast.

Windows and doors are generally in good condition having been replaced relatively recently within the life of the building.

In many places, particularly around the lower windows, rusting reinforcement is showing through the concrete. This will require repair. Moss build up and stained concrete could be left in place if it is not causing damage. Some of the triangular panels at the foot of elevations have been displaced relative to their original positions and need to be set back in place. Individual concrete elements need to be replaced or repaired in situ almost universally over the whole building. However, it would be important to understand whether the cladding panels themselves are damaged or if their fixings are suspect or rusting. Clearly this will have a fundamental effect on the approach to the repair of the building.

In order to assess the repair requirements for this building, a detailed, elevation by elevation survey is needed to identify the amount of repair to each damaged panel.

The single storey addition buildings built of brick on the east side of the common room block are in fair condition except for some decay in the doors.

Some elements of external joinery are in poor condition, notably the southernmost door on the west external side of the west block.

The principal aspect of the condition of the interior is the ongoing problem with condensation which is a result of cold-bridging.

Context

The building has open ground to the north and east. The area to the east is fairly narrow. The building design stresses the importance of enclosing a strip of parkland between its north and south wings. This contains some landscaping elements - a single tree - and a mound of earth to the south. The landscaping to the west is less carefully designed because, when formed, it was possibly intended to be temporary until the later blocks of similar design were completed.

The areas to the south east and south west are the back or service areas of the building. To the south east, the area has been used for additional boiler buildings. To the south west are kitchen stores and the current access. It is unfortunate that the main vehicular access into the building is through the service yard. Most students walk to the building from the closest car park which is an attractive walk between the two arms of the building up to the central block. The original route into the building from higher level is not used. Again, this is unfortunate because it was one of the cleverest and most successful visual elements of the building. The building is hidden in the approach, only for it to be revealed as a southwards reaching arm containing the entrance door and stair.
Views

Figure 72 View from roof of south block (not now accessible to students). Note the mature trees that now block the views towards the sea. S&B

Figure 73 View from promenade towards St Andrews. S&B

Figure 74 View from bedroom window on upper level. S&B

The views from Andrew Melville Hall to the north and north east are an important part of its design and siting. The building was intended to have views of the sea and part of the reason that the windows have their characteristic projection from the wall plane of the building is so that the sea view could be given to as many as possible of the student bedrooms. Views of the sea – the horizon within the Firth of Tay – are now only visible from the upper levels, such as the senior common room and the upper levels of accommodation which were originally designed as the warden’s flats. The floor level of the upper common room seems to have been designed to be higher than the level of the floor on the blocks to either side so that eye level is above the main parapet level of the two accommodation blocks. This means that panoramic views can be obtained from this part of the central block.

The view to the north now has the horizon cut off by the top of the planting of mainly coniferous trees along the A91. There are only glimpses of views towards the Firth of Tay instead of the original full horizon line.

The Old Course Hotel is now a much bigger object within the view. The Old Course Hotel has been redeveloped on various occasions. The flat roofed 1960s version was built at around the same time as Andrew Melville Hall.

When first built, the view to the north east from Andrew Melville Hall, roughly on the central axis between the two arms and to the right of this axis, would have been
different, particularly in the foreground. At that time the gap between all the residence and university buildings would have been clear and there were tennis courts on site now occupied by New Hall.

The chemistry and physics building would have been less bulky with fewer additions, and the gateway building was not built at that time.

Trees have been planted across the open areas and around the car parking. These restrict distant views from Andrew Melville Hall, particularly at lower levels. A fringe of trees that has been planted along the A91 also restrict views towards the sea. Some distant views are possible to the north east over the roundabout at the entrance to the campus. Further to the right, the view of stone built generally Victorian buildings at the western end of North Street has not changed significantly since the construction of Andrew Melville Hall except that the railway is no longer in use.

Views should be a consideration when masterplanning the North Haugh campus site. It is not possible to retrieve the original design intention of views from Andrew Melville Hall but some retention of views should be considered, particularly in the management of tree belts.

Recommendations

The exterior of the building should be repaired where concrete is failing, but it is probably not possible to remove the staining.

Internally, it will be important to upgrade the accommodation both to meet the current expectations and needs of students, and also to ensure that the building is not damp, is well ventilated, and does not have excessive heat loss. In practice, this probably means a substantial amount of cladding of internal walls including renewal of the inner face of outside walls and, in many cases, renewing the ceilings to increase insulation under the parts of the building which project under their own triangular roof.

4.3 Character Area 3: Service Yard

This area comprises a group of buildings which have sheeted cladding. The largest shed to the east is the relatively recent temporary building for the special collections. The service yard contains many portacabins, vehicles, commercial waste bins. It is surrounded by trees to the south west and south east but is relatively open to the north. Recent planting along the edge of the new building looks to be inadequate to disguise this building when the trees mature.

The appearance of the area is well organised but it is bound to be visually intrusive due to the many different containers and vehicles. The roads are concrete are generally cracked. There is a disparate arrangement of buildings. Some of the road edging has been quite poorly built with damaged rubble stone walls pointed with neat cement on the access near the north west corner. The new building has been built with more care, with grey rubble filled gabion walls forming a retaining wall to the east and south.

This area has the character of a typical service yard. There is no particular concern for aesthetic appearance. The main area is used for storage and materials, waste, and parking vehicles.
The setting of this area is the ornamental trees of University Hall to the south. There is a steep bank rising to the west so that this area is hidden from the playing fields in character area 5. The area is at its most visible along its north side where the new block is visible in views across University Hall and along the southern route past chemistry and New Hall. In this utilitarian area, views out are much less important than views towards the buildings. The views towards the site are hidden from the south east due to the University Hall buildings, the landform and tree planting. The site is not particularly visible from the playing fields to the south west and the green colouring of the tallest of the buildings helps to disguise it. The site is most visible from the north and it is considered that considerably more tree planting is required to create an appropriate tree screening for the yard buildings.

4.4 Character Area 4: University Hall

The eastern block of University is a Baronial hall style mansion with a prominent tower visible in views to the east.

The western block of University Hall is an Edwardian Baronial Revival building which is romantically composed but essentially symmetrically arranged. There is an entrance porch near to the western end but this is no longer used as the main entrance.

The pediment of the gable at the western end appears to be dated “1911”. The built form is generally along the southern edge of the site and the buildings face south, with the exception of the original house to the east. The character of the north side of the western block is of the rear of the building. This faces towards an area of mown grass with two tennis courts beyond. There has been one relatively small single storey extension to the north east corner of the western block.

The building has been extended to the east to provide a large central block. This contains the dining room and other common facilities with a bedroom block extending to the north.

The central block is much larger and on the north side rises to five storeys. This building has a mix of materials, with two different colours of render, a limestone surround to some of the windows and a cast stone base course.

The area surrounding the buildings has trees around its edge which appears to define the original grounds associated with the original house. To the north east facing boundary is a group of ornamental trees which are well established and which protect the grounds from open views towards the roofs of the University buildings. The character of the drive from the east is also protected and has been retained.

Ornamental planting continues across the southern edge of the site.

There is a small caretakers house due south of the entrance to the central block, and a garage block. Both of these look earlier than the central block.

The gates to University Hall are set at right angles to the main southern wall and face along Kennedy Gardens to form a view closer at their western end. Ornamental evergreen planting continues along the southern edge with a further gate near to the south west corner.

To the north are well established trees which help to disguise the University of St Andrews’ service yard to the north.

The condition of the buildings is good.
Character

The character of this group is still of substantial buildings within a garden setting associated with a large villa. This garden setting remains at the eastern and western ends but has broken down, to some extent, at the centre with the construction of very large halls of residence buildings between two large earlier buildings. The central building is planned differently to the other buildings. The eastern building has its service area facing west. The western building has its service area facing north. The central building has its service area facing north east which, unfortunately, is towards the only surviving part of ornamental garden associated with the original villa. There is an opportunity for development of this site which would help to mitigate the quality of the service wing at the back of the central building.

The setting for this area is suburban villas to the south and the University character areas to the north. To the north-west is Character Area 3 which is the service yard.

The most important views from the site are from the terrace of the original villa and its ornamental yew gardens looking north east across the Firth of Tay.

Views into the site are relatively restricted and the central and western blocks are not particularly visible from other character areas. The western block is strongly visible on the gap between the chemistry and computer science buildings. It is also strongly visible from along Kennedy Gardens and from the pedestrian route which runs along the southern edge of the physics and astronomy building.

Recommendations

The relationships between the buildings on this site are good with the exception of the space between the west side of the original villa to the east and the central block. This relationship could be improved by development across the eastern side of the central block which would take greater recognition of the elements of formal planting and also to the form and character of the west side of the eastern villa. This elevation was not necessarily intended to be seen as it is now. The northern part of this elevation climbs to three storeys with crow stepped gables. The southern part is a much lower two storey service wing. The point where the two parts of this elevation join could be considered to be an appropriate end for a building line which could form the position for a new block across the eastern side of the central buildings.

Although repairs have been made recently, particularly to the stonework, the eastern block still needs considerable further repair to its roofs. There are many places where slates are missing exposing flashings and timber substrate behind. This is particularly the case on the square tower on the terrace front to the north east. Finials and cresting are missing from the heads of the turrets. Some of the roof pitches need a general overhaul.

4.5 Character Area 5: Sports Playing Fields

This is a large open area, generally flat, with sports pitches. The University of St Andrews Sports Centre is near the northern part of the site. The site is divided by rows of evergreen trees which form windbreaks between sports pitches. Along the eastern edge of the site is the main access road and this has a single storey house on it which is opposite the area of University Hall.
At the centre of the area are the University observatory buildings. These are rendered blocks, in a Modernist style. There are four distinctive observatory domes in this area over a range of different sizes.

Running roughly east-west across the centre of the site is a strong line of coniferous trees. Immediately south of this is a well-tended hedge. This marks the line of a wall which originally had railings along its upper edge and probably marked the extent of the first of the sports pitches. This southern part contains the cricket pitch and also a rugby stand with the original sports pavilion to the south.

The buildings within the character area, and with the exception of the sports centre to the north, are light in colour and generally harled. This contrasts with the majority of the surrounding suburban villas.

Around the observatories are a tall evergreen planting and beyond this an open area of ground, also flat.

The pavilion building to the south does not have a strong front face towards Hepburn Gardens. Oddly, the pavilion does not have its expected show front towards the sports pitches. This side does contain a half timber gable which has lost its finial but contains a clock. The most recent building in this area is a separate storage building which has been carefully designed to match in with the style of the main pavilion. Unfortunately, there is a previous flat roofed extension which forms a kind of visual void between the original building and the most recent one.

The character of this area is generally one of open playing fields, although at the centre of the area, the observatory buildings create their own quality of interesting geometric forms set within dark tree cover. The main element which gives this area its character is trees rather than buildings. The banks of trees in this area are particularly attractive. There is a quality of serendipity about the way that the trees mark the boundaries which have subsequently been extended, but have been retained.

The setting of this area is one of Edwardian and early 20th century suburban housing to the south and east. The character of the houses in the setting becomes typically mid-20th century, further westwards towards the centre of St Andrews. To the south of the western part of the playing fields the houses are almost universally white harled.

The main view into the site is from Hepburn Gardens to the south towards the symmetrical front of the Centre for Research into Ecological and Environmental Modelling. This is a minor view towards a symmetrically arranged Modernist building set within tree cover. The views out from the site are generally the most important from the original area of playing fields to the south east. These include views towards the western elevation of the Edwardian block of University Hall, the backs of prominent Edwardian villas to the east of the club house, views to the west of the clubhouse towards the front of stone built villas, and a view to the west towards the tower of St Leonard’s Church.

*Recommendations*

There are a few recommendations for this area. It would be desirable to reinstate the railings along the wall to the main road and some visual improvement to the club house/pavilion would help the overall character of the area. However, the area in general has an attractive quality and is well maintained. Some minor repairs or improvements are also possible to the Modernist buildings which have the
observatories on them. The work to the environmental building would be that it needs painting white, including around the central door. The sports centre to the north has a poor appearance but it is not particularly prominent in any views.

4.5.1 Rugby Stand

This building faces eastwards towards the main pitches in the original, south eastern, part of the stands. Behind is a shed with a lean-to building to the west. These parts of the building were not intended to be seen and are hidden by the splayed walls to the north and south of the seating area of the stand. This is a building with one show front, which is the side facing the sports pitches. The playing-field side has a seven bay colonnade with thin iron columns supporting a beam. Over the central bay is a boarded pediment with curving profile. The profile is surprisingly unconfident. The cornice is broken at the centre with a panel depicting the St Andrews University coat of arms set into a pediment. At the front of the seating area there is a brick wall with cope.

The buildings behind are of utilitarian appearance, particularly the lean-to shed to the west which is outside the original line of the playing fields, has a profiled asbestos sheet roof and which is presumably an addition. Some alteration is possible to this building without detracting from its essential and most important character, which is the covered seating area to the east.

The condition of this building is generally good.

The building retains its original context facing onto sports pitches.

4.5.2 South Pavilion

This building is a two storey building with red tiled roof and mock half-timbered upper storey. Its main face is northwards towards the sports pitches but this has a gable with a clock set in-between two windows on the first floor. The ground floors are covered by a porch with a symmetrical door. The building has been extended with a flat roofed, white harled, extension to the west and has had a further separate building constructed recently to the west. The condition of the building is good, although some finials are missing.

The original context of the building has been retained by its original relationship to the sports pitches to the north.

A plaque on the building notes that “This recreation park and the pavilions are a gift of Andrew Carnegie, Esquire., LL.D., of Skibo, Rector of University of St Andrews, in trust for the students of the University. 1903”

The building presents its back to Hepburn Gardens to the south. More planting in this area would help to disguise this rear elevation.

4.5.3 University of St Andrews Sports Centre

This is a large building built of brown brick with a broad timber fascia. It is flat roofed. The building has relatively few windows because it contains sports courts.

The condition of the building is fair. The roof was not inspected.

The context of this building is appropriate near to the sports courts. It is a building of not particularly good appearance. However, it is well screened from the roads and from the North Haugh site to the north and so there are no particular recommendations for changes.
4.5.4 Centre for Environmental Research

This is a two storey 20th century Modernist building. It is set at 45 degrees to the road and sports pitches to the south of it. Originally the building was a V shape and so had a quarter circle wall, porch and observatory tower where the two wings meet. The condition of the building appears good. The parapet of the central part has recently been reharled.

The context of this building faces towards the sports pitch which is an attractive and appropriate setting. To the north-west are other observatory buildings of different dates but forming an interesting and coherent group. The housing research building to the south west is rather less attractive.

There has been an extension to the north of this building. Unfortunately the render has stained and should be repainted. Some further development around the observatory research buildings at the centre of this area is possible in a way which would not diminish the function or aesthetic significance of the site overall.

The main recommendation is for general tidying and maintenance, and repainting the render on all of the observatory buildings.

4.6 Character Area 6 - Kinnessburn House

This is a single plot on Kennedy Gardens which has a substantial symmetrically fronted, two storey house on it. To the north is a parking area which takes up the original front garden. The building occupies nearly the full width of the plot. There has been an extension to the south side. This extension has only recently been completed.

The house is relatively modest compared to its neighbours, particularly the spectacular Revivalist house to the plot to the east.

The condition of the building is generally good.

The character of the building still is one of a residence and the extension is reasonably subservient, being a single storey. The architectural design of the extension is high quality.

The front garden has lost some of its original character due to the amount of paving over an area which originally would have had some grass. The original domestic character of the front garden is also eroded by the clumsy way that the openings have been cut through the wall opposite the front door and the loss of railings. It should be noted, however, that all of the railings on this run of houses facing Kennedy Gardens have been lost.

The main views from this site are northwards from the front garden which are over the North Haugh University buildings, over the Old Course, and with hills in Angus in the distance.

The recommendation for this site would be to recover some of the garden character of the front garden to the north of the house. This could be done with railings and gate piers.
4.7 Character Area 7 – David Russell Hall & Fife Park

This is an area of student residential housing. To the east comprises 15 similar four storey blocks with a further three to a similar design to the north-west, with an earlier nursery building to the west between block 9 and block 11. Towards the south east, near to the entrance, is the facility building.

The buildings are grouped informally around serpentine paths with two sustainable urban drainage systems, one at the centre, immediately north of the facility building and one at the north east of the site. This part of the development, which was completed in 2004, replaced previous halls of residence which were much more regularly planned.

To the western part of the character area is Fife Park – a group of pitched roof houses arranged in blocks of five, six, or seven so that the houses are joined at the corners to form a regular serrated patterned edge. Generally the houses rise from single storey on one side of the block to two storeys on the other. They have a rendered finish which is white painted with rectangular windows and concrete tower roofs. These buildings date from 1972.

The area is bounded by Strathkinness High Road to the south west. The area has no boundary treatment against the pavement, although the other side is well established early 20th century housing with some mid-20th century infill, all with well-tended boundary hedges and walls.

To the west is a hedge and boundary next to a small domestic plot on the north side of Strathkinness High Road. The north boundary is not clearly defined. There is a gentle transition between the student housing area and the fields in character area 8 to the north. To the west there is no barrier at all between the tended grass area around the Fife Park housing but a row of trees defines the boundary. The boundary further east has been altered considerably recently with the construction of three new housing blocks of a similar style to the blocks in David Russell Residences. The boundary to the east is the edge of the sports fields.

The condition of this landscape area is generally good. Most of the buildings to the east have been recently completed and in good condition. The condition of the houses to the west is fair, although typically of buildings of this date which are built of relatively short life materials, maintenance will be needed to windows, render coverings and tower roofs.

The character of the area is generally of a built up area. The character modifies from west to east. To the west, where the buildings are more low-rise and the grouping is informal but tighter, the character is possibly more successful at the moment. This is largely because the landscaping is not new, as it is in the east, and this had 20 to 30 years to develop to provide an appropriate landscape context. The plots to the east are much bigger but the relationship between them is not as tightly planned. At the moment there is a slightly odd character of large blocks of similar appearance and materials placed in an informal grouping. This character is at its most stark at the moment because the landscape is relatively recently planted. As the landscape grows to maturity then the area will not be so dominated by areas of render and the strong contrast between render and areas of timber. The facilities building is successful architecturally in creating a lower level hub building which also is the focal building in the approach to the site from the south east.

The most characterful views within the site are across the SUDS system from the refectory area of the facilities building looking east – west. The view to the west is
centred on the nursery building which is one of the more utilitarian buildings on the site.

Views out from the site are restricted and the buildings are hidden in views from the east across the sports pitches by tall coniferous trees. The buildings are most visible from a distance along the long straight path and from the north east. In this view the large blocks along the northern edge of this site, including the three new blocks, are a prominent part of the landscape. There is a strong contrast between these essentially urban blocks and the open fields to the north in character area 8.

The eastern boundary is a belt of trees along the edge of the sports ground.

The development has been successful in providing an attractive and appropriate area for student accommodation and leisure. Further development of a similar character is possible, particularly to the north without affecting the overall character of the North Haugh. The further extension to this area could benefit from a greater variety of building appearance and landscape detailing. Although the existing appearance and landscape character is broadly successful, this cannot be continued indefinitely over a larger area without monotony and lack of orientation.

The character area comprises open fields to the north of the David Russell and Fife Park student accommodation. The area included in this study is a broad U shape with its open face northwards. This open face contains further field of similar character but not part of the study area because it is in separate ownership. The boundary to the north is mature woodland for the full length of the fields, both within and outside the study area. To the west is a path between this area and the sports pitches which is defined by well-tended hedges. The southern boundary is the least well defined. This is next to the student housing. There is no change in level and there is a gradual transition between agricultural crops and rough grassland which is defined only by a post and wire fence. Running across the western part of the fields is an intermittent hedge and a further post and wire hedge which has not been tended to and is overgrown.

At the northern boundary is the same estate wall as noted in Area 1.

The condition of the area is of agricultural land. The field boundary hedges are not maintained fully.

The character of the area is of open farmland bounded by trees.

The views to the west include some vernacular agricultural buildings and to the south include the mid to late 20th century student residential blocks of character area 7. There are no significant views within this site.

The north eastern corner of this character area was intended for development when Andrew Melville Hall was first planned. In the initial proposals there were to be two blocks of the same form, shape and size placed at the head of the bank to the south of the part of Andrew Melville Hall that was constructed.
5.0 ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

5.1 Introduction

The Burra Charter provides the following definition of cultural significance:

‘Cultural Significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects.’

The following assessment of the heritage value of the North Haugh is based upon an analysis and understanding of the historical development of the site, including the tangible documentary and physical evidence, as well as intangible historical, and social associations.

The assessment of significance establishes the importance of the buildings as a place of cultural heritage. In order to establish parameters for appropriate and sensitive ongoing use of the site, whilst respecting elements of significance, the grading of significance helps to identify the key elements of the site. It also identifies elements which may be of an intrusive nature – that is, those which adversely impact upon the appreciation of elements of greater significance and should be removed or changed.

Each element of the site has been graded according to its significance as an individual item within the overall context of the site.

This information informs policies, or guidelines, which should be met to ensure that any future changes to the site, appropriate respect is paid to the site and its components.

5.2 Historical Significance

Historical significance encompasses the importance of the relationship of a site to the evolving pattern of our cultural or natural history, or has a strong or special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in our cultural or natural history.

A site may have historical value because it has influenced, or has been influenced by, a historical figure, event, phase or activity, or as the site of an important event. For any given place the significance will be greater where evidence of the association or event survives in situ, or where the setting is substantially intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. However, some events or associations may be so important that the place retains significance regardless of subsequent treatment.

The North Haugh as a whole has moderate historical significance. It has little historical association with any major event other than the succession of the University of Dundee in 1967, which was a major influence on the decision to develop the North Haugh. A minor element of historical significance is the connection of the playing fields to Andrew Carnegie, who gifted the site and its pavilion to the University.

In summary, historical significance of the site can be argued to lie primarily in the ongoing development of the six-hundred year-old University of St Andrews. As the third-oldest university in the English-speaking world, this underlines the importance of ongoing change and development of its estate and its presence in the town of St Andrews itself.
5.3 Architectural, Aesthetic and Artistic Significance

The importance of the site in terms of its contribution to an understanding of the architectural development of the site and broader context locally, regionally, nationally or internationally. Aesthetic value includes aspects of sensory perception such as consideration of the form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric.

Andrew Melville Hall is of outstanding architectural significance. Its association with one of the most celebrated, and controversial, figures of the 20th Century UK architectural movement, James Stirling, immediately marks the building out as being of interest. Furthermore, the highly developed aesthetic is instantly recognisable, being noticeably differentiated from the rest of Stirling’s œuvre – something which is arguably the case with most of his buildings. The technical aspects related to the construction of the building are also of interest, primarily in the modular prefabrication of parts assembled immediately upon delivery on site. This, of course, is tempered by the significant and sustained change that the building has undergone almost constantly since it was originally constructed.

Other buildings of architectural significance include the three buildings on the site that are already listed: University Hall (Old Wing), the University Hall Wardlaw Wing (formerly Westerlee) and the Rugby Football Club Stand. The latter is listed at Category C(S) primarily for its interest as one of the few remaining largely unaltered structures of its type from the inter-War period. Both wings of University Hall are listed at Category B and are fine examples of mid and late-19th century architecture. Whilst none of these buildings are associated with architects of particular note, they remain elements of considerable architectural significance in the site.

The buildings masterplanned and designed by William Holford & Partners are of moderate architectural significance. None of the buildings are of particular note in terms of their design, and the majority of internal areas of character (i.e. entrance areas and lecture theatres) have also been comprehensively refurbished, but nevertheless represent a major developmental stage in the University’s history. Other buildings from the early to mid-20th century, namely the Scott-Lang Observatory and Carnegie Pavilion can be seen to have moderate significance, being well-designed buildings of modest interest. Two recent buildings, the Gateway Building and the new Bute Medical School are of moderate significance, both being high-quality examples of recent architecture that enhance the aesthetic of the North Haugh as a whole.

None of the remaining buildings can be found to have more than neutral significance, with two particular areas, namely the service yard (and new Library Annex) and the Science Units being of negative significance. Later extensions to the Andrew Melville Hall also detract from its significance and are therefore negative elements.

5.4 Social Significance

Social value represents the strong or special association of the site with a recognisable community or cultural group for social, spiritual or cultural reasons.

As a place of education and recreation, all university campuses have inherent social importance, both to present and past generations of students and local residents. The North Haugh, although situated outwith the town centre is an important amenity for
the town, in particular the playing fields and sports centres which are open to the public.

The social significance of the estate as a post-War example of a new university site where students both study and reside is also of note. Although the residences are no longer specifically linked to the departments found on the site, this original link is still apparent in the overall concurrent development of the site in the late 1960s.

5.5 Archaeological Significance

The low-lying North Haugh itself can be shown on analysis of historical map evidence to have no identifiable signs of any modern-era human activity other than agriculture prior to the development of the site by the University. Nevertheless, analysis of vertical aerial photography for crop marks, or finds upon excavation may yet provide such evidence.

Although the Sites and Monuments Record does not hold any consistent data on the North Haugh study area, the Council Archaeologist states that whilst largely untested, the archaeological potential of the North Haugh is considered to be high. This cannot be accurately mapped without intrusive sampling, but such potential significance was confirmed with the discovery of human remains on the site of the Gateway Building in 1999.
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6.0 GRADING OF SIGNIFICANCE

The various elements of the building have been assessed and graded to assist with the future conservation and management of the site and its elements.

Grading of the individual elements of a site is based on the contribution each element makes to each component of significance, (i.e. historic, archaeological, architectural and aesthetic, landscape, social and spiritual etc) whether it be at a local (St Andrews), regional (Fife), national (Scotland/United Kingdom) or international level.

Elements of Outstanding Significance
A building or element of international importance, or a fine, intact (little altered) example of a particular period, style or type that embodies the importance of the building or site overall.

Elements of Considerable Significance
A building or element of regional (Scotland) or national (United Kingdom) importance, or a good example of a particular period, style or type with a high degree of intact original fabric that contributes substantially to the importance of the building or site overall.

Elements of Moderate Significance
A building or element of local (St Andrews) importance, or an element that contributes to, but is not a key element to the importance of the building or site overall.

Neutral Elements
An element which neither contributes, nor detracts from the importance of the building or site overall.

Negative Elements
A building or element which detracts from the overall significance of the building or site overall.
Figure 75 Site plan showing significance. A larger version is shown in Appendix II. S68.
Figure 76  Plan of Level 1 showing significance. S&B

Figure 77  Plan of Level 2 showing significance. S&B
Figure 78 Plan of Level 3 showing significance. S&B

Figure 79 Plan of Level 4 showing significance. S&B
Figure 80 Plan of Level 5 showing significance. S&B

Figure 81 Plan of Level 6 showing significance. S&B
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7.0 CONSERVATION ISSUES & POLICIES

7.1 Introduction

The North Haugh, setting, landscape and all associated structures within the study area combine to form a site of moderate importance, with individual areas of considerable or outstanding significance. The heritage value and significance of this site should be protected and managed for future generations through the implementation of appropriate conservation policies based upon recognised good practice.

There are a number of reasons for the preservation of buildings within a site and their settings on cultural grounds. One is historical: for the information or evidence of the past embodied in it. Another reason is aesthetic: for its beauty, for its value as works of architecture. Yet another is social: for the value embodied in both the tangible and intangible attributes of the site to the local and wider community. Together with other aspects of significance, such as the importance of the landscape, all of these aspects apply directly to the North Haugh and its landscape.

Nearly all buildings are built with the intention that they should look well, in addition to being sound and useful. The beauty of a building, as a work of architecture, may depend on the formal qualities of its design. Unlike historical authenticity, which once lost can never be regained, the formal beauty of a work of architecture may be recovered, through restoration.

The aim of this conservation plan is to encourage and inform the management and future development of the North Haugh, its landscape and structures on the basis of good conservation practice. This section of the conservation plan examines the issues and informs a set of policies for the future care of the site as a whole. The policies aim to inform future management and use of the estate, landscape, and structures in the landscape in accordance with their assessed level of significance.

Adoption and implementation of the policies by the University of St Andrews Estates Department and other people associated with the management and development of the estate will enable the retention and enhancement of significance of the site for the future.

7.2 Base Policies

7.2.1 Strategy

Policy 1 - Strategy

A strategic approach is essential tool in the management of the University stock of buildings. Strategy is important for maintenance and specific adaptations to meet changing needs across the building stock, such as access for people with restricted mobility.

7.2.2 Resolution

Some of the buildings within the site are listed. Others, such as the Andrew Melville Hall, are proposed for listing.
**Policy 2 - Resolution**

A conservation-led approach to the repair, conservation and management of the buildings with heritage significance on the North Haugh site and their surroundings should be adopted by all interested parties, based on an understanding of their significance.

**7.2.3 Vision**

**Policy 3 - Vision**

Through active and informed conservation, development and interpretation the North Haugh site should continue to be an attractive and integral part of the University of St Andrews. The buildings should have a full use as a part of the purpose of the University.

**7.2.4 Conservation principles**

**General**

Buildings of heritage significance in their townscape and urban park setting together with their interior decoration, fixtures and fittings should be regarded as a composite work of art and documents of history. The construction of a building should be considered as a whole and treated in a holistic way. Its structure, materials, method of construction and patterns of air and moisture movement should be properly understood. All significant work should be preceded by thorough documentary research and physical investigation. Where possible, work should be reversible, with a minimum of damage.

**Policy 4 - Conservation Principles**

- In general, all work should be carried out in accordance with the *British Standard Guide to the Principles of Conservation of Historic Buildings BS7913:1998*. The definitions of terms used in this conservation plan are those set out in BS7913.
- Minimum intervention – No repair should be effected without proper consideration, justification and good reason.
- Repair should be preferred to replacement.
- Repair should use like-for-like techniques and materials. Materials should be salvaged and re-used where possible.
- Priority should be given to maintaining and enhancing the integrity of the historic fabric over other regulations and requirements.
- New work should not be intrusive, and should be of the highest quality in terms of design, material and workmanship, whether it is in matching or contrasting style.
- Adequate historical research, investigative opening-up, recording and sampling should be carried out before and during work (as necessary) to inform good design and technical solutions.
- The design of repair works should be undertaken with a thorough knowledge of traditional construction history and practice.
• Repair work should be designed to be carried out safely and consideration should be given to safety issues arising from the continued maintenance of the building.

• It is essential that conservation work to listed buildings is carried out by experienced tradespeople. The work should be designed, specified and inspected by a suitably experienced and accredited conservation architect. A large part of the success of any project is in the understanding of the task and sharing of experience between all professionals and all the tradespeople involved.

• Whether in repair, restoration or alteration, new work should not draw attention unnecessarily, but should be identifiable to a discerning eye.

• Particular attention should be paid to matters of detail to help preserve and enhance fabric and character including, for example, specific choice of materials, detailed location of services, methods of fixing, etc.

• Fabric or spaces to be altered or removed should be adequately recorded before works, following relevant guidelines and the record lodged with an appropriate public archive, such as the RCAHMS.

• Detailed design development should precede implementation of all on-site works.

• Any compromises proposed to the above principles should flow from an options analysis and should be fully justified and agreed by all interested parties.

Harm could result from differing approaches or standards in different parts of a building, such as changes in appearance or character. A holistic approach is important.

**Minimum intervention**

A conservative approach of minimal intervention and disturbance to the significant fabric of a significant heritage building is fundamental to good conservation. The stock of historic buildings is finite and every loss is significant. Andrew Melville Hall is an unusual building and its design and details are not repeated on other buildings. The destruction, alteration or renewal of parts of a building can be damaging and should always be carefully considered and properly justified. It is important to understand and work with the fabric of a building, not against it, and to be flexible and imaginative.

The principle of minimum intervention in conservation is well established. Ideally a building should be used, kept in good order and maintained on a regular basis.

If a building can no longer be used for its present or former purpose, more substantial alterations will be necessary, amounting to a conversion of the building from one use to another. It can be appropriate to restore a building, or parts of it, according to its original or to a subsequent design.

**Knowledge, experience and skill**

The responsibility placed on the owners of historic buildings is made clear in the legislation governing their protection. All buildings should be systematically maintained and it is desirable for maintenance, to be planned as a regular routine,
usually on a five-year cycle. Some understanding of the nature of the building and its actual or potential problems is important in devising a maintenance schedule, coupled with specialist advice. When more substantial repairs or alterations are required, an important factor in ensuring appropriate standards is the quality of the professional advice, project management and decision-making. As building conservation becomes more science-based, so an understanding of the objective basis of the relevant treatments and processes increases in importance. This understanding needs to be added to the traditional skills of methodical recording and analysis, clear exposition and comprehension of instructions, sound craftsmanship, and appropriate experience encompassed by the project team.

**Planning for repairs and other works**

When work is proposed, whether or not arising from a condition inspection report, it should be well planned. Simple, small or urgent tasks, subject to funding and consents, can often be authorised immediately, though such works should not be undertaken without proper advice. More substantial or complex packages of work may require further investigation, outline specification and cost planning to enable funding to be secured, consents obtained and other arrangements made. To minimise disturbance to the fabric of the building, alterations and new work should wherever possible be integrated with repair work.

Care should be taken to identify any hazardous substances in the construction, to assess any risks associated with them, if disturbed or left undisturbed, and to plan appropriate precautions. Where necessary to avoid accidental damage, vulnerable finishes or parts of a building should be physically protected.

**Inspection, survey, research and investigation**

The specification of repair and other work should be based on a genuine understanding of the building as a whole and in the context of the North Haugh. It should follow from an inspection, such as a five-yearly inspection, and be informed by adequate measured survey drawings. If this basic information does not exist, the necessary inspection and measured survey work should be undertaken.

It will frequently be necessary, particularly where complex historic buildings are concerned, to undertake documentary research and physical investigation of the fabric, and of the site, including, in some cases, above and below ground archaeology, so that the historical development and construction of the building can be understood. Such physical investigation should be careful and as non-destructive as possible, and the results should be properly recorded. Preliminary investigation can, however, never entirely eliminate the possibility of unexpected discoveries during the course of building operations. It may also be necessary to carry out more detailed survey work and to produce large scale measured drawings of details, as a basis for the detailed design and specification of work.

7.3 Statutory and Non-Statutory Constraints

7.3.1 Listed Building Consent

Listing gives a building statutory protection against unauthorised demolition, alteration and extension.

Listed building consent from Fife Council will be required prior to any programme of alteration works to a listed building. Consultation with the council should be
undertaken early in the programme to determine any specific requirements as part of attaining listed building consent.

**Policy 5 - Listed Building Consent**

It is important that listed building consent is obtained prior to works being carried out. Although it may not answer specific questions raised as part of a Listed Building Consent application, the conservation plan should be used as a tool to assist in this process.

7.3.2 Scottish Historic Environment Policy

**Policy 6 – Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP)**

The Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP), July 2009 by Historic Scotland provides guidelines for listed buildings and conservation areas and should be referred to.

7.3.3 Scottish Planning Policy

This document applies the provisions of the following pieces of legislation relevant to this site: Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997; the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979; the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act, 1997; and Planning etc (Scotland) Act, 2006. It includes an explicit recognition of the need for informed conservation, to understand the significance of historic sites and the potential impacts that any proposed development might have. Policies relating to Historic Environment (policy numbers 110, 111 & 112), Listed Buildings (113 & 114), Conservation Area (115, 116 & 117) are relevant to the North Haugh.

**Policy 7 - Consultation of SPP**

It is important that SPP is consulted in detail to determine specific constraints and requirements that may apply to the estate.

7.3.4 Conservation Area

Part of the North Haugh is in the Hepburn Gardens Conservation Area, and the east boundary is adjacent to the St Andrews Conservation Area.

It is possible to regard a conservation area as a large or complex building, which is entirely or substantially of a single or unified design, or which is layered and narrative, made up of diverse components, yet having an overall integrity. Many such historic areas have elements of unity and diversity in different ways and to different degrees. The consistent use of a limited range of materials for roof coverings, walls, ground surfaces, and for other elements and details, can be vital to the integrity of an area. In this respect conservation areas may often have to accommodate relatively more change than individual buildings, in order to live and thrive. Whilst there will always be a strong presumption in favour of retaining existing buildings which contribute to the special interest of the area, the replacement of individual buildings can sometimes be justified. The erection of new buildings in gap sites, to provide enclosure, to enhance townscape, to provide for specific functions or for economic reasons, can also be desirable.
**Policy 8 - Conservation Area**

Conservation Area Consent should be obtained for works relating to buildings that are within the Conservation Area boundary. Consideration should be given to determining the appropriate level of sensitivity of works that are near to and which may affect the St Andrews Conservation Area.

### 7.4 Retention of Significance

The study area includes three listed buildings. In addition there are twelve buildings or parts of buildings considered to have some significance within the North Haugh.

According to the Historic Scotland criteria, listing identifies buildings as being of both regional and national importance. Most of the buildings on the North Haugh are in good condition. Many of the buildings have been altered and extended but still retain the key elements that form their character.

Not all of the significance has necessarily been revealed within each building and the assessment of significance should be reviewed following consolidation and discussion of research about the buildings.

It is important to retain the overall significance of the buildings during any proposed repair or alteration works. However, it is recognised that changes will be required to the buildings in order to ensure the sustainability of the core uses of the University. Some of the buildings fail to meet the standards required to fulfil their current University use and so changes are required.

Projects to alter buildings to make them sustainable and useful will allow the retention and enhancement of key significant features. Some areas of lesser significance may need to be altered in order to enhance the areas of greater significance.

#### 7.4.1 Outstanding Significance

The one building in the study area that is of outstanding significance is Andrew Melville Hall.

Andrew Melville Hall is in habitable condition. Some ongoing repairs and maintenance has been identified in the notes of condition included within this report. Any building of outstanding significance should be retained in good repair. The few parts which are either missing or have damage to the original fabric, such as out of position concrete panels at the foot of the walls, should be placed back to their original condition or appearance. Alteration to the exterior of this building should be kept to an absolute minimum.

**Policy 9 - Outstanding Significance**

Great care should be taken so that building fabric considered to be of the highest level of importance is not adversely affected or changed by any future works, use or management.

#### 7.4.2 Considerable Significance

Buildings of considerable significance, including the older buildings at University Hall and the rugby stand, should be retained and repaired. Alteration is possible in
these buildings. This is justified particularly where an alteration is intended to protect an element of significance.

Alterations to any interiors of considerable significance will probably be necessary to give the building a sustainable long-term future use. An alteration to a room of considerable significance might be necessary, for instance, to introduce services which would not be appropriate on the exterior. However, buildings and interiors of considerable significance should be restored and remain free of alteration wherever possible. Rooms with considerable significance should generally be left undivided.

**Policy 10 - Considerable Significance**

Buildings and part of buildings of considerable significance should be retained and respected. These buildings may be changed, with care, to make them suitable for a new use.

### 7.4.3 Moderate Significance

Buildings of moderate significance, including the original sports pavilion, should be retained and repaired. Alteration is possible in these areas of moderate significance. Alterations to the interiors of moderate significance within the Andrew Melville Hall and University Hall will probably be required to give the buildings a sustainable long-term use. An alteration to a room of moderate significance might be necessary, for instance, to introduce services or a vent pipe which would not be appropriate on the exterior or in an internal space of higher significance. In Andrew Melville Hall alterations will be needed to improve the insulation performance of the building. However, buildings and interiors of moderate significance should be restored and remain free of alteration wherever possible. Rooms with moderate significance should generally be left undivided.

**Policy 11 - Moderate Significance**

While there should be a general presumption against change, areas of moderate significance should be regarded as being capable of being altered, providing such alteration can be justified and providing it is planned and executed with appropriate consideration, skill and care.

### 7.4.4 Neutral Significance

Elements of neutral significance, could be demolished or altered to provide a new use for the site.

**Policy 12 - Neutral Significance**

Areas of neutral significance should be regarded as being capable of being demolished or altered.

### 7.4.5 Negative Significance

Elements considered to have negative significance, such as the alterations to the dining room ceiling in Andrew Melville Hall and some other elements in the landscape, such as the service yard, should be altered for the overall benefit of the site. The removal or screening of elements of negative significance and, in some cases, their sensitive replacement, will be a benefit to the significance of the site overall.
Policy 13 - Negative Significance

Areas of negative significance should be altered for the overall benefit of the site and in particular areas of considerable or outstanding significance.

7.5 Repairs

7.5.1 Guidelines for Repairs

The detailing of repair and restoration work should normally match the original or existing building exactly, except where the earlier detail is manifestly bad practice and has been the cause of failure. There were significant cost reductions when Andrew Melville Hall was built and this has led to some elements being inadequately specified. If it is possible to improve the detail, such improvement would be justified.

Where no suitable material is available, a strategy other than like for like repair might have to be adopted. The use of modern substitutes or synthetic ‘look alike’ materials and the introduction of impermeable materials or membranes into permeable traditional construction is not usually good practice. This would apply for alterations to University Hall but not Andrew Melville Hall where the moisture was intended to be controlled by membranes. Where the long term or side effects of materials or processes on a building or its occupants are not fully understood, they should normally be avoided. Sometimes, though, new materials used skilfully can facilitate the most conservative and economical repair. Untried materials and techniques, however, should be used with caution, monitored and the results made known. Previous repairs should be treated with respect, with a willingness to learn from them.

There are fundamental differences between, for example, the soft, weak, permeable materials and the patterns of air and moisture movement in the various types of traditional building, such as the two older buildings at University Hall, the south sports pavilion, and Kinnessburn House, and the hard, strong, impervious materials and patterns of air and moisture movement in the buildings constructed from the 1950s onwards. Before any work is carried out to a building its system of construction and the way in which that system may have been modified over time should be understood. Changes should be compatible with the system of construction.

The continued use of a building and of its components and materials in situ is, in environmental and cultural terms, almost always the most desirable option. Components and worked materials necessarily detached in the course of work should, if possible, be reused within the building, subject to conscientious avoidance of deception. If this is not possible, they could be reclaimed for use elsewhere. The disassembly of components and the recycling of materials is preferable in environmental terms to burning for energy recovery. Dumping is always the most wasteful and least desirable option.

7.5.2 Condition

When it is necessary to provide scaffold access to a high or otherwise inaccessible part of a building, it might be sensible to carry out more repairs to that part of the building than were strictly necessary at the time if the additional repairs are likely to become necessary within the foreseeable future. Some types of building decay can be
fast, for example, where water penetration affects internal finishes, but most building
decay is significantly slower than is often imagined. Conclusions as to the extent of
decay and the significance and speed of deterioration, and decisions as to the
urgency or necessary extent of repair work, can often only be reached on the basis of
prior experience of the particular building, general

experience and professional judgment. A traditional craft-based approach to repair,
replacing decayed material on a like for like basis is preferred, although there are
occasions when it is more appropriate to use non-traditional materials and methods
if these are more discreet and allow more existing fabric to remain in situ,
undisturbed.

Overall, the condition of the buildings within the study area is remarkably good.
This is a testament to the thorough maintenance procedures of the University.

Andrew Melville Hall

Unfortunately, the building that needs most investment in response to its condition
is possibly the most significant on the site – the Andrew Melville Hall. The need for
investment has been caused by flaws in the original design rather than lack of
maintenance.

There is a tension between the high significance of Andrew Melville Hall and the
need for investment to make good deficiencies in its original roof and wall
specification (moisture control and lack of insulation), deficiencies in its heating
system, and results of cost savings before its original construction. These factors
mean that the University might seek outside funding for repairs to Andrew Melville
Hall, including from Historic Scotland. Although the University can be shown to be
relatively wealthy building owner, it has a very large call on its resources to be spent
on repair and maintenance of buildings, and the investment of new buildings in
order to sustain the future of the University. Although it is rarely stated now, the
purpose of grants from Historic Scotland, for instance, was once intended to cover
the difference between the quality of repairs needed in conservation of a significant
building and standard building patching repairs using less expensive materials.

The (proposed) listing of Andrew Melville Hall has brought the issues relating to its
condition and the cost of its operation into a sharper focus. This new recognition of
its significance means that the conservation approach described in this document
should be adopted for alterations and repairs to Andrew Melville Hall. A
conservation approach does not mean that the interior of the Andrew Melville Hall,
its arrangement of rooms, its provision of ensuite bathrooms, can not be changed.
Many alterations can be made to the interior of the building without it affecting its
significance. These alterations would now need listed building consent. These are
alterations which would be undertaken because they are needed to meet
contemporary expectations and standards. Alterations would not be eligible for
grants. However, repairs to the building might be eligible for Historic Scotland
grants and the University could consider an application. Since this is an unusual
case, since the University has failed to attract Historic Scotland grant for some of the
buildings in the past, and since the repairs that are needed have been caused by the
innovative and ambitious nature of the design of the building – precisely the same
reasons why the building is being listed – we consider that Historic Scotland have an
obligation at least to consider grant aiding repairs to the Andrew Melville Hall. This
is an unusual case and so exceptional discussion prior to an application should be
undertaken to establish grant eligibility.
**Policy 14 - Repairs**

Repairs should be planned on the basis of an inspection system which is prioritised so that the most urgent repairs can be carried out systematically across the whole University building stock. Repairs to buildings with heritage significance should be carried out on a like for like basis unless there is a particular reason why the original material or detail has failed. Although repairs should be carried out in order of urgency, there will be circumstances where efficient use of scaffolding and other access systems will mean that it makes sense for other, less urgent, repairs to be carried out at the same time as urgent repairs.

**7.5.3 Condition Reports**

All University buildings are subject to a reporting system which is intended to assess the value of repairs required to University building stock. This is standard format required by the Scottish Government. This standard format is probably inadequate for complex buildings and buildings with historic significance. Broad brush reports can produce figures which are very different from the costs which arise from a detailed inspection and a consideration of the needs of individual materials. The conservation process is not necessarily more expensive. One of the principles of conservation is that the minimum work is to be carried out at any time and this applies particularly to repair. Broad brush reports can suggest wholesale repair which is not entirely necessary. A conservation based report might find that less work is strictly necessary.

The format of the conservation based report should follow the Historic Scotland recommended format. This is a format which has been used for historic buildings for the last eighty years and has been proven to be a successful way of prioritising repairs and allowing useful costing. Each element of the building should be examined starting with the roofs, then the walls, then the interiors and then the land, grounds, pavements, railings, etc. surrounding the building. The services such as boiler and ventilation plant should also be inspected at the same time. The parts within each section should be undertaken in a logical order. Actions for repair should be clearly identifiable within each part of the text. Each action should then be grouped together into identifiable actions in a list of priorities. The priorities should be listed according to urgent works – work that should be carried out within one year, necessary work – work that should be carried out within five years, and desirable work – works of restoration or defects which are decaying slowly and where repair could be deferred. This list of repairs could be costed by a quantity surveyor.

For each building which has a conservation based condition assessment, this report could become the basis for further surveyor’s reports into the future.

It is important to agree a standard format and brief for the conservation based inspection reports. This brief must be compatible with the type of surveyor’s reports that the Scottish Government reporting system requires although they will be considerably more detailed.
7.5.4 Planning Investment

It is unlikely that there will ever be enough money available to carry out all of the desirable works to all of the buildings of the University within a short or medium timescale.

The University has a record of planning investment in repair and maintenance of its buildings to the point that most of the buildings are in good sustainable condition where they can be maintained relatively easily.

**Policy 15 - Planning Investment**

Investment planning will be largely based on the needs of the University to fulfil its function. However, it is clear that some buildings should be considered to have a priority because they are of higher significance historically, architecturally or aesthetically. The need for conservation and the significance of buildings should be a factor in determining investment priorities.

7.5.5 Materials

There is a broad variety of materials used in buildings across the North Haugh. The earlier, traditional, buildings at University Hall use stone, bedded and pointed in lime mortar, in a way which has been used for centuries. Buildings from the early to mid-20th century, such as the group of observatory related buildings at the centre of the playing fields, the rugby stand, and the southern sports pavilion, imitate traditional construction in their appearance but are built with different ideas of how materials work. In the 20th century, with the use of cement, and the adoption of wall cavities, thinking about materials in construction tended to be about barriers and membranes to keep water out. This is different to traditional construction which works by absorbing and evaporating moisture through stone and which depends on ventilation and air movement to keep the buildings dry.

From the development of the North Haugh site onwards, materials in construction have adopted a late 20th century frame, cladding and modular approach which, in some cases, has been innovative. At Andrew Melville Hall, innovative construction techniques, possibly combined with cost savings, have led to a building which needs a lot of maintenance and cannot meet efficient heating or insulation standards.

The other major buildings across the North Haugh site are built in composite materials, such as block work for New Hall and the unusual use of narrow cast stone blocks for the chemistry and physics buildings. More recently, buildings have been constructed with curtain wall glazing and with some cladding of natural sandstone. This use of natural sandstone is probably considered appropriate for the location of buildings in St Andrews and it has been part of a significant improvement in the appearance of most recent buildings to be constructed on the site than the buildings of the 1970s.

On stone buildings the most important factor is to use lime based mortars in pointing and other repairs. Cement based mortars can cause damage to the surrounding stones due to differential erosion and in operating in a different way to the way that the stone works.

If replacement stones are required, these should be carried out in natural stone which matches the colour, texture and weathering characteristics of the existing stone. Replacements should be carefully dressed to match the original tooling and joint patterns.
External painting on both timber and metal should be carried out according to a regular five to ten year cycle.

On listed buildings repairs to timber elements, such as windows and doors, should be carried out by piecing in timber where it has decayed, rather than wholesale replacement.

7.5.6 Masonry Cleaning

Policy 16 – Masonry Cleaning

Exterior stone cleaning to remove dirt is not appropriate conservation practice. Some chemical cleaning methods can lead to further deterioration.

Cleaning to remove paint from masonry is appropriate. This should be done with care and using test sample areas. The exact method will be determined by the types of paint that have been applied to the stone surface.

Historic Scotland has a TAN regarding cleaned stone: Technical Advice Note 25 - Maintenance and Repair of Cleaned Stone Buildings. In addition, there is an Inform Guide that discusses cleaning of sandstone: Inform Guide - Cleaning Sandstone [Download PDF]

7.6 Safety, Vandalism and Security

The estate has no abnormal health and safety issues. At present, the North Haugh does not appear to be susceptible to vandalism. The security of buildings is particularly important, both for areas where research is carried out (i.e. laboratories), where students safety is a consideration (halls of residence), or where important collections are held (i.e. museums and galleries).

7.6.1 Safety

Policy 17 – Safety

Any proposed works and final designs will need to follow appropriate safety guidelines and policies to ensure that fire and health and safety regulations are met, depending on the final use of the building.

7.6.2 Graffiti

Policy 18 – Graffiti

Graffiti removal should be undertaken with care using recognised treatment methods, applicable to the particular surface material. If necessary, a specialist contractor should be consulted to test and determine the most appropriate form of removal.

Historic Scotland has a TAN regarding graffiti: Technical Advice Note 18 - The Treatment of Graffiti on Historic Surfaces. In addition, there is an Inform Guide that discusses graffiti: Inform Guide – Graffiti [Download PDF]
7.6.3 Security

Policy 19 – Security

Existing security procedures should continue as required on a location-specific basis. Security equipment within the buildings, or fixed to external fabric or within the grounds should not have an adverse physical or visual impact on historic fabric and should be reversible.

7.6.4 Fire

Fire is the greatest single threat to the fabric and contents of any building and, in the case of an historic building, the loss of authentic fabric in a fire is irretrievable. Management policies should minimise the likelihood of fire by the assessment and elimination of major risks and by the management and control of those risks that cannot be eliminated. Professional advice should be sought on fire precautions. Fire safety and protection measures and insurance arrangements should be regularly reviewed, at least every five years.

The following specific measures should be considered:

- establishment of a written fire safety policy;
- appointment of a named person to be responsible for all fire matters;
- preparation of a fire safety manual;
- preparation of a fire risk assessment;
- installation of a fire detection and alarm system;
- reviewing fire separation and compartmentation, and improving standards as necessary;
- obtaining a fire certificate and complying with its requirements, if the use is subject to current legislation;
- provision and maintenance of appropriate first aid firefighting equipment;
- ensuring that access for firefighting is always available to all parts of the building and site;
- fire training for all staff;
- regular inspections of residential apartments and places of fire risk, such as boiler rooms;
- ensuring that all building and maintenance contracts contain clear fire safety requirements, including hot work procedures, and that these are enforced;
- formation of a salvage and damage control team, if appropriate;
- regular liaison with the local fire service;
- establishing that work is desirable or justified in terms of cost/benefit and disruption to historic fabric;
- maintenance of proper records, including inventories, drawings and photographs;
- consideration of the need for lightning protection;
- regular inspection and maintenance of heating systems, including boilers, chimneys and flues
- regular testing of all electrical wiring and equipment, repairing or renewing as necessary.

It is important to consider whether the introduction of particular fire safety measures would cause irreversible damage to the historic fabric. It is often appropriate to consider alternative approaches to fire safety. Apart from the direct impact, fire safety improvements can affect the fabric of a building indirectly, for example by inhibiting air movement through concealed voids, which is necessary to keep the timbers dry in traditional construction.

It is important that the interior of a building has fire protection and fire safety measures. The paramount importance is for the safety of the people who occupy the building but the building also needs to be protected as a valuable asset and, in some cases, as a building with historic significance. Fire compartmentalisation and fighting measures need to be carefully designed. It is possible to upgrade doors to appropriate level of fire separation by using intumescent varnishes and paints. All cabling and detection systems should be concealed. There is a well-established practice of air sampling fire detection systems which have minimal visual intrusion on the appearance of significant rooms.

**Policy 20 – Fire Plan & Detection**

Existing fire plans should be maintained and updated accordingly.

Any new installation of a fire detection system, or enhanced provision of safe routes of egress in historic and significant buildings should be non-invasive and discreet. It must not be visually or physically intrusive within the any interior spaces identified as being of considerable or outstanding significance.

**Policy 21 – Smoking**

The existing smoking policy for all building users should be maintained and enforced to prevent accidental fire risk to the building fabric, textiles or furniture.

Historic Scotland previously published four TANs that discussed fire in historic buildings, *Technical Advice Note 11 - Fire Protection Measures in Scottish Historic Buildings; Technical Advice Note 14 - The Installation of Sprinkler Systems in Historic Buildings; Technical Advice Note 22 - Fire Risk Management in Heritage Buildings; Technical Advice Note 28 - Fire Safety Management in Heritage Buildings*. These have since been superseded by the *Guide for Practitioners 7: Fire Safety Management in Traditional Buildings Parts 1 & 2*. In addition, there is an Inform Guide that discusses fire safety: *Inform Guide - Fire Safety [Download PDF]*

### 7.6.5 Other Disasters

Consideration should be given to the need to be prepared for, and to take precautions against, other sorts of disaster. Individual buildings can be more than normally vulnerable to flooding due to complex roof forms, extreme winds, or failure of ground conditions, while some disasters can be entirely unpredictable. In certain circumstances professional advice should be sought on preventive or precautionary measures or on the need for a disaster plan.
Policy 22 – Risk & Disaster Management Plan

Risk & Disaster Management Plans should be maintained and reviewed as appropriate. These should be prepared with advice from specialist conservators (e.g. for stonework, woodwork, flooring, textiles, furniture etc). The plans should include priority management in the event of a disaster (e.g. fire, flood) at specific buildings. Necessary information should continue to be passed to visitors and people attending events.

It is important that consideration be given to the different aspects of insurance cover and that the appropriate advice is sought.

7.6.6 Lightning

Lightning conductors should be discrete and should be the minimum necessary to conduct lightning to the ground. This should involve the minimum conductor tapes per building. The conductor tapes should be positioned in the most discrete possible positions, possibly attached to rainwater pipes. It is not standard conservation practice to attempt to meet the full British Standard for lightning conductor provision on historic buildings. The British Standard is considered to be excessive.

7.7 Restoration

The British Standard definition of restoration is alteration of a building, part of a building or artefact which has decayed, been lost or damaged or is thought to have been inappropriately repaired or altered in the past, the objective of which is to make it conform again to its design or appearance at a previous date. [BS 7913:1998]

The heritage significant buildings are generally complete on the North Haugh and so there are no obvious places where restoration is needed or desirable. There may be instances in interiors where restoration is appropriate.

7.7.1 Restoration and Conservation

The word ‘restoration’, meaning the reinstatement of lost or missing fabric on a significant building is often a concern for statutory authorities for the historic built environment because:

- it can affect the authenticity and the historic value of a building;
- it can affect the aesthetic value of a building, especially one which depends for its interest on its narrative or picturesque qualities and on the patina of age, rather than on formal qualities of design.

Alternatively a case for restoration can be made in certain circumstances, particularly in the case of more recent buildings of formal design in which the significant work is of a single period. The following factors can support the case for restoration of a building as a whole, or a part, or a feature of it:

- a missing element in an otherwise complete or coherent design, for instance a house in a terrace, a wall in a house, a door in a wall, or a moulding on a door;
- the absence or failure of significant secondary or later work;
- a record of a known or proven design for a missing building, element, feature or detail; or
• a functional, structural or constructional reason for the missing element.

New work should be carefully matched and blended with the old in order to achieve an architectural whole, but it should not be the intention to deceive or to falsify the historical record as to the age or authenticity of any part of the work. As much old work as possible should be retained, and where it survives, even in the form of small or detached fragments, it should be incorporated with the new. Substantial new or relocated work should be discreetly dated, separated from the old or otherwise made distinguishable to a discerning eye. Such identification should not, though, be visually distracting. Records of the work should be made before, during and after the project and should be maintained, properly deposited and stored.

To be compatible with the existing fabric, new material introduced in the course of like for like repair and restoration should match the original materials as closely as possible. Matching should not be merely in terms of colour and appearance, but of physical and chemical characteristics, composition, species, source and method of processing, as appropriate. Identical material used in repair can initially present a raw appearance in its context but it will weather sympathetically over time. By contrast, different materials, chosen to match at the outset, will often match less well as they age. Where material identical to the original cannot be obtained, the most similar available material, providing the match is reasonable, should be used.

Policy 23 – Restoration

Restoration may be appropriate where there is sufficient evidence.

Any repair and restoration of missing elements should be based on detailed examination of the relevant parts of the existing structure or feature. The specification of materials in building restoration should match the existing in terms of quality, materials, colour, and finishes.

7.7.2 Intactness and Composition

Policy 24 – Entirety & Composition

The buildings on the North Haugh and the setting including the gardens, walls and other structures within the landscape, should be considered as a whole, including all building components and the context of the building (or structure). This will ensure that component elements, buildings and spaces, and the relationships between them are protected and enhanced where possible.

7.7.3 Interiors

There are no proposals to make alterations to the interiors of significant buildings, with the exceptions of alterations being considered for the interior of Andrew Melville Hall. The arrangement of bedrooms in groups off stairs and the allowance of ensuite accommodation per bedroom does not meet contemporary standards expected of student halls of accommodation. Alterations can be made to these areas without affecting the more significant interiors, which are the corridors and the originally open or layby spaces within the corridors. The stairs have some significance because they contain the original stair handrail detail. This stair handrail detail has been adapted to meet current safety requirements. The adaptation is probably the best way that this handrail could be altered, leaving the original
intention and design legible. Alterations to the rooms in Andrew Melville Hall and also their current arrangement should be recorded in photographs and plan drawings.

It is anticipated that interiors of the significant buildings other than Andrew Melville Hall have cornices and original detailing, such as door architraves and skirtings, etc. In some cases, partitions will have been inserted across original rooms.

Interior restoration should be concentrated in the areas that are identified as having high significance.

**Policy 25 – Restoration of Interiors**

Where run cornices are to be retained and painted, it is not necessary to remove layers of paint beyond that required for adequate preparation. This work is not essential to the character of the interior and it might be restricted to rooms where some degree of restoration of original character is being attempted.

In any good building, the interior is integral with the exterior. Listing and other forms of protection normally applies to whole buildings, interiors as well as exteriors. Decoration, fixtures and fittings, services, plant and machinery can all be significant. In some circumstances, textiles and furniture may have been made or acquired for the building, or be historically linked with it.

Care should always be taken to ensure that significant schemes of decoration are retained, if necessary covered up rather than destroyed and, where appropriate, recorded.

Policies for the interior depend on the significance of each room. Most rooms have been altered.

In some circumstances, the uncovering or restoration of historic schemes of decoration and furnishing can be desirable. Furniture and textiles historically associated with a building can occasionally be protected and should, wherever possible, be kept with it. Such interiors, fittings and contents should be recorded in a conservation plan for the specific building.

**7.7.4 Original Features**

**Policy 26 – Original Features**

Where original fireplaces, joinery and cornices remain, they should generally be respected and repaired. If made necessary by alterations which mean that the parts of the building that have considerable significance have a sustainable future then it is possible to alter features of moderate significance. The removal of original fittings and features should be minimised but it is recognised that retention of all fitted joinery might compromise a successful design.

Where original joinery or an original cornice is removed it should be photographed and the photograph referenced according to a position on the plans. This should be part of the general building record.

**Policy 27 – Interior Work**

Work proposed to the significant interiors of the buildings should be reversible and still allow appreciation of the key spaces and details of the interior.
Policy 28 – Removal of Partitions

Consideration should be made to the removal of partitions that are detrimental to the appreciation of key spaces of the interior, particularly if any future alteration project provides the opportunity to reassess the current accommodation arrangements.

7.8 Adaptations of Buildings

All buildings on the North Haugh, both significant and non-significant, will require adaptations so that they can continue to meet the expectations of students and staff. The interior of Andrew Melville Hall also requires adaptation to make sure that it is comfortable to live in without being damp, cold or needing an excessive use of energy to keep it heated.

Restoration would include returning the ceiling of the dining hall within the Andrew Melville Hall to its original design intention with deep coffers and top lighting. It would be better to form a new glazed roof where it cannot be seen above the rooflights than to fill each of the coffers with a glazed panel, as has been carried out in the past. The effect of this previous intervention is seen as negative and its removal is desirable in terms of the architecture of the building.

7.8.1 Intervention

The design of new work in close association with existing work of significance and quality, requires particular architectural knowledge, judgement, skill and care. There may be several appropriate ways of carrying out such work. New work should not damage, mask or devalue the old, either physically or visually. It should be of appropriate quality and should complement the original building. It should be reversible and, whether carefully matched, blended or contrasted with old work, should combine to form a composite building or group of buildings of overall architectural and visual integrity. Even when a particular approach is judged to satisfy all the relevant criteria, the success of the work as a whole can often depend on the fine detail, and on the skill and scholarly, aesthetic sensitivity with which it is carried out.

The following criteria apply to alteration work.

- Sufficient survey, investigation, recording, documentary research and analysis should be undertaken in advance of design work, to ensure that the building is as well understood as reasonably possible and that the risks of accidental damage, destruction, missed opportunities or unexpected discoveries are minimized.

- Disturbance of significant existing fabric should be avoided and any unsound work retained and repaired in association with alteration work wherever possible. The need for alterations should not be used to justify avoidable damage or destruction.

- The need for alteration can sometimes justify the removal of earlier fabric which, though part of the history of the building, is not of appropriate quality, is not well integrated architecturally, and manifestly detracts from the overall quality of the architecture.

- The need for alteration can also sometimes justify the restoration of the layout or of missing parts of the building according to an original or earlier design.
• Even materials now regarded as hazardous can be of historical significance, and if so may best be left undisturbed.

• New work in alterations should always be of appropriate quality, should not draw attention disproportionately, and should contribute to the architectural integrity of the altered building as a whole.

In many circumstances it is appropriate for new work to be different and distinguishable from original fabric and to be in a natural contemporary manner. Such work should be well designed and of similar quality in terms of materials and detailed design. In other circumstances it may be appropriate for new work, even when it is not restoration according to an original or earlier design, to be carefully matched in materials, construction and details to existing work, subject to appropriate identification and records.

Consideration should always be given to the desirability of carrying out alterations in such a way that they could be reversed; that is, that new work could be removed and the building reinstated to its previous state without further significant damage to the pre-existing fabric. This is particularly desirable the installation of services, where the life of such cables and installations is likely to be short compared with that of the building as a whole.

7.9 Additions to Existing Buildings

Additions to existing buildings of significance are possible to the north of the western part of University Hall and to the west of the central part of University Hall.

At Andrew Melville Hall, some small scale addition/redevelopment is desirable on the site of the existing boiler house and on the site of the existing kitchen, stores and service area. Such development should be of a subservient scale to the Andrew Melville Hall accommodation wings. Since the east and west sides of this common block are the least significant exterior elevations of Andrew Melville Hall, alterations, and a two storey extension is possible in this area.

7.9.1 Additions

This policy applies to the exterior elevations of the accommodation wings of Andrew Melville Hall and also the general aspect of accommodation wings central block in the view from the north east. It also applies to the exterior elevations of the eastern block of University hall and to the south elevation of the western block.

To enable a building to continue in use and to earn its keep it is sometimes necessary to alter or extend it, or to erect a new building within its curtilage, or close enough to it to affect its setting. In some circumstances, for example when there is an obvious or identifiable gap in a larger formal or informal composition, such new work may be positively desirable on broad architectural grounds; in other circumstances it is less desirable, but necessary. However, there are some buildings, parts of buildings, and settings in which no alterations or new work of any sort should be acceptable; care should always be taken to ensure that such work is genuinely necessary and that the end result could not be achieved in an easier or less damaging way by other means.

The criteria for alteration work apply equally to additions. Careful regard should also be given to the following aspects when considering the construction of new additions.
• Buildings whose external form and elevations have been carefully designed, or whose settings are particularly sensitive, may not be capable of being extended in an architecturally satisfactory way.

• It is sometimes appropriate for an addition to be different and distinguishable from the existing building, in which case the materials and detailing might be quite distinct. In other circumstances it may be appropriate to match the new work to the existing, in which case the new materials should be carefully matched.

• Where an addition is blended with existing work, its design should not be perceived as an end in itself, to be regarded in isolation. The composite building should be of appropriate quality throughout and should have architectural integrity as a whole and in its setting. The component parts should be maintainable and should be expected to age, weather and generally to grow together.

• Additions should neither dominate, mask nor challenge the authority of the old, nor detract architecturally or visually from it.

7.9.2 Cladding

Some buildings function well but have particular problems with their exterior facing. In such circumstances new cladding could be proposed. Such alterations are an appropriate way to tackle particular problems such as poor insulation capability or the failure of fixings in an existing cladding or external wall facing system. The cladding system for a building should also respond to the architectural design of the building beneath, not least because it needs to respond to existing window positions. The eventual appearance of the building should be considered in the same way that a new building would – in terms of its scale, appearance and location - how does it respond to the buildings and other context around it?

External cladding would not be appropriate on Andrew Melville Hall where the complex interrelationship of planes, the crispness of the detailing, and the surface texture of concrete panels is an important part of the significance of the building.

7.10 Development Opportunities

Development can enhance an area of significance. In some cases, development is desirable. Properly and strategically planned development can lead to conservation objectives being met.

Development within the North Haugh site could help to strengthen existing building relationships, enhance views within and out from the site, and provide an appropriate context for the significant buildings both at Andrew Melville Hall and at University Hall.

Development in the site should, therefore, be welcomed. The proposed listing of Andrew Melville Hall strengthens the case for appropriate development as long as it improves its context.

Andrew Melville Hall was intended to be part of a larger development which would have spread westwards into Character Area 1. This means that it would be appropriate for further development on the site originally proposed by James
Stirling. Redevelopment on this site should recognise the importance of the plan form of Andrew Melville Hall and the plan form of the unbuilt proposals. Development should also respect the general height, colour, rhythm and texture of the significant parts of Andrew Melville Hall. There is no need to match the detailing, however. The detailing of Andrew Melville Hall is specific to its design and construction in the late 1960s. It is therefore not relevant to produce a building on the site to the west of Andrew Melville Hall which looks exactly like it. The architecture of Andrew Melville Hall is sufficiently robust and visually expressive to remain legible even if a building which is similar in form but different in detail is built on the adjacent site.
The buildings on the North Haugh site have been built in a line, roughly in the positions that were imagined when Andrew Melville Hall was first designed. The construction of New Hall was probably a deviation from the original intention which was to have a gap between the University department buildings and halls of residence. It is the appearance of New Hall, both in position and design, which is most intrusive to the context of Andrew Melville Hall.

The Gateway Building is also different to the original layout intention for the North Haugh site but, unlike New Hall, it is a successful deviation from the original intention. It has been carefully composed architecture for its site and it now fulfils a function which is appropriate for a visually distinct building. The Gateway Building is a landmark which announces the start of the University as a whole on the approach to St Andrews from the north-west.

When first designed, it seems to have been intended that the northern part of the North Haugh would be left as open space with the southern part having a series of University buildings tucked into the bank along the southern edge.

The gateway building is not the only appropriate view closer at the eastern end of the relationship of the Andrew Melville Hall and the open space to the north of it. The Gateway Building has its main fronts to the east and north – towards the centre of St Andrews and towards the roundabout at the point of arrival in St Andrews. Its western and south faces are flat, do not acknowledge the cylindrical form of the building, and can be considered to be, to a certain extent, the backs of the building. It would be possible to build an extension to the Gateway Building on the western side, or a separate building close to it, which could further enhance the relationship between the Gateway Building and the North Haugh site in general.

Originally, the buildings on the North Haugh site were intended to be laid out in a line with pedestrian access by most students from the south. In the case of the Andrew Melville Hall, this is one of the most audacious parts of the original design where the principal access was to be from the top of a bank through an understated porch, then over a bridge and down flights of stairs to the central foyer. This southern access route has been one of the main design elements in the overall masterplanning of the North Haugh as first laid out. However, it has become obsolete. This is partly due to an increasing amount of students and staff arriving at North Haugh in their cars, but also because the later development of New Hall has failed to recognise the southwards facing aspects of the other buildings and faces north. Although an interesting historical fact about the layout of this site, the south pedestrian route is unlikely to be considered an important design factor in future masterplanning of the site. The fronts of the earlier buildings all faced south towards the pedestrian route. This left the backs of the buildings extending to various lengths towards the open, northern part of the North Haugh site. The original buildings had their backs facing the open part of the site.

During the 70s and probably 1980s, the backs of the buildings have been treated as such, with various ad hoc additions. However, as the masterplanning logic of the pedestrian access to the south has been lost, the orientation or strength of orientation southwards on the main buildings has also reduced. The extensions to the chemistry building are large blocks but without a prominent entrance so they still form buildings which have the character of the back of the building, although with a strong edge formed to the northern end of the development rather than buildings tailing off into the landscape. More recent developments and alterations address the space in the north part of the North Haugh in more positive terms. The Gateway
Building articulates the space by placing an object building within it. The design has been largely successful in defining and giving character to the open space to the east without dominating it.

The medical building by Reiach & Hall which has recently been completed is an intelligent and successful piece of planning as well as being an attractive building in itself. The architecture of this building is well judged. It forms a corner to the development at the north east of the run of buildings between physics and astronomy, through to Andrew Melville Hall. It is the first building to be built in this group of buildings which has its main entrance front facing north. It sets a new standard for development on the site which, if followed carefully, could produce a desirable "hard edge" of development facing the open part of the North Haugh site. Such development could include higher buildings aligned with the medical building on the Jack Cole Building site, and the computer science building site. These buildings could be aligned with the northern block of the chemistry building. A development of this kind could continue westwards across the land to the north of New Hall. A development in this position would have the advantage of disguising the appearance of New Hall in views towards Andrew Melville Hall.

The new medical building establishes a height for development along the north face of these buildings. There is a clear height to the head of the wall design. The building has been continued upwards by a further storey to contain plant. This plant storey makes the building one storey too high and the medical building site is the first building to cut across the horizon in views across the top of the bank, for instance, from University Hall and Kennedy Gardens. However, now that this unbroken horizon has been lost there is no point in keeping buildings below the level that has been established by the medical building.

The buildings could be extended southwards. Now that the alignment of the buildings and orientation has changed, it would be possible to introduce further development along the south parts that acknowledge the new role of the southern faces of the University buildings. Such sites include the possibility of building to the west of the mathematics building as far south as the south extent of the physics building. An entrance courtyard with the pavilion of the mathematics building centered on its north side would be formed.

Development to the same height as the biomedical building is possible on the sites of the computer science buildings and the St Andrews Technology Centre. The St Andrews Technology Centre is a particularly poor quality building and its low level makes its large expanse of flat roof an unwelcome and unduly prominent element in the views from the head of the bank.

Further development opportunities are possible within the study area. At University Hall the area to the south is well coordinated where it faces the fronts of the central and western blocks. The front of the eastern block, the original villa on the site faces east. However, the backs of these buildings are not coordinated with the central block facing east, the western block having its back facing north. This relationship is poor between the eastern block and the central block where the service yard of one of the central blocks faces the more important fronts of the original house. Further development on this site, for instance across the north side of the western block and across the eastern side of the central block, could help reveal or enhance significance of this character area.
Within the playing fields character area, the observatory buildings at the centre of the site could sustain some further limited, development without affecting the character or significance of the estate overall.

7.10.1 Criteria for new buildings in the context of significant buildings

The architecture of a new building should be appropriate to, and influenced by, its site. In addition to the criteria listed in the guidelines in the policies for alterations, interventions and additions, the following points are recommended.

- Buildings should be designed for a long life and soundly constructed of durable materials chosen to suit their context. They should be planned so that they are capable of alteration and adaptation in response to changing needs in the future.
- Archaeological disturbance should be kept to a minimum.
- Historic settlement patterns, plot boundaries, pedestrian routes and enclosures should be respected, as should the form, texture, grain and general character of the site, and its existing buildings.
- New buildings should be designed with due regard to their site and surroundings using materials that will weather and age well and settle into their place in the context of the North Haugh and the conservation area.

There can be no simple prescription for good architecture. Good new buildings in historic settings should not merely be fashionable or photogenic, but should stand the test of time. Mere conformity to restrictive formulae or the dressing of modern structures in traditional guises may fail to produce good architecture.

Consistency and continuity can, on the other hand, be as important within a group of buildings as within a single building and, as with alterations, new buildings should not draw attention to themselves disproportionately. In much the same way that successful artists have regard to the settings in which their works are to be placed and respond positively to the constraints which these contexts impose, so the designers of buildings in historic settings must draw upon their knowledge, ability and intellectual ambition.

7.10.2 Planning Policy

With the intensified development of the buildings on the land to the south, the overall character of the area – as open space with three buildings sitting within it, is now lost irretrievably and a new approach must be considered in masterplanning. The open space is also been used for parking and does not have clear views due to the mounds formed and tree planting. The Gateway building has been built across it. There is little point of trying to recover open space character in this area and the recommendations of this study is that masterplanning should consider a new approach to the use of this land which responds positively to the character of the developed strip and the significance of Andrew Melville Hall.

7.10.3 Guidelines

Height and Scale

Most of the buildings within the study area are not particularly high but many are of a large scale with significant floor areas, and wide and long blocks.
New development on this site needs to respond to the important views and relationships. Any development in the area of important views north and north east of Andrew Melville Hall should be carefully considered.

There are several important views north-south from the site. From the east there are important views from the south east corner of the site across the car park and across the Old Course towards the Firth of Tay, with the Sidlaw Hills in the distance. There are similar views further west from around University Hall and from Kennedy Gardens but some of these views are now cut off by the most recent medical building. Views have been identified on figure 86.

There are important views within the site, notably from the open area of the North Haugh between buildings and up to specific buildings on Kennedy Gardens to the tower of the eastern part of University Hall. In redevelopment of this site, even with taller buildings, these particular views glimpsed between buildings are an important contributor to the character of the site and should be retained.

The height of buildings should generally be appropriate to their context. The buildings should be of a similar height to the neighbouring existing buildings. although it is sometimes possible to build a storey higher, particularly if the top storey is recessed or differentiated as a storey for ventilation or other plant.

![General view from the east end of the North Haugh. S&B](image)

**Figure 83** General view from the east end of the North Haugh. *S&B*

![Detail of figure 83 above. S&B](image)

**Figure 84** Detail of figure 83 above. *S&B*

![View of the Sidlaw Hills from within the study area. S&B](image)

**Figure 85** View of the Sidlaw Hills from within the study area. *S&B*

**Materials**

There is sufficient variety of materials across the North Haugh site for any long lasting and attractive material to be appropriate for use on a new building within the site. The Gateway and the new medical buildings show how materials associated with contemporary architecture can be used to fit well within the existing setting.

Consideration should be made of the dominant material in the surrounding buildings. This is particularly if the surrounding buildings are considered to be of high significance, if they are listed or if they form a component in the conservation area.
The materials which are most common and which give most character to the existing buildings are sandstone and glass. The University buildings give an indication of how these materials have been used from the late 19th century through to the early 21st century. These surviving materials demonstrate different attitudes to design within the University site. This tradition of use of glazing systems could appropriately be continued in contemporary design.

The use of sandstone as an exterior building and cladding material is common within the University buildings. It is a tradition that could be successfully continued. The use of stone provides an opportunity for continuity between new buildings and the wider context of St Andrews.

Character

New buildings within the lower part of the North Haugh site might have a different character to those on the sites to the south, such as the playing fields. New buildings should not be built to look exactly like existing buildings, but the analysis of character does suggest that the rhythm, repetition, scale and use of materials should be influenced by the particular character of the surrounding buildings and landscape context.

The University site to the north of the bank at the south boundary of the first two character areas has derived its character from groups of large scale public buildings.

The large scale forms of the University buildings provide a good precedent for contemporary buildings of a matching ambition and scale.

Views with the Site

It will be important, in masterplanning areas such as North Haugh site, to understand the principal views and view closers. A new design should respond to such views within the site. The key views have been identified on figure 86.
Figure 86 Site plan showing key views. A larger version is shown in Appendix II. S&B
Energy Conservation

Embodied energy and energy conservation will be an important consideration within the design of new buildings. It is bound to affect the design of external cladding and the external appearance of new buildings.

7.11 Landscape

Screening of Service Yard

The service yard is of utilitarian rather than attractive appearance. It is placed near the centre of the site and, in some cases, views towards this building detract from the overall character of the North Haugh. Recent buildings have green cladding which helps to hide them to some extent but the bulk of the recent special collections building is intrusive, particularly in the context of views towards University Hall. Some screening planting has been planted which will eventually help to screen the building. It is possible that this screening planting is inadequate.

7.12 Access

Access for people with restricted mobility is possible to most of the University buildings. Safe egress from the buildings also needs to be considered.

7.12.1 Public access

Policy 29 – Public Access

It is important that reasonable public access is available to the key spaces of all public buildings.

7.12.2 Access for the Disabled

Policy 30 – Physical Access

Full access to the public, education and residential buildings is desirable. Access should be provided to meet the needs of the various different groups who use the buildings. A less satisfactory alternative to accessibility issues is to provide suitable accommodation elsewhere.

There may be a difference in the access requirements between students and visitors in terms of permitted access, security and privacy which would have to be addressed in the planning of new access, such as a lift.

7.12.3 Access Audits

Policy 31 – Access Audits

Access audits should be commissioned for specific buildings to highlight areas for improvement. The recommendations of these audits should be discussed in the light of minimising adverse impact of any suggested improvements on significant fabric.
7.12.4 Intellectual Access

Andrew Melville Hall is a very well-known and appreciated building internationally. We have anecdotal evidence of students in the USA and in Germany learning about it in their architecture and art history lectures. As often with important Modernist buildings, it is possibly more highly regarded outside Scotland than within Scotland. The fame and importance of Andrew Melville Hall, its construction system, some of its failings as a building subsequently are all of interest as architectural history. Since the building has some celebrity it is hoped that this, together with its proposed listing status, would engender a sense of pride for the students who live there. There is a very significant Stirling Archive at the Centre for Canadian Architecture, Montreal, and it is possible that the story and understanding of Andrew Melville Hall could be considerably enhanced by research and access to this collection.

The opinions and memories of people who worked on the building, and people who lived in the building at an early stage, could be recorded. The memories and opinions of the architects who worked with James Stirling at the time that Andrew Melville Hall was being designed would be an important record as part of the appreciation and understanding of the building.

The Gateway Building provides a venue for understanding the buildings of St Andrews University and this might be a possible location for a permanent display or access to a digital based display/archive to present the history of Andrew Melville Hall.

Further research

Further research should be conducted from in the Canadian Centre for Architecture archive and from interviews from various people involved in the design and construction of the building, and who lived there in the first years after it opened.

Policy 32 – Intellectual Access

Interpretation material should be produced to assist in the understanding of the significance and historical development of the Andrew Melville Hall. This should include information about the original design intentions, perhaps using copies of material from the James Stirling Archive. This information could be directed both at residents of the Hall in the form of interpretation panels fixed on a suitable wall, and made available online on the University website.

7.13 Interpretation and Understanding

7.13.1 Interpretation

There may be an opportunity for the St Andrews University building stock to provide a further educational role for the public for the conservation of historic buildings.

It is recognised that it will not be possible to provide access for all visitors to all parts of the buildings for a variety of reasons such as student security, physical access restrictions, health and safety, and for ongoing operational reasons whereby access is limited to licensed users only. Generally, inaccessible parts of the buildings are not considered to be sufficiently significant to require remote interpretation.
Those directly involved in managing the building stock, as well as occupiers should be able to understand the conservation and repair project and to appreciate the building and how it has developed.

Policy 33 – Interpretation

The history of the buildings, their former and current role within the life and operation of the University, their architects, their original details and arrangement, and the ways that they have been adapted are all of interest and requires interpretation. It is appropriate to provide some interpretation in the publicly accessible areas.

7.13.2 Heritage Skills Training

In most alteration and repair projects there are opportunities to provide specialist training in conservation work during the construction phase. This could include, for example, stone repair; conservation of metalwork, joinery, glass and leaded glass. Conservation professionals are committed to ongoing training and teaching of students and colleagues during involvement in such projects.

7.13.3 Further Research

Policy 34 – Further Building Research

An appropriate level of archival research and consultation has been carried out for this study. More detailed study may be possible if another research source becomes available in the future and in the James Stirling archive. Any new information should be used to inform ongoing management of the building and to update the conservation plan.

7.14 Maintenance

7.14.1 Maintenance

Systematic care based on good maintenance and housekeeping is both cost-effective and fundamental to good conservation. Early action can often prevent decay and avoid the need for major intervention later. Any building is best and most economically maintained by establishing a consistent level of good repair by a carefully thought out routine of maintenance and housekeeping. It is essential that there should be easy and safe access to all parts of a building for maintenance purposes. Essential information about each building, including materials, construction, services, maintenance and housekeeping procedures, should be maintained and regularly updated. Regular inspections and checks and the results of these, along with a note of any work carried out on the building should be recorded in a log book.

The following procedures should be included:

• checking, testing and servicing of building services installations;
• at least twice yearly cleaning of gutters and checking of roofs, rainwater disposal systems and drains;
• checking of all rooms, particularly little frequented areas such as attics, cellars, roof spaces and other voids;
sweeping of chimneys, window cleaning etc.;
• checking of underfloor vents and other natural ventilation.

7.14.2 Maintenance Plan

It will be essential as part of the ongoing management of the buildings to develop a maintenance plan for the site. Immediate appropriate repair and ongoing maintenance will arrest and prevent further decay of the building fabric.

Policy 35 – Maintenance & Management Plan

A maintenance schedule and budget for ongoing maintenance should be established for each building. This should be revised on completion of an alteration project to ensure that it is accurate for the future care of the building.

There are a number of actions and issues that should be addressed in the maintenance and management plan. They include the following:

• Annual inspections for maintenance and basic maintenance tasks such as checking the roofs for slipped slates, checking and clearing flat roofs and guttering, rainwater heads, downpipes, rainwater gullies and gratings.
• Regular inspection of services by suitably qualified Estates Department staff, including electrical, gas, heating, fire and other safety appliances and plumbing.
• Regular repainting as required.
• Minor repairs should be carried out as and when needed.
• Maintenance and management of any proposed extensions, external alterations or new buildings should be included and the plan updated accordingly to include them.
• Regular and thorough condition inspections should be commissioned at five year intervals.

7.15 Management

7.15.1 Conservation Plans

A conservation plan aims to aid in the conservation of the a building by providing a thorough understanding of the history, significance and issues facing the building.

Conservation plans should be used by the Estates Department in a strategic manner, and will be understood and agreed by consultants and contractors working on the buildings.

It will be the responsibility of the owner and/or building manager to ensure that the conservation plan is disseminated to all relevant stakeholders for their information.

Policy 36– Conservation Plans

The University should make reference to the conservation plan for each building as appropriate, and continue to use it in conjunction with other management policies and procedures that are in place. They should ensure that the building is maintained and managed according to best conservation practice in order to
preserve the building for future generations. The Estates Department should be responsible for issuing the conservation plan to all interested parties working on, or maintaining the building for their information. The conservation plan will be a core document to enable the sensitive and appropriate ongoing use of the site and for its management.

**Policy 37 – Advice and the Conservation Plan**

A conservation plan is designed to provide a framework to inform the future management, use, protection, repair and conservation of the building and it should be adopted by the University. It is not expected that the conservation plan could ever be sufficient in detail to provide for every eventuality or answer every question that might arise in the future. It should not be used as a substitute for professional conservation advice. Any professional conservation advice sought should use the conservation management plan as a guide.

**Policy 38 – Archiving & Dissemination**

A copy should be kept in the University archive and in the office responsible for administering buildings. A copy should also be lodged in a suitable public archive, such as the RCAHMS.

A copy should be made available by the University to all consultants and key administrators working on or in the building, now and in the future. A digital copy should be maintained by the author.

Conservation Plans should be commissioned for the following buildings:

- Andrew Melville Hall
- University Hall

A conservation plan for Andrew Melville Hall would need to present an understanding of the structure and construction system in detail. This would be an unusually technical standpoint for a conservation plan. In this case, the innovative construction system is one of the most important features about the building which gives it significance. It is also the element of the building which has most led to problems and most needs amendment to give Andrew Melville Hall a sustainable future where it provides sufficient degree of comfort for the people who are resident there. A conservation plan would need to be based on thorough research along the lines suggested in this study.

The conservation plan should also consider proposals which the University could advance for altering the internal arrangement to suit contemporary student requirements.

As part of its policies it would assess the need for recording and recommend types of recording.

The conservation plan could also assess the opportunities for extension of the building to the south east and south west where buildings of negative significance should be redeveloped in the overall conservation interests of the building. It could assess possible development in character area 1 to the west of Andrew Melville Hall which could respond to it architecturally.
7.15.2 Conservation Statements

A conservation statement is a brief form of a conservation plan which is intended to cover the main points needed for a designer to work on the buildings. It would include a historical assessment taken from current published sources, brief overview of significance, and some policies to guide the designer.

A conservation statement could be commissioned for the Rugby Stand.

7.15.3 Updating Conservation Plans

Policy 39 - Updating the Conservation Plan

Conservation plans are intended to be dynamic documents. They should be reviewed every five years to maintain their reliability. The plans should also be updated, preferably by the original author, when further information becomes available. Any new material for the project in the future should be kept in a secure location and be accessible along with the conservation plan.

7.15.4 Environment and Climate Change

The reuse of the existing buildings retains the energy embodied in their original construction. Any proposed structures should be designed to complement the existing building, but also incorporate energy efficient technologies and environmentally sound materials.

Climate change, in particular increased rainfall, will continue to cause the buildings to deteriorate. Water ingress is usually the main cause of material failure in a building. In repairing gutters and rainwater goods, the likelihood of increased rainfall should be taken into account in designing replacements. Larger gutters or a greater number of conductor pipes would both help to increase the provision for increased rainfall, but are unlikely to be acceptable alterations to the building fabric in visual terms, as the original design did not make allowance for such alterations.

Policy 40 - Climate Change

Design and specification of repairs and new structures should take into account the possibility of increased rainfall and wind, particularly in the detailing of gutters and rainwater goods.

Conservation and repair work, as well as new work, will have some impact on the environment through choices of materials, design and siting of structures and choice of services for the building.

Policy 41 - Environmental Impact

All work to the existing buildings and any new structures should be designed and managed to minimise adverse impact on the environment.

7.15.5 Professional Advice

Policy 42 - Professional Advice

Suitably qualified and experienced professional advice should be employed on a consultancy basis as needed, if not already available in-house.
7.15.6 Skilled Workmanship

Inexperienced or amateur workmanship can cause irreversible damage to historic fabric, no matter how well intentioned. Relevant professional skills that may be employed at the site in the future may include surveyors; structural engineers; architects; conservation accredited architects; and stone conservators.

Policy 43 – Skilled Workmanship

Appropriate professional or craft skills and experience should be used in all work including inspection, maintenance and repairs. Maintenance department personnel, contractors and consultants should have relevant historic environment qualification and experience.

The interior spaces and exterior walls that are considered to have moderate or considerable significance are most at risk from damage by work of unskilled workers. Some trades are more critical than others. An unskilled mason using cement can cause damage to an exterior that is difficult to reverse. Most painting is reversible.

7.15.7 Specification and preparation of contracts

As in new construction, the purpose of drawings, specifications and descriptions of work or bills of quantities is to describe the work in qualitative and quantitative terms so that:

• it can be executed in precisely the manner intended; and
• it can be properly priced, cost controlled and accounted for.

The documents should, however, also provide for changes to the scope of the work owing to characteristics of the building that could not have been ascertained at the outset of the contract and for the proper financial control of these changes. They should be concise, comprehensive and easy to use in the course of the work as well as for accounting purposes, but should be so constructed as to underline the significance of the various operations to be carried out. Redundant or irrelevant material should be excluded.

7.15.8 Preliminary contracts

It can sometimes be desirable to instruct a package of work to be undertaken in advance of a main contract. This will usually be for one or more of the following reasons:

• to carry out emergency repairs in order to prevent rapid deterioration, while the project development and the preparation of contract documents is in progress;
• to provide protection for vulnerable parts of the fabric, including decorative finishes, during the course of works;
• to remove rubbish and rotten material, material that is clearly of no historical significance, or hazardous material such as asbestos;
• to give a building, or building element, that has become very wet as long as possible to dry out;
• to investigate a building for archaeological reasons, above or below ground, so that it can be as well understood as possible before work is specified, and to minimize the need for changes to the scope of work once a start is made, arising from unexpected discoveries;

• to investigate the construction and the building generally, to assess its condition more precisely and generally to eliminate or minimize uncertainty, enabling the work to be more accurately specified;

• to establish by trial, testing and analysis appropriate specifications, particularly for sensitive work;

• to trace or record drains or services, routes or concealed voids within the fabric;

• to provide temporary security and fire precautions;

• to improve the immediate appearance of a building in decay and to give reassurance that proper repair will be undertaken.

All such work, including investigation, should be carried out as non-destructively as possible. It may sometimes be appropriate simply to instruct preliminary work on a time and materials basis, or, if the work is substantial, it may be desirable to negotiate or obtain tenders on the basis of a simple specification and description of work, with or without bills of quantities.

7.15.9 Administration and overseeing of repair contracts

The administration of a repair contract may not be significantly different from that of any other building contract. However, in some historic buildings repair projects, extra supervision may be necessary; certainly more than the inspection from time to time that is appropriate to new building. The need for close attention in the course of work can be reduced by accurate surveys, thorough research and investigation in the preliminary stages of the project and by the preparation of contract documents that are related to conservation work.

Even with great care at the pre-contract stages, the need for close supervision and frequent decision making in the course of work is likely to be a feature of the more complex type of conservation projects. No matter how thorough the preparatory work, unexpected discoveries, major and minor, good and bad, are features of almost every historic building repair contract. Good communication is vital, particularly with regard to the financial implications of unexpected or forced changes, and an ability to administer such complex contracts effectively is an important professional skill.

Policy 44 – Archaeological Potential

Prior to any works proposals for the site, discussion should be undertaken with the Council archaeology officer to assess any possible archaeological implications of work within the site.

7.15.10 Research and Investigation

There are sound practical as well as academic reasons for the maintenance of good records. Measured surveys are expensive to undertake, so survey drawings are valuable. Knowledge of the structure, construction and sometimes complex nature of
the fabric of a historic building can suggest opportunities and preclude mistakes. Survey drawings and written accounts should, therefore, always be kept up to date and maintained as part of the permanent documentation of the building. The results of any research or investigation of the building should be carefully recorded.

Methods of recording available include: photogrammetry, rectified photography, hand-measurement and thermography. Other more sophisticated non-destructive investigation techniques will also have applications in recording buildings. When work is in progress in any significant historic building, and particularly in a building of significant age or complexity, any disturbance of the fabric or of the ground in the vicinity of the building in the course of work should be carefully watched.

7.15.11 Physical Evidence and Recording

The RCAHMS has a statutorily defined duty to record listed buildings and buildings in conservation areas for which permission to demolish/part demolish/ significantly alter has been granted, as defined in Section 7(2)(B)(C) and Section 66(3) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997. The RCAHMS has three months from the date of consent to undertake such recording at their discretion.

Policy 45 - Physical Evidence and Building Recording

A photographic survey should be undertaken before and during alterations. A general programme of building recording should be developed in consultation with Historic Scotland and the local authority, as required. Assessment and recording should be carried out by an experienced archaeologist or buildings historian. The results should be made publicly available i.e. by submission to the RCAHMS.

(Return to Table of Contents)
8.0 APPENDICES

Appendix I  Listed Building Reports

- Wardlaw Wing
- University Hall
- Sports Stand
HB Number 40920  Item Number: 16 SA

Map sheet: Category: B
Group Category: Date of Listing 23-FEB-1971

Description:

FURTHER DESCRIPTION: E (street) elevation; advanced round tower corbelled to square at top stage with tall 2-leaf 6-panel timber door with roll-moulded architrave. Decorative armorial panel dated 1865 to second stage flanked by architraved windows. Single central windows to 3rd and 4th stage of tower. Top stage with central star emblem below corbel course; turret to SW corner and stepped parapet. To right, 3-storey recessed crowstepped gabled bay. To far right, 2-bays with outer bay with pedimented dormerhead breaking eaves. Corbelled conical turret at NE corner. To far left, recessed 1- and 2-storey wing with later lean-to glasshouse with decorative multi-pane glazing, conical-roofed tower, and single crowstepped gabled bay.

Mixture of 8-pane and plate glass timber sash and case windows with horns. Graded grey slates, graded grey fishscale slates to conical roof turrets. Some ashlars coped gable stacks with cans. Cast-iron rainwater goods.

INTERIOR; (partly seen 2007). Altered to form hall of residence for students of St Andrews University. Ground floor principal common room with simple timber and tile chimneypiece, 6-panel timber door and decorative plaster cornice and ceiling. Vaulted central corridor. Fine quality timber turned baluster staircase with timber handrails.

BOUNDARY WALLS AND GATEPIERS: low coped sandstone section of wall to SW curving inwards (E) incorporating bull-faced square-plan chamfered gatepiers with moulded caps.

References:

Notes:
An excellent example of the work of local architect John Milne (1823-1904). Wardlaw is sited on a prominent position along Kennedy Gardens overlooking North Haugh and the western approach road (A91) to St Andrews. Constructed in 1865 this is a finely detailed building with a plethora of Scots Baronial references such as crowstepped gables, turrets, canted bay windows and stone dormerheads. The tower is a particularly distinctive feature. Externally
it remains largely unaltered. Whilst some alterations have been made to the interior for conversion to a hall of residence, the building was acquired by St Andrews University in 1947, many original features remain such as the fine timber baluster staircase and some decorative plasterwork.

John Milne was Clerk of Works to the celebrated Edinburgh-based Baronial architect David Bryce. Milne later established his own practice in St Andrews around 1850 and many of his early commissions such as Mary's Free Church in St Andrews resulted from his close association with the Free Church. Later, partly through his position as a town councillor and Bailie, Milne was involved in the expansion of St Andrews and funded the Rathenolpe area in 1864. This area included Wardlaw. He was also involved in street improvement schemes through tree planting in Market Street, The Scores, North Street, as well as the Lade Brae Walk. The University of St Andrews Library hold his personal Scrapbook (Ref: MS 37447) which contains newspaper cuttings and letters dealing with his career and several commissions, along with an anonymous 1903 publication Concerning His Designs (Hay Fleming Collection).

Wardlaw, originally Westerlee, was built for Mr Ewing Curven at a cost of £4,700. The plans were given an honourable mention at the International Exhibition of Architecture in 1874 (A. Ledgard p. 27). At present (2007) Wardlaw Wing, together with Old Wing (1896/1911) and Lumsden (1962), comprise student accommodation for the University of St Andrews collectively known as University Hall.
HB Number: 40921  Item Number: 14 SA
Group with Items:  
Map sheet:  

Category: B  
Group Category:  
Date of Listing: 23-FEB-1971

Description:
Gillespie & Scott, 1895-6, 3-storey, 8-bay, asymmetrical Scots Baronial purpose built hall of residence. Sympathetic additions and alteration Mills & Shepherd, 1910-11 comprising U-plan adjoining wing to left and single storey 2-bay wing to right. Transomed & mullioned windows. Crowstepped gables, conical roofed turrets and pedimented gabled dormerheads. Squared and snecked sandstone rubble with ashlar margins. Base and eaves courses; string course to original L-plan Gillespie & Scott central section. 1962 Lumsden Wing H-plan extension joining to SE.

FURTHER DESCRIPTION: (principal) SE elevation: 1895-6 building with right of centre slightly advanced 3-storey and attic crowstepped gabled bay with timber door and integral 12-pane glazed fanlight; tripartite windows to 1st and 2nd floor. To right single bay with semi-circular dormer-headed breaking eaves and bartizaned turret to NE corner outer bay. To far right 1910-11 Mills & Shepherd 2-bay single storey addition with projecting pyramically-roofed outer bay with 5-light window with pedimented sundial above breaking eaves. To left of entrance 3-bay section with 4-light bay window.

To far left Mills & Shepherd 1910-11 U-plan extension. Near-symmetrical with central timber 2-leaf door set within curved gabled porch, windows in flanking bays with pedimented dormers breaking eaves. Projecting crowstepped gabled bays forming U-plan with full-height circular tower to SW corner. To rear, N elevation former service wing projection leading to whitewashed harl single storey planked and crowstepped gabled section.

Predominantly 6- and 12-pane over plate glass timber sash and case windows with horns to Gillespie & Scott building. Predominantly 6- and 4-pane over plate glass to Mills & Shepherd additions. Graded grey slates. Variety of ridge and gable stacks with cans. Cast-iron rainwater goods.

INTERIOR: (partly seen 2007). Good decorative scheme in place to principal rooms with good quality joinery work throughout. Mills & Shepherd timber panelled dining hall with stone chimneypiece with University crest and moulded stone horns, exposed kingpost type roof with decorative Gothic braces. Simple decoration to reading and common rooms including integrated timber bookcases with fluted surrounds. Many surviving chimneypieces, some corner set, predominantly timber with tiled inserts; one with carved thistle motif and 'PRO PATRIA 1896'. Simple moulded cornices.

BOUNDARY WALLS AND GATEPIERS: squared and snecked semicircular coped section of wall of varying heights to S and W incorporating boarded timber door to W St Leonard's Road entrance with square plan gatepiers with alternate ashlar and bull-faced courses, pyramidal caps and decorative cast-iron gate. Gatepiers to Kennedy Gardens: similarly treated, with pedestrian gated entrance to right.
References:

Notes:
University Hall (Old Wing) is a fine late example of Scots Baronial architecture. Although largely constructed in two phases, the later additions are sympathetic and follow the Scots Baronial style. The initial 6-bay building was designed by prominent St Andrews architects Gillespie & Scott in 1865-7 as a residence for women students at the University of St Andrews. It was extended by the Dundee based architects Mills & Shepherd in 1910-11. They added a large U-plan wing to the left of the original building and a single storey 2-bay section to the right. The building now forms part of the wider University Hall site which includes the nearby villa of Westerlee (now known as Wardlaw) by John Milne (1865, see separate listing). University Hall (Old Wing) is a large and well designed building sited discreetly in Donaldson Gardens. There is much attention to detail and the interior is of good quality with many surviving chimneypieces. The fine original glazing pattern remains and adds character to this impressive building.

Today (2007) University Hall is comprised of Old Wing, Wardlaw Wing (Westerlee) and Lumsden (New Wing). Lumsden is a 1952 H-plan building situated in low lying ground between Wardlaw and Old Wing and linked to the latter by a partially glazed corridor.
HB Number 50319  
Group with Items:  
Map sheet:  
Item Number: 5 SA  
Category: C(S)  
Group Category:  
Date of Listing: 27-JUL-2007

Description:
J Young, 1934. Simple unaltered symmetrical sports stand sited to W of University Playing Fields with distinctive oculus detailing. Flat-roofed projecting tiered boarded timber seating area supported by narrow iron columns with part-glazed harled spayed sides, moulded eaves cornice, central timber pediment with university crest. Low red brick wall with semicircular coping immediately in front of iron columns. Series of 3 blind oculus openings with raised surrounds to rear wall. Harled red tile plien-roofed narrow store attached to rear.

References:
Dean of Guild Register of Plans No 1828 (University of St Andrews Library). Ordnance Survey Map (1938-43).

Notes:
Dating from 1934 this distinctive sports stand remains largely unaltered and forms an important part of the University Playing Fields landscape. Its blind oculus detailing to the back of the stand is particularly unusual and adds much to its character. Unaltered sports stands of this era are becoming increasingly rare and this example is a good illustration of the type.

The Dean of Guild Plans show a clock within the pediment where the university crest is now. It is not known if a clock was formerly located here. The Playing Fields and adjacent Pavilion were a gift from Andrew Carnegie, then Rector of St Andrews University, in 1903.

© Crown copyright. Historic Scotland. All rights reserved. Mapping information derived from Ordnance Survey digital mapping products under License No. 100017505 2016. Data extracted from Scottish Ministers' Statutory List on 22 December 2016. Listing applies equally to the whole building or structure at the address set out in bold at the top of the list entry. This includes both the exterior and the interior, whether or not they are mentioned in the 'Information Supplementary to the Statutory List'. Listed building consent is required for all internal and external works affecting the character of the building. The local planning authority is responsible for determining where listed building consent will be required and can also advise on issues of extent or 'curtilage' of the listing, which may cover items remote from the main subject of the listing such as boundary walls, gates, gatepier, ancillary buildings etc. or interior fixtures. All enquiries relating to proposed works to a listed building or its setting should be addressed to the local planning authority in the first instance. All other enquiries should be addressed to: Listing Team, Historic Scotland, Room 2.20, Longmorn House, Saltire House, Edinburgh EH9 2SH. Tel: ++44 (0)131 006 6701 / 6703. Fax: ++44 (0)131 006 6700. e-mail: hs.inspectors@scotland.gsi.gov.uk. Web: www.historic-scotland.gov.uk.
Appendix II  A3 Drawings