

Proposals for the future location of Boroughmuir High School: outcomes arising from statutory consultation and project update

City of Edinburgh Council

28 June 2012

1 Purpose of report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to:

- advise on the outcome of the statutory consultation exercise conducted on proposals for the location of Boroughmuir High School and associated minor catchment changes affecting Boroughmuir and Tynecastle High Schools and Bruntsfield and Dalry Primary Schools and respond to the issues raised during the consultation;
- provide an update regarding the Boroughmuir High School project and the wider Fountainbridge site; and
- make recommendations on how the proposals should be progressed.

2 Summary

2.1 The Council conducted a statutory consultation in February and March of 2012 seeking views on two options for the proposed redevelopment of Boroughmuir High School. These options were:

Either

- A. Relocation of Boroughmuir to a new building on the Fountainbridge site and associated minor catchment change (the Council's preferred option); or
- B. Refurbishment and extension of Boroughmuir on its existing site with associated temporary decant to Burdiehouse.

2.2 Views expressed on both options were collected during the consultation process through written representations and verbally at four public meetings. The main issues raised by respondents are addressed in detail in the main report; the key outcomes can be summarised as follows:

- The significant majority of respondents favoured the new build proposal at Fountainbridge with only a small number favouring refurbishment;
 - A significant number of respondents expressed a desire for a larger site at Fountainbridge; and
 - Significant objections were expressed regarding the decant associated with the refurbishment option.
- 2.3 After taking account of the representations made, the issues arising and the costs associated with both options it is considered that implementation of Option A, new build on Fountainbridge, is the best way forward and is the recommendation. The reasons for reaching such a conclusion are that it offers clear educational and financial advantages, including delivering the optimum educational environment; avoids educational disruption; is the better value option; reduces the time and cost risks to the project and is the quicker option to deliver.
- 2.4 The report sets out the next steps for the project in terms of site assembly; design team appointment; and an update on the development strategy for the future development of the wider site.

3 Main report

Statutory Consultation Exercise

- 3.1 Council approval to consult on two options for the future development of Boroughmuir High School was given in November 2011. The consultation period ran from 20 February to 30 March 2012. The rationale for the proposals is set out in an excerpt from the consultation paper attached as Appendix 1. The full consultation paper can be accessed through the following link.
www.edinburgh.gov.uk/BoroughmuirConsultation
- 3.2 Four public meetings were held between 5 and 14 March: one at Boroughmuir High School and one at each of the three feeder primary schools. At each meeting Council officials answered questions on both options following a short presentation. Records of each meeting are attached at Appendix 2.
- 3.3 Representations were also invited by letter and by e-mail. A total of 180 representations were received from 177 groups and mostly individuals (3 individuals submitted two responses). Of the 177 respondees, 152 expressed a distinct preference with 131 (86%) being for new build on the Fountainbridge site and 21 (14%) for refurbishment of the existing building. This proportion was reflected in an informal show of hands at the conclusion of one of the public meetings. The remaining 25 respondees expressed no distinct preference for either option.
- 3.4 Consultation with pupils was also undertaken through the Boroughmuir High School Pupil Council whose 42 pupil members are elected by their classmates. An initial meeting was held with the group where the process for deciding upon the location of the new Boroughmuir was explained. The pupils were also taken through the consultation document and encouraged to read it thoroughly

and engage in the feedback process. A straw poll at the beginning of the meeting showed an approximate 75%/25% split in favour of refurbishment. The meeting worked in groups and further discussed issues such as the decant process and location and the type of facilities they would ideally like to see at any new school. There was a very full question and answer session and from this it was clear that the pupils had a clear grasp of the process and possible issues. A further show of hands was taken at the end of the meeting which resulted in a 95%/5% split in favour of new build. The main reason given for the change in 'voting' was the issue of decant, both in terms of the upheaval and the chosen location.

- 3.5 Responses to all of the major issues raised during the consultation process are considered in the 'Key Themes and Issues and Council Responses' section which follows. A summary of all submissions is presented in Appendix 4, with copies of the full submissions being available in the Elected Members lounge for reference. The Council's response to Education Scotland's report on the educational aspects of the proposals is contained in section 4 of this report.

Key Themes and Issues and Council Responses

- 3.6 A number of points were recurrent in the public meetings and in the responses received during the consultation period. The following section draws out the most commonly recurring themes and issues together with the Council's response.

| Theme | 1. New build as favoured option |
|-------------------------|---|
| Issues Raised | <p>The majority of respondents (131 submissions) identified new build at Fountainbridge as their preferred option, and in many cases, strongly advocated it. They felt it offered significant advantages including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering a state of the art, educationally fit for purpose building and offering a creative design opportunity; • Delivering a quicker solution for a new school; • Avoiding the prospect of decant; • Delivering greater opportunity for after hours community use of the school; and • Delivering the prospect for enhanced dining to promote healthier eating options. |
| Council Response | <p>It is agreed that the delivery of a new building on a new site can deliver the optimal educational solution for the school. The spaces within the school can be purpose designed to meet the educational brief, to ensure that the right spaces are available in the right locations of the school, capturing synergies between faculty groupings. The site can also be used more efficiently to ensure that additional space can be created where possible. This can be achieved through the configuration of buildings on the site and also through innovative use of spaces that traditionally have been 'dead' space i.e. roofs.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>It also avoids the need for any type of decant which allows the educational environment provided for the pupils to continue undisturbed for the duration of the project. For these reasons, this option was the Council's expressed preferred option and is the recommended option going forward.</p> <p>It is recognised that this option allows the school to be designed so that certain areas can be opened up for community use after hours without the necessity for the entire school to be open, which is one of the disadvantages of utilising the existing building.</p> <p>A number of concerns were expressed about the current dining options available for pupils when they leave the current school site for lunch. It is anticipated that a better environment can be created within the school for dining on the Fountainbridge site, possibly in a canal side setting which will make remaining on site a far more attractive option for pupils. Experience in recent projects (Portobello and James Gillespie's High Schools) has identified different types of dining options, more akin to café solutions, that can be delivered in new buildings which are more likely to be attractive for pupils.</p> |
|--|--|

| Theme | 2. Site Size at Fountainbridge |
|-------------------------|--|
| Issues Raised | <p>A significant number of respondents (77 submissions), while preferring the new build option, made the case for additional land being made available for the school site, particularly as the Council owns the much wider Fountainbridge site. Some queried whether other sites for the school within the wider Fountainbridge site were available.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>When first considering purchasing the Fountainbridge site as an option for Boroughmuir the Council undertook an appraisal of the whole site. There were a number of factors which led the Council to conclude that the site to the west of Viewforth (i.e. the one subject to statutory consultation) was the optimum site for the school. The Council has an established view regarding the opportunities which the wider site presents for the City as a whole and the requirements which follow from this which must be considered alongside the delivery of a school in this location.</p> <p>Firstly, the site offers one of the only places remaining in the City where the financial quarter can be expanded to provide a city centre location for the economic growth of the city over forthcoming decades. Thus it is expected that the site will deliver a significant amount of commercial floorspace at its eastern end.</p> <p>Secondly it is anticipated that this site will provide a place that people will want to both live and work, with a vibrant, mixed use community being created with a strong element of mixed housing types. The canal side location gives it a special character that can make it a destination in its own right as a city wide resource. The fact that a school can be introduced into this mixed community is likely to enhance the sense of place. However, were the school to dominate the site, the opportunity to deliver these other significant objectives would be lost.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Accordingly, from a planning perspective, there are certain prerequisites the overall site must deliver in addition to the school. In order to deliver these, sufficient land must be safeguarded on the eastern side of the site.</p> <p>In addition to these planning principles for the site, the Council must also be able to deliver a development to the east of Viewforth which is viable in financial terms. The purchase of the full site was made possible by using funding from the Children and Families Capital Investment Programme. There are a significant number of other priorities within the Children and Families physical estate for which capital funding is a necessity including the Council's contribution towards the build cost of Boroughmuir High School. The Council must therefore divest the remainder of the site in order to release the funding for these projects.</p> <p>Both the Planning and financial context for the site mean that it is not possible for the dedicated school site to extend to the east of Viewforth.</p> <p>Over the course of the consultation period, consideration has been given to whether the school could share a building with other users on land to the east of Viewforth, with the school having some floors of the building. However, there are two issues with this concept. Firstly, there is no funding in place from Council resources to deliver any such separate building in this area nor is it clear what such a facility would deliver. Were such a building to be considered; this would introduce a significant risk of delay to the school project while funding for this building is sought with there being no certainty that funding could be identified. Nor is there a mechanism for the delivery of this building as it could not be delivered as part of the school project. Secondly, a building of this type would take up developable space on the east side of Viewforth; land that is required to be maximised to ensure that the Council can deliver its other priorities, commercial and residential use. Any reduction in land available on the east of the Viewforth reduces the amount which can be realised from disposal making it more difficult for the Council to recoup its initial outlay and release funds back to the Capital Investment Programme.</p> <p>The school site size to the west of Viewforth is, however, still being considered and is described in more detail below.</p> |
| <p>Issues Raised</p> | <p>Many respondents queried why the park could not be incorporated or reconfigured as part of the school site. A number of respondents highlighted their concern about the school site being split in two by the park. Conversely, a number of responses wrote in support of protecting the park and indicated concern about the phrase that the school 'would spill out' into the park.</p> |
| <p>Council Response</p> | <p>The school site is adjacent to a park proposed as part of the student residences development for Napier University. The park has detailed planning consent and is a requirement of the delivery of the student residences; they are unable to be occupied without the completion of the park within certain timescales.</p> <p>It is, however, recognised that the prospect of a school adjacent to the park has changed the context of what was originally envisaged here. It is therefore</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <p>proposed to continue to consider with Planning how the park could be best configured while meeting the needs of all users in the area: the local community; the student community and the school community. However in order to take a view on whether the park could offer opportunities for school use, Planning would have to have some idea of emerging designs for the school, which cannot be undertaken until the design team is appointed. It is accordingly proposed that should the Council select this option, this would be the first job of the design team; to consider various permutations of how the school floorspace could be delivered, including the opportunity to reconfigure the park.</p> <p>Part of this evaluation would include whether elements of the school floorspace could be delivered under the park, by utilising the natural fall in the site from the canal to Dundee Street. As a very minimum, it is envisaged that, should the school boundary continue to follow that set out in the consultation document, the pupils will naturally be active users of the park with the building opening out onto the park, and there is opportunity for dedicated environmental space created for the school within the park area.</p> |
| Issues Raised | <p>Most of the concerns regarding site size related to the provision of outdoor sports facilities and the continued need to bus pupils off site to use facilities at Meggetland. The potential for using Harrison Park for sports facilities was also raised.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>The Council is clear that it cannot deliver full size playing pitches for the school on the Fountainbridge site. Doing so would prevent it from delivering the priorities set out above of creating a mixed community for commercial and residential uses. In addition, it would prevent the Council from divesting a significant part of the site, which would be unaffordable. From a planning perspective, the provision of large pitches in this city centre location would not be appropriate.</p> <p>However the development of the school on the Fountainbridge site would offer the opportunity to provide a significant improvement to outdoor sporting facilities that could be offered on the existing site. By providing an outdoor sporting space on a roof deck, a larger element of the curriculum could be offered here, instead of the requirement to be bussed to Meggetland for every outdoor sports requirement as would exist with the current site.</p> <p>The suggestion of using Harrison Park for pitches has been raised. While Meggetland is further away, Meggetland offers superior facilities in both pitch quality and changing rooms. However, should the possibility of developing a community based facility at Harrison Park be feasible, then this would also be open to the school to use who could adjust their travel to which ever facility best suited their needs. Accordingly, the option of a community facility at Harrison Park will be explored further to determine whether a viable proposal could be created.</p> |
| Issues Raised | <p>It was queried whether the school site could be extended into the neighbouring land occupied by Kwik Fit.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Council Response | The Council owns the land occupied by Kwik Fit, opposite Fountain Park on Dundee Street. It is not contiguous with the proposed school site, with other landowners being in control of the land in between. The land is subject to a long term lease from the Council to the current occupants which has over 90 years left to run. To try and relocate the current occupiers would be likely to introduce significant delay and cost to the school project. Accordingly it is recommended that the school project proceeds without consideration of this additional land. |
| Issues Raised | It was questioned whether, by designing a school for a smaller roll, space savings could be made (given the fact the roll comprised less than 70% catchment pupils). |
| Council Response | <p>In terms of floorspace, there are certain facilities that need to be provided with any size of school. Accordingly, providing for a smaller roll does not result in a pro rata decrease in the size of the floorspace required; the decrease is likely to be at the margins.</p> <p>It would not be desirable from an educational perspective to decrease the size of the school. The curriculum choices on offer are a factor of the size of the roll; to decrease the size of the school could have a negative impact on the extent of the curriculum on offer. The proposed size of the school, at 1,150 places, also future proofs the school for the time when it is expected that catchment numbers will rise.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Theme | 3. Concerns about the new build option |
| Issues Raised | Concern was raised regarding the narrowness of Viewforth as the access to the Fountainbridge site, particularly the narrow canal bridge with poor sight lines. Dundee Street was highlighted as a busy road. |
| Council Response | The access route to the site and the narrowness of the bridge is acknowledged as being an issue requiring a design solution as part of the project. Planning have always envisaged new pedestrian routes being created through this area as part of the redevelopment of the wider area, including a new bridge link over the canal, and this becomes of increased relevance with the pupil population using this as a route. The design team, once appointed, will actively consider a new crossing point for the school should this option be selected by the Council. In addition, the design of this section of Viewforth itself will be considered to improve the pedestrian environment, and improve linkages between the western and eastern parts of the site. In terms of entrance locations, to take best advantage of its setting, the school is likely to open out onto the canal side and the park, away from busy roads such as Dundee Street. |
| Issues Raised | A number of respondents were concerned about the reputation of Boroughmuir if it moved to what they considered to be a 'downmarket' location. Other respondents countered this by considering the Fountainbridge area to be an exciting opportunity. |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Council Response | The Fountainbridge area is on the outskirts of Bruntsfield; indeed it is the type of successful, vibrant community that already exists in Bruntsfield that the Council wishes to see extended into the Fountainbridge area. This is an area of regeneration and ultimately, as new uses develop here (of which the school would be one), it is anticipated that the nature of the area will change to being a successful neighbourhood which becomes one of Edinburgh's destinations in its own right, capitalising on its canal side setting. |
| Issues Raised | Some expressed the view that the new site was not well located in terms of public transport. One submission suggested the additional distance would increase the walking time by 20-25 minutes. |
| Council Response | It is recognised that the Fountainbridge site is located further away from established bus routes than the existing site. However the distance between the school sites is just 430m, which is around five minutes walking time. |
| Issues Raised | Concerns were noted about the potential neighbours for school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fountain Park as a poor neighbour; • The canal as a health and safety issue; and • The construction work adjacent to the Fountainbridge site. |
| Council Response | <p>It is anticipated that the nature of the Fountainbridge area will change as it is regenerated through new developments; the school and the student housing will be the initial catalyst for change.</p> <p>With regard to the canal, the school will work with the Council and the Design Team to ensure that the landscaping of the site is such that adequate measures are taken to prevent or deter ingress to the canal. The school would also seek to reinforce with pupils the dangers of playing near and in water. The school is confident that their pupils would soon accept their new surroundings, including the canal, and that the number of related Health and Safety issues would be minimal.</p> <p>One of the benefits of locating the school on the west side of Viewforth is that this whole city block will be developed out by the time the pupils move in; the student housing is due for completion in 2013, and the school would form the remainder of the development on this side of the road. Construction on the wider site will be contained within separate city blocks. The school is likely to be designed to face the quieter elements of the site (the park and canal side) which will also minimise the impact of construction noise on the school.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Theme | 4. New building design |
| Issues Raised | It was hoped that the new building would offer opportunities for sustainable features in its design. |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Council Response | The Council places great emphasis on the sustainable approach to new design, and will consider all appropriate features for a new build to embed sustainable principles. The design process will target significant improvement in the environmental performance of the new buildings over the existing. Every opportunity will be taken to utilise low and zero carbon technologies which will improve energy efficiency and reduce carbon footprint. The new secondary school will include appropriate renewable technologies and develop learning and school project opportunities as part of these installations. Throughout the design and delivery stages, the implementation of Council policies on sustainability and the climate change aims and reduction targets will be adopted. An energy centre, if proposed, would include a combined heat and power unit and the proposals will consider natural passive ventilation solutions to the main teaching areas. Sedum roofs may also be appropriate in a number of areas. |
| Issues Raised | Concerns were noted about how a rooftop pitch could be delivered without affecting daylighting underneath, and how exposed the pitch might be to the winds/weather. |
| Council Response | The Council has seen a number of good examples of how roof top pitches can be delivered: by locating them on the roof of the gym hall they can occupy a good sized space without compromising the daylighting of the space below. The examples included pitches which were on upper storeys but surrounded by masonry walls – these would provide shelter and, indeed, from the street did not look like a rooftop pitch. |
| Issues Raised | Forth Canoe Club indicated the potential to work with the school and deliver a new joint facility on the school site. |
| Council Response | The opportunity to capitalise on the canal side location with activities such as canoeing would be welcomed, and the Council will explore the potential synergies in more detail with the Forth Canoe Club. |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Theme | 5. Refurbishment and Extension as preferred option |
| Issues Raised | <p>A number of responses (21 submissions) indicated support for the refurbishment and extension option citing reasons of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • architectural value engendering a sense of gravitas and the building's role in school ethos; • the school's place in the fabric of the Bruntsfield community and economy; and • the sustainability benefits of reusing an existing building. |
| Council Response | It is recognised that the existing building for Boroughmuir represents a sense of tradition for the school. However, the building is not considered to offer a good educational environment at present and, even when upgraded, will still not be able to offer the optimal educational environment. |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <p>It is noted that all the reasons cited for retention of the existing building relate to history and tradition, and do not refer to educational environment in any way. This consultation is focussed on delivering the best educational outcome for the school; the new build has been identified as the Council's preference for delivering the best educational environment. The consultation exercise has not elicited any points to support the refurbishment over the new build as the better educational environment, and accordingly the Council remains of the opinion that the refurbishment option does not offer the educational advantages that could be achieved with new build.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the future of the Boroughmuir building will be one of continued use. Even if it was no longer used as a school it would be converted to an alternative use such as flats. The building is listed category B and will not be lost to the townscape of Bruntsfield.</p> |
| Issues Raised | Respondents indicated they did not believe the refurbishment option would take longer than the new build option to deliver. |
| Council Response | Before full design work can start, a dimensional survey and structural survey would need to be undertaken. These could only be carried out when the building is unoccupied, which in itself introduces programme delay. The existing building also houses both an electrical sub station, which serves the school and some of the local area, and a gas governor. Both of these would require to be moved before the main construction works could commence. With the building being listed, listed building consent would also be required in addition to normal planning consent. Once on site major construction works to an existing building are inherently more difficult and are often subject to many unforeseen issues, including asbestos removal. Accordingly, the indicative programme for the refurbishment project has additional allowances built in to cover the aforementioned issues. |

| Theme | 6. Concerns about the refurbishment |
|-------------------------|---|
| Issues Raised | <p>A number of respondents indicated they did not support the refurbishment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would result in a compromised educational environment; • There were additional costs associated with this option for no resulting gain; • It was more likely to run over budget and take longer because of the uncertainty associated with using an existing building; and • It was predicated on a decant which was 'a waste of money'. |
| Council Response | The Council concurs with these viewpoints which is why the new build was expressed as the preferred option. While a good educational environment can be created in the existing building, it would not be an optimal solution. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>There are inevitably higher risks associated with a project that involves opening up an existing building and one that requires approval for any changes to the building because of its listed status compared with a new build on a cleared site. These risks would impact on the construction programme, potentially leading to delay, and increased project costs.</p> <p>Also of concern is that any decant, no matter where to, would incur significant revenue costs at a time when the Council is faced with the need to significantly reduce revenue budgets. The source of this funding, were that to be required, has not been identified.</p> |
|--|---|

| Theme | 7. Objections to the decant proposal |
|-------------------------|---|
| Issues Raised | <p>Over 90 respondents raised concerns about the prospect of any decant, citing learning environment issues (temperature and acoustic problems); maintaining school ethos and morale and discipline issues.</p> <p>The principal objection to the decant was the location, raising concerns about the length and logistics of travel to and from school; lack of participation in after school activities and friction with neighbouring schools.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>It is recognised that the accommodation provided in a decant situation, no matter where located, cannot compete with the type of accommodation found in a permanent building. The proposal would involve a series of rows of two storey temporary units, plus a separate large space for a gym. The configuration alone would require outdoor movement between classes.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Burdiehouse site is some considerable distance from the existing school and that travel logistics would be more than difficult than presently exist. An extensive search of options was undertaken prior to selecting this site, including those within the catchment, an analysis of which is referred to below.</p> |
| Issues Raised | <p>Respondents queried why other options could not be found for the decant. The principal query was why the Fountainbridge site could not be used as a decant location. Other suggested decant locations included Darroch, Tynecastle, NHS sites (Astley Ainslie/Royal Edinburgh), Craighouse, Meadowspot park, Fairmilehead park, TUs on the current site and phasing the building works to reduce the need for decant.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>It should be noted that in all cases, the educational compromises of a decant, along with the significant financial revenue burden it would bring, would apply no matter where the decant was located.</p> <p>The Fountainbridge site was bought as an option for the delivery of a new build school for Boroughmuir, with the requirement to divest the remainder of the site as soon as possible in order to reimburse the Children and Families Capital Investment Programme for the purchase. If the site is not chosen for the school then the Council will immediately enter into negotiations to divest the entire site. To do so with a requirement for a</p> |

decant village located on part of the site until 2019 (i.e. almost seven years hence) would unnecessarily fetter any prospective developers ability to plan for the site's development. This in turn would be likely to compromise the Council's ability to secure best value in the rate of return for the land purchase. In conducting a land transaction such as this, a better price can be secured for an unconditional release of land. Accordingly it is not considered appropriate that a decant could be located on the Fountainbridge site.

With regard to other decant location options, the following applies. Given the extensive work to the existing building that would be envisaged under a refurbishment, it would not be appropriate to retain some pupils on site and work around in them in phases. Nor, given the constrained site, the extent of new build still necessary and the need for contractors compounds, would there be sufficient room to accommodate part of the roll in temporary units on-site. In addition, working around existing pupils in phases would extend the length of the construction period significantly. Accordingly a whole school decant would be necessary. This rules out options such as the Darroch building which, in addition to already being used as a decant location for part of the roll at James Gillespie's and therefore unavailable, can only accommodate a maximum of 500 pupils, less than half of the Boroughmuir roll.

The old Tynecastle school building was previously considered as an option for the decant for James Gillespie's. It was ruled out given the proximity of the new Tynecastle High School meaning that 2,000 pupils would be using the same access at the same time off the busy Gorgie Road. The same would apply for Boroughmuir. In any case, the buildings are in such a poor state that significant clearance and replacement with temporary accommodation would still be necessary.

Other sites were considered within the Boroughmuir catchment area and across the city. Sites outwith Council ownership, such as the NHS sites, Scottish Water site or Craighouse campus have risks associated with them as the Council would be dependant on a third party for bringing forward the site for use at the appropriate time. As this would be outside the Council's control, there would be significant risks of the project being delayed if the sites were not made available in time. There would also be revenue costs associated with renting that land, which would be in addition to the significant costs of temporary unit rental which have already been identified. The fact that this land would be needed until 2019 would also fetter those particular landowners in their own plans for those sites.

The use of parks for the decant would come with its own disruption for park users for a three year period. The two parks suggested are both currently used as facilities for Buckstone and South Morningside Primary Schools, given their own constrained facilities on small sites.

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Theme | 8. Alternative sites |
| Issues Raised | It was suggested that the project should wait until an alternative new build site emerged – suggestions included the Scottish Water site; Craighouse Campus and Astley Ainslie. |
| Council Response | As described during the consultation, the Council has been looking for a new site for Boroughmuir for many years. Many, including those listed, have been explored in depth. Some have been excluded on affordability grounds (such as the Scottish Water site) and others excluded on both affordability and time grounds – they would only become available at a much later date, if at all. To continue to explore other options would inevitably lead to extensive delay to the project and jeopardise its entire delivery. The Scottish Government has approved the project funding with the expectation that the school would be delivered for the 2017/18 academic session; this could be significantly compromised if alternative sites were sought. |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Theme | 9. Catchment review |
| Issues Raised | <p>Bruntsfield Parent Council raised concerns about expanding the catchment area, given that new housing would be proposed both on the remainder of the Fountainbridge site and the former Boroughmuir site, should the new build be selected.</p> <p>Some respondents asked for the catchment area to be extended to incorporate the entire Fountainbridge area to create a cohesive community as part of the redevelopment of this area.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>The change to the catchment area is a necessary consequence of the new build proposal, otherwise the high school would lie (just) outwith its own catchment area. Should this option be chosen, the redevelopment of the existing high school building is likely to be for flats, although flatted developments tend to generate very few pupils (seven pupils per 100 flats on average). The Fountainbridge development would be expected to generate more pupils as it is expected that a mix of housing types would be delivered here. The numbers would be monitored to ensure there would be sufficient primary school accommodation in the area to cater for these new catchment pupils.</p> <p>However, with regard to extending the size of the catchment area further, the proposed boundaries have been identified on the basis of having minimal impact. Further extension would affect Tollcross and James Gillespie's schools, as well Boroughmuir, Tynecastle, Bruntsfield and Dalry. Any further changes would require a further full statutory consultation to be undertaken, and it is not proposed to consider further realignment.</p> |

| Theme | 10. Procurement route and quality of build |
|-------------------------|---|
| Issues Raised | <p>Concern was expressed about the type of procurement and the perceived low quality of the buildings achieved through PFI.</p> <p>It was queried how long the new build could be expected to last and support indicated for the current building which had functioned for more than 100 years.</p> <p>There were concerns that a full comparison between the options of life cycle costs had not been made and that the refurbishment option would perform better than the new build.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>The procurement route for both options – refurbishment or new build - would be the same. This is a condition of the Scottish Government funding that would require a revenue based Design, Build, Finance and Maintain funding model to be put in place.</p> <p>With regard to the quality of new build, it should be noted that even with the refurbishment option, the present building would be extended by almost a third again with new build accommodation. The design and build quality for either option would be to the highest standard.</p> <p>The key to ensuring that both options are built for the long term future are the maintenance arrangements which are put in place. Under the proposed procurement route, the private sector partner will have an obligation to maintain, repair and renew elements of the building during the first 25 years. Therefore, the asset will be in excellent condition when returned to the Council thereafter.</p> <p>Life cycle costs have been considered for both options over a 30 year period, with no significant difference being identified between them.</p> |

| Theme | 11. Consultation Process |
|-------------------------|---|
| Issues Raised | <p>Some respondents felt that the consultation was biased towards the new build option.</p> <p>One suggested the purchase costs had not been included in the financial appraisal which skewed the benefits towards new build.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>The consultation paper made it very clear that the Council's preferred option is for new build for many reasons including delivering the optimum educational environment; avoiding educational disruption and being the better value option; reducing the time and cost risks to the project; and being the quicker option to deliver. This has been construed as bias from some respondents, but the Council views it as a simple statement of fact.</p> <p>With regard to the respective costs of each option, all land purchase and build costs have been included, with the costs expressed as net costs. The new build remains the better value option.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Issues Raised | Boroughmuir Parent Council asked for more detail on the academic aspects of the proposals. |
| Council Response | <p>All Staff were involved in early consultations around the Strategic Educational Design Brief (SEDB) of the new school; regardless of it being a refurbishment or a new build. Staff were asked to look at what type of spaces they saw being necessary to deliver a 'Curriculum for Excellence' effectively in any 'new' school. Staff looked at how to 'future proof' the teaching spaces that a 'new' school would deliver by looking at how they teach now and how they would like to teach in the future. The use of flexible/adaptable teaching spaces was a common theme along with well designed break out spaces that can be used for specific groups of learners in a variety of ways. Also the adjacencies of subject areas to allow effective interdisciplinary learning was explored and is a key outcome of the SEDB. The ability to get useable outdoor learning and sports facilities is also a common theme. The SEDB has been a major driver in the outline 'shape' of any 'new' building.</p> <p>The Senior Management Team of the school believe that it is far better to have a building with the elements of 21st Century teaching and learning built in at source i.e. flexible spaces, break out spaces and outdoor space rather than trying to adapt existing spaces within the constraints of a listed building.</p> <p>The school have expressed that they are highly excited by a new Boroughmuir High School being part of a new urban development on the canal side location of Fountainbridge. They are convinced it will provide a new dynamic to the school and provide an environment which is urban but with the canal and park being enhancing elements of this regenerated landscape. This can only enhance the experience for the pupils in terms of learning opportunities, learning environments and will also provide a social space around the school with a much softer feel than the highly constrained Viewforth site.</p> <p>They believe the great tradition and reputation of Boroughmuir will only be enhanced in a state of the art new build, and are striving to make all pupils modern, relevant and adaptable for a life in the 21st century.</p> |
| Issues Raised | <p>One community council objected to the style of the consultation and sought to gather the views of parents across the several communities affected.</p> <p>One resident objected to not being formally consulted.</p> |
| Council Response | The terms of the consultation are set out in the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010, which prescribes who the Council should consult with. The Council has complied with this Act and indeed gone beyond the requirement set out in the Act which is to consult with parents whose children are either at the school or would be expected to commence at the High School in the next two years. The Council has conducted extensive consultation with all school communities in the school cluster as the proposal is wide reaching and would affect far more than just incoming cohorts in the next two years. |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>This is a consultation into the education merits of the proposals as prescribed under the Act. There will be formal consultation with the local communities, including neighbours, as and when proposals for the buildings are brought forward through the planning process. This would apply both to any new building at Fountainbridge and any changes proposed for the existing high school building.</p> |
| Issues Raised | <p>Bruntsfield Parent Council asked how much the school's SMT position on the proposals was informed by staff's views within the school.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>Staff at Boroughmuir have been kept informed of progress on all issues relating to the new school and were actively encouraged to express their views as part of the statutory consultation process. They were also made aware of, and welcomed to attend, the public meetings. Individual or departmental views were not sought by the Senior Management Team. It was felt that the response to the proposals should be a strategic educational response and as such was one that should be made solely by the Senior Management Team.</p> |
| Issues Raised | <p>Bruntsfield Parent Council questioned how much parental engagement there would be as part of the ongoing design development.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>To date, development of the brief has focussed on the pedagogical styles of the teaching profession and the type of environments best suited to learning. Views of the pupils have also been sought to give a user perspective. The next stage will be the appointment of the design team to start translating this brief into school designs. Initial engagement on these designs will take place with the teaching staff. This will be followed by a full public consultation, including parents, through the pre-planning process, prior to a planning application being submitted.</p> |
| Issues Raised | <p>Some queried the validity of the consultation process given the fact that the Fountainbridge site had already been purchased.</p> |
| Council Response | <p>If the new build option on the Fountainbridge site were to become a deliverable option, the Council had no choice but to make a purchase prior to conducting the necessary statutory consultation on the options. The sale of the site by Lloyds Banking Group was a competitive process conducted in less than four months in which the Council was just one of many bidders.</p> <p>Were the Council to have conducted a six month consultation process in advance of purchase it would not have secured the site. Prior to making the purchase, the Council evaluated the options and considered that there were clear benefits of new build compared to refurbishment, which is why it expressed the new build as its preferred option. However, ultimately the Council could still decide to follow the refurbishment route and sell off the entire Fountainbridge site had the consultation exercise brought forward a significant degree of concern regarding the new build option.</p> |

4 Education Scotland

Legislative Context

- 4.1 The Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 requires that the authority refer the proposals to Education Scotland so that they may prepare a report on the educational aspects of the proposal. In producing their report, which is included in Appendix 4, Education Scotland considered the proposals of the authority as set out in the consultation document and the verbal and written responses received during the consultation period.
- 4.2 The Act requires that the Council's consultation report include 'a statement of the authority's response to Education Scotland's report'. Some of the issues raised in the Education Scotland report were also raised by other respondents and the Council response is incorporated in Section 3 of this report.
- 4.3 Education Scotland state that the present building is no longer fit for purpose and this position has been repeated in successive inspection reports. They indicate that young people would benefit from significantly improved social and educational facilities in a building with well-resourced accommodation designed to promote flexible learning and teaching approaches consistent with Curriculum for Excellence, as set out in the Council's specification.
- 4.4 They indicate that either option would bring a clear educational gain to young people compared with the present building. They state that the new build at Fountainbridge would be to the overall educational advantage of the young people involved. They would expect the option to deliver a high quality educational experience whilst avoiding any disruption caused by decant. They also recognise the continuity of provision for community users that this option would provide, rather than the programme being disrupted during a decant period. They indicate that this is their view despite the limitations of space and the continued need for young people to use Meggetland for part of their physical education programme.
- 4.5 In taking forward the new build proposal, they highlight two factors for particular consideration by the Council:
- Seeking to maximise the amount of space available at Fountainbridge for outdoor activity; and
 - Minimising the impact of any potential traffic risks to young people.
- 4.6 With regard to the refurbishment option, they note the potential negative impact of the decant. Their concerns relate to the restricted educational experience; the limited social facilities for young people and the logistical and travel issues associated with the location in Burdiehouse. They also highlight that it would take longer for young people to benefit from an enhanced educational environment with the refurbishment than it would with the new build.
- 4.7 Education Scotland conclude by indicating that the educational benefits of the new build option clearly outweigh those of the refurbishment option.

Response to Education Scotland

- 4.8 The Council concurs with the views expressed by Education Scotland regarding the new build option clearly outweighing the benefits of the refurbishment option. There are two issues with the new build identified by Education Scotland, both of which are addressed in Section 3 of this report. The Council will continue to explore all possible options to maximise the space for the school on the west side of Viewforth, to allow the maximum available space to be offered to the school for outdoor activity. It should be noted that the park itself, even if not within the dedicated boundary for the school, can offer a significant potential resource for outdoor activity. The issue of pedestrian access to the school site is also one that will be actively examined, with the potential for a new pedestrian crossing of the canal explored. Both of these issues will be explored in detail as part of the design process for the school once the design team are appointed.

5 Statutory Consultation Conclusions

- 5.1 The response to the consultation has been significant and very strongly in favour of the establishment of a new school on the Fountainbridge site. There has been limited support for the refurbishment option, which has focussed on the history of the building rather than the educational environment that can be achieved. Education Scotland have considered the proposals and all the responses made to the consultation and concluded that new build on a new site offers clear advantages over refurbishment.
- 5.2 It is considered that the new school on the Fountainbridge site offers clear advantages including delivering the optimum educational environment; avoiding educational disruption; being the better value option; reducing the time and cost risks to the project and being the quicker option to deliver. Accordingly it is recommended that this option is approved as the way forward.

6 Project Update

Site size regulations

- 6.1 Legislation relating to school site sizes is set out in the School Premises Regulations 1967. These prescribe overall site sizes for schools of varying sizes. For a school of the size proposed for Boroughmuir High School, a site size of 2.6 hectares is prescribed. Many of the schools in the city do not meet the Regulations, and the existing site of Boroughmuir, at 0.9ha, is one of them. The proposed new site at Fountainbridge is a minimum dedicated site of 1.0ha, and new build here would present opportunities to maximise this space, through for example provision of decks for sports space and play.
- 6.2 As the proposed new site would not meet the Regulations however, the consent of the Scottish Ministers would be required to progress with this site. In line with the intent indicated in the consultation paper, following conclusion of the consultation process the Council wrote to Scottish Ministers to seek this consent in order to allow Council to have a clear position on this matter in advance of its decision. Scottish Ministers have now formally confirmed that it would be impractical to apply the standards of the 1967 School Premises

Regulations should the Council opt to relocate Boroughmuir to the site at Fountainbridge. Accordingly they have given their approval to the 1ha site applied for.

Site Assembly

- 6.3 Prior to the purchase of the Fountainbridge site, Elected Members were briefed regarding the fact that a site to the north of the land in Lloyd's ownership, at the corner of Dundee Street and Viewforth (55-63 Dundee Street), lay under separate ownership and was outwith the land for sale. This corner plot forms part of the site consulted upon for school use. Negotiations have commenced with the landowner regarding the purchase of this site and will continue to endeavour to find a Best Value solution. However, Council should be aware that it may be necessary to commence procedures for a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) to secure the land for the school. The Education (Scotland) Act 1980 makes provisions for Councils in Scotland to acquire land for educational institutions and, as 55-63 Dundee Street is required for the new school, should the Council select this option it would be appropriate to promote the acquisition under this legislation. In advance of this the Council would, however, have to obtain Planning Consent for the School site. Should Council select Option A, new build at Fountainbridge as the approved project, and a negotiated purchase of 55-63 Dundee Street proves impossible, Council authority is sought to commence CPO proceedings under S20 of the Education (Scotland) Act 1980.
- 6.4 Considerable debate during the consultation centred on the site size and the use and configuration of the public park adjacent to the proposed school site at Fountainbridge. Discussions on this subject will continue with Planning once design proposals for the school start to emerge after the design team is appointed. The park itself, and the neighbouring access roads, which was a condition of the sale of the land from Lloyds are in the shared ownership between the Council and the owner of the student housing development. Once opportunities are identified, discussions can recommence with the shared landowners of this area of land to consider how these opportunities can be implemented.

Design team appointment

- 6.5 A selection process for a multi disciplinary, architecturally led design team commenced in December 2011 under the Official Journal of European Union (OJEU) procedures. A design team for both options was pursued to cover each eventuality of the outcome of the statutory consultation process. A very high level of interest was achieved including internationally recognised architectural practices.
- 6.6 The details of the tender process and associated outcomes are set out in Appendix 5. Following interviews of a strong shortlist for both options, the following appointments are recommended to the Council as being the most economically advantageous:
- Allan Murray Architects, should the Council select new build at Fountainbridge as the approved project; or

- John McAslan and Partners, should the Council select the refurbishment/extension option on the existing site.
- 6.7 The next action in accordance with OJEU regulations would be to notify all bidders of the results of the tendering process and start the mandatory 10-day standstill process for any feedback and/or challenge by the unsuccessful contractors before the actual contract was awarded.

Wider Fountainbridge site

Terms of Engagement of EDI

- 6.8 At its meeting on 24 November 2011, Council delegated authority to the Directors of City Development, Corporate Governance and Children and Families to consider and finalise the proposed involvement with EDI regarding the future development of the wider Fountainbridge site. This has not yet been concluded and this work will continue under that delegated authority.
- 6.9 Options for the future development of the remaining site have been reviewed in conjunction with EDI and their advisers appointed to consider the investment strategy for the site. Options evaluated include immediate sale; development through a joint venture partnering agreement; or direct development by EDI. This work is important given that future financial returns from any sale and/or development form a component part of the Business Plan for the new school.
- 6.10 Alongside the assessment of the development strategy, initial feasibility work has been undertaken by the Masterplan design team appointed by EDI to assess the status of the current Planning Permission in Principle (secured by Lloyds Banking Group in 2011). Initial work has been undertaken to evaluate how the Council's wider aspirations can be delivered whilst also delivering the school on the west part of the site. It is proposed to discuss with elected members in more detail their priorities for the site to set out an overall development framework which will inform the most appropriate strategy for the site's future development.

School project delivery mechanism

- 6.11 The school project is attracting a significant proportion of its funding from the Scottish Government's Scotland's Schools for the Future Programme; this is described further under the Financial Implications section. In order to comply with the requirements of the programme, the Council must follow a Design, Build, Finance and Maintain procurement route. There are two procurement routes to explore for the delivery of the project:
- Delivery through Hub South East; or
 - Delivery through a Non Profit Distributing model as defined by the Scottish Government.
- 6.12 Both options are currently being explored in detail to establish which would be the better route for the delivery of Boroughmuir High School. It is proposed to report back to Council on the recommended route at a later stage in the project.

7 Financial Implications

- 7.1 The Scottish Government will provide funding of approximately two-thirds of the cost of construction of the new school based on the delivery of like for like facilities. Therefore, for example, any costs associated with the provision of a sports pitch would require to be funded 100% by the Council. They would not provide any support towards the cost of any land required for a new build option nor for any decant costs associated with the refurbishment/extension option.
- 7.2 In addition, there is a maximum level of funding which they will provide based on current capacity and an assumed construction cost per m² and area per pupil. For a new build based on an assumed construction cost of £1,900 per m² this would equate to funding of approximately £16.5m (before any provision for inflation, with a base date of Quarter 2 2011); the contribution for a refurbishment/rebuild option would be lower due to the lower construction cost.
- 7.3 The Children and Families Capital Investment Programme 2011-2015 currently includes £9.5m in 2014/15 of unallocated funding in respect of the Wave 3 Schools Projects. Beyond this timeframe the 10 year capital investment programme contains a further £7m allocation each year to the Wave 3 Schools Programme which, together with expected repayments of essential maintenance works from elsewhere within the capital budget, would leave net available funding for the Wave 3 programme of approximately £36m in the period to 2017/18 which would be available for the Boroughmuir project and the other remaining Wave 3 schools – St John’s Primary School and St Crispin’s Special School. This obviously assumes that the level of capital funding reflected in the capital investment programme is maintained.
- 7.4 The funding for the project from the Scottish Government will be a revenue based model and hard facilities management services will require to be provided under the contract as a condition of this funding. The options available to the Council will be a Design, Build and Finance and Maintain model procured through the South East Territory Hub Company, or a Non-Profit Distributing model procured through a competitive OJEU processes.
- 7.5 In either case, the Council would be required to cover the Hard FM (Facilities Management) and Lifecycle costs through an annual unitary charge over a period which is likely to be 25 years. This is similar to the existing PPP contracts, however, there would be elements of the unitary charge (such as their agreed proportion of construction costs, all Special Purpose Vehicle running costs and all financing interest and fees) which the Scottish Government would cover as part of their contribution. The capital contribution from the Council would be paid on completion of the build project.
- 7.6 It should be noted that either route will entail an additional revenue cost to the Council in future years which is as a result of the necessity to use this revenue based funding model. Such costs would not arise in this regular way on projects financed fully by capital funding (such as the new Portobello) for which the cost of ongoing hard FM and lifecycle would be accommodated as and

when the need was identified and based on the timing of expenditure being determined by the Council. As an illustration, the ongoing revenue costs in respect of the new James Gillespie's High School which requires to follow the same funding model have been estimated at £400,000 per annum.

- 7.7 An initial appraisal of the project build costs has been undertaken based on the Council's current experience with both Portobello and James Gillespie's High Schools, to inform the relative financial aspects of the two options subject to consultation, referred to below. This assessment is set out below. However, full detail of the project costs will be further developed once an option is approved by Council, and the project team assembled to consider the design permutations of the approved project in more detail.
- 7.8 Both options have been costed using the same methodology; construction costs, fees, development costs and contingency. In addition to this, land purchase, disposal receipts, any necessary decant costs and anticipated Scottish Government funding have been factored in to arrive at comparable costs for each option. This results in the refurbishment option being £5m more expensive to deliver than the new build option.
- 7.9 The main cost for both options is the cost of construction. The cost per square metre used for Boroughmuir is above current school benchmarks and is considered to be sufficient to deliver the quality aspirations and design permutations for either option. It should be noted that the construction cost and associated Scottish Government funding assistance for the refurbishment option are lower than the new build to reflect the re-use of an existing building.
- 7.10 Within the overall cost comparison, the refurbishment option includes £7.7m of revenue costs associated with the decant, for which a budget has not been identified.
- 7.11 It should be noted that provision has been made for the acquisition of 55-63 Dundee Street within the outline business case for the delivery of the school. Any CPO costs would include the Council's legal costs, any compensation plus any reasonable surveyors and/or legal fees incurred by the owners.
- 7.12 Given that design development is required to examine the various design permutations that may emerge for the new school, for example, how the park may be incorporated within the school design under the Fountainbridge option, it is proposed that a further report will be brought to the Council at stage D; the submission of an application for planning permission. This report would give a project update and seek authority for the funding of the full project together with the estimated ongoing Hard FM and lifecycle revenue costs. It is accordingly recommended that approval is given to allocating funding of up to £1.25m to take the project to Stage D. This would be met from the Children and Families Capital Investment Programme. External sources of additional funding will also be explored to determine whether a viable proposal could be developed to enhance the community sports facilities at Harrison Park.

8 Equalities Impact

- 8.1 The Council has undertaken a consultation that meets the requirements of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010 and, in doing so, has given the

parents and pupils of Boroughmuir High School and all the feeder primary schools, equal opportunity to have their say in the future development of the school.

- 8.2 This report has considered the issues raised during the consultation and, in doing so, has assessed the benefits and disadvantages of both options.
- 8.3 For these reasons, the overall equalities relevance score is 3 (out of a possible 9). Accordingly, a full Equalities Impact Assessment is not required.

9 Environmental Impact

- 9.1 The development of the entire Fountainbridge site represents the regeneration of a brownfield site previously occupied by heavy industry. The strategic coordination of this site's development could enable innovative responses to be delivered, for example shared heat sources across the site. Examining how sustainable measures can be incorporated into the school design will be an integral part of the design process. Sustainable principles will be fundamental to the design strategy, informing strategic decisions such as building orientation and ventilation strategies. Every opportunity will be taken to utilise low and zero carbon technologies, and focus on improving energy efficiency. The principles that might apply to the school design are set out in Section 3 of this report.
- 9.2 With regard to the existing high school building, it is envisaged that this will be sold for conversion into an alternative, viable use, securing its future for the long term.

10 Conclusions

- 10.1 Considerable support has been expressed through the statutory consultation exercise for the relocation of Boroughmuir High School into a new building on the Fountainbridge site. This option is also the clear preference of Education Scotland. It is considered that the new school on the Fountainbridge site offers clear advantages including delivering the optimum educational environment; avoiding educational disruption; being the better value option; reducing the time and cost risks to the project; and being the quicker option to deliver. Accordingly it is recommended that this option is approved as the way forward.
- 10.2 It is proposed that the first action of the design team is to consider how the site to the west of Viewforth is configured to maximise the potential for the school, whilst also respecting community use of this area.

11 Recommendations

- 11.1 It is recommended that Council:
- (i) Approves new build on Fountainbridge as the project for the replacement of Boroughmuir High School;
 - (ii) Approves minor revisions to the catchment area of Boroughmuir, and Tynecastle High Schools and Bruntsfield and Dalry Primary Schools, as

set out in the consultation proposals, implemented from the academic year within which the new Boroughmuir High School will open;

- (iii) Approves that a Compulsory Purchase Order is pursued if necessary to secure the site at the corner of Viewforth and Dundee Street under S20 of the Education (Scotland) Act 1980;
- (iv) Approves the acceptance of the tender from Allan Murray Architects and that a contract be entered into with them as the design team to deliver the new school project on the Fountainbridge site;
- (v) Approves a budget of £1.25m from the Children and Families Capital Investment Programme for design fees and other necessary costs to take the project forward to Stage D (submission of planning);
- (vi) Notes the intention for a further report to be submitted to Council on the project status and budget at Stage D; and
- (vii) Notes that the strategy for the future development of the wider site is progressing.

Billy MacIntyre
Head of Resources, Children and Families

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Appendices | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1 Rationale for Proposals – Excerpts from the Consultation Paper2 Record of Public Meetings3 Summary of Consultation Submissions4 Education Scotland Report5 Design Team Appointment |
| Contact/tel/Email | lindsay.glasgow@edinburgh.gov.uk |
| Wards affected | City Centre; Colinton/Fairmilehead; Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart; Meadows/Morningside; Sighthill/Gorgie |
| Single Outcome Agreement | Supports National Outcome 4 - 'Our young people are successful learners, confident individuals, effective contributors and responsible citizens.' |
| Background Papers | Boroughmuir High School: Purchase of Fountainbridge Site and Options for Future Development – Report to Council, 24 November 2011 |

RATIONALE FOR PROPOSALS – EXCERPTS FROM THE CONSULTATION PAPER

The consultation paper released in February 2012 set out the options for the future location for Boroughmuir High School, together with the associated implications for each option. Excerpts from the paper are replicated below.

Option A – new building on the Fountainbridge site (Council preferred option)

Site description

The proposed new school site is located immediately to the west of Viewforth, adjacent to the canal and the proposed public park. The site is located less than 500m to the north of the existing school site. The site size is 1.3 hectares in total, including 0.3 hectares currently designated as public park space.

The site is bounded by Viewforth to the east, Dundee Street to the north, and to the south has a long frontage along the canal side. The other principal use of this block of land within the site will be student housing. The existing plan will see a public park being delivered alongside the school as part of the student housing development. It is the intention to review the exact configuration of this park as part of the revised master planning exercise. This particular area has been identified for the school from within the wider Fountainbridge site following consultation with the Council's planning division.

The proposed building would be built to an overall space budget of 13,110 square metres. This equates to 11.4 square metres per pupil and is consistent with the space standards allocated to the other current Wave 3 secondary schools projects.

Educational advantages

- The new build offers the opportunity to fully respond to the Strategic Educational Design Brief, by creating a purpose designed building. It allows the optimum configuration of each faculty, setting the collaboration spaces at the heart of each faculty, and ensuring the desired adjacencies between subject areas can be achieved.
- All the spaces created can fully meet the design brief requirements, including all room sizes and sports facilities.
- The location offers the opportunity to create outdoor learning environments in the park.
- The canal side location offers an excellent potential learning and sports resource for the school.
- Outdoor sports facilities, in the form of a Multi Use Games Area or a seven a-side all weather pitch, could be delivered which, along with the indoor sports facilities, would meet almost all of the sports curriculum requirements.
- It would allow for the school to move directly from the old building to the new facility, with none of the educational disadvantages associated with a decant.
- The adjacency to both business and further education communities could offer the opportunity for excellent synergies e.g. the business faculty.
- The enhanced facilities delivered by the completed project could be available to pupils and the community at least 1 year earlier than the refurbishment and extension option.

- There would be no disruption to community education programmes during the construction period.
- All school accommodation would be located on a single site.

Educational disadvantages

- This option will have limited on-site sports facilities and cannot deliver a full size pitch adjacent to the school. The school would continue to use Meggetland when it required access to a full size pitch.
- The Fountainbridge site would entail a slightly longer travelling distance to school for many pupils albeit that for some this would be mitigated by the provision of bus passes.

Option B – refurbishment and extension of existing building

Site description

Boroughmuir High School is located on a small site (0.9ha), with the main school building being located fairly centrally on the site. The main building is supplemented by accommodation in a number of more recent ad hoc additions or stand alone buildings on the northern half of the site. Limited playground space wraps round the southern half of the main building. The main building is listed category B, which means its removal to make way for a new building is not an option. The main building currently offers just over 10,000m² of space. The site is bounded on all sides by high density residential buildings, comprising four storey tenements and two and three storey town houses.

The accommodation is further supplemented by an annexe in St Oswald's Hall in Montpelier Park, providing around 800 square metres of accommodation. This space delivers all drama facilities; examination accommodation; music and drama productions and other whole school events.

To deliver the accommodation requirements, the new school needs to have minimum available space of 13,110m² which equates to 11.4m² per pupil. With the removal of the various ad hoc additions to allow new build, the existing main building would be able to provide just under 10,000m². A further 3,000m² of new space would require to be built on the site to deliver the necessary floorspace.

Educational advantages

- It is considered that this option could provide a reasonably good fit with the Strategic Educational Design Brief. The majority of the faculties could be arranged appropriately within the new building, and opportunities are offered to create new collaboration spaces to enhance the learning environment. Many of the required adjacencies between subjects could be achieved.
- There would be no change to the existing catchment area for any pupils albeit that the numbers of pupils affected by Option A are very small.
- All school accommodation would be located on a single site.

Educational disadvantages

- One of the faculties (maths and science) will be difficult to fit within any single floorplate of the existing building.
- Some classroom sizes are likely to be significantly compromised to fit with existing spaces.
- The collaboration spaces are likely to be smaller, dispersed spaces, rather than a central, larger space in each faculty.
- There are no opportunities to create any type of outdoor sporting facility.
- It is difficult to envisage how any opportunities for enhancement to the outdoor learning environments could be achieved.
- The requirement to introduce new buildings will further reduce the already limited outdoor space available on the site.
- There are educational disadvantages associated with an off-site decant for three years, including the more limited learning environment that could be achieved in temporary buildings, and the risk of fewer extra curricular activities being achievable.
- There would be disruption to the community education programme that is currently hosted by Boroughmuir High School – it is difficult to see where this could be accommodated in the centre of the city for the duration of the decant.

Proposed Site for new build school at Fountainbridge – Option A (Including Public Park)



Existing Site of Boroughmuir High School – Option B



Record of Meeting

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the Location of Boroughmuir High School

The meeting was held on 5 March 2012 in Boroughmuir High School

Present:- There were approximately 50 members of the public.

In Attendance:- Tom Wood (Independent Chair), Billy MacIntyre (Head of Resources, Children and Families), Lindsay Glasgow (Asset Planning Manager, Children and Families), David Dempster (Acting Head Teacher), Jack Hamilton (Seconded Head Teacher), Alastair Wallace (Project Manager, Thomas & Adamson) and Riccardo Marini (City Design Leader, Services for Communities).

Introduction

Tom Wood explained that he had been invited by the Council as an independent person to chair this consultation meeting. The meeting was the first of four meetings being arranged as part of the consultation process on a proposal for the location of Boroughmuir High School. Officers from the Children and Families Department would be asked to give a presentation explaining the proposals in more detail and then to answer any questions.

Convener's Statement

Councillor MacLaren, Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee, stated that she was pleased to be at a consultation presenting two potential options for the location of Boroughmuir High School. The location of a new school for Boroughmuir had been a longstanding issue during her time as a Councillor which had been frustrating for staff, pupils and parents alike. A variety of sites had been discussed and debated over the years but none had come to fruition. Because of the previous problems in identifying a new site for Boroughmuir High School, the Council had taken the opportunity when the Fountainbridge site came up for sale, to purchase the site and then to consult on whether this was the best option for the school. Councillor MacLaren confirmed that the recommendation in the report was the Council officials' recommendation and that the final decision would be taken by Councillors at the full Council meeting on 28 June 2012, whereupon the report including the results of the consultation would be considered. She asked all present to think ambitiously about what the school could be and what facilities it could have.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
5 March 2012

Presentation

Lindsay Glasgow (Children and Families) explained the background to the proposals. The Scottish Government in December 2010 had announced that Boroughmuir High School would receive funding support from the Scotland's Schools for the Future programme. The Scottish Government's expectation was that the completed school should be delivered by 2017/18 at the latest. An Investment Steering Group had been established to manage and progress the project and had identified two options which were thought to be the most appropriate solution; a new build on a new site or the refurbishment and extension of the existing building with an associated decant.

The two options were then outlined in more detail.

Option A – The Council had purchased the Fountainbridge site as a potential site for the new build school. The site was located on 430m from the existing school and was 1.3 hectares in total including 0.3 hectares currently designated as public park space. The size of the proposed Fountainbridge site did not comply with the relevant minimum school site size regulations from the Scottish Government but it was considered that a case could be demonstrated that the overall benefits of the proposal represented a significant improvement compared with the existing site. This was based on the opportunity to configure indoor space more effectively and use the site more efficiently so that the space was optimised for different uses. The proposed building would be built on an overall space budget of 13,100sqm and would accommodate a roll of 1,150 pupils. There was a potential for sport pitches on a roof deck as had been achieved successfully elsewhere in the UK particularly in London. The actual design for the school would only emerge following the conclusion of the consultation and the subsequent appointment of the design team. Access to full size pitches would remain at Meggetland. If the new build option was approved by the Council the timescale for full completion was the Summer of 2016. The new build option was the preferred option of the Council officials.

Option B - The second option was the refurbishment and the extension of the existing building. The existing building was located on a site of 0.9 hectares and was supplemented by an annex in St Oswald's Hall in Montpelier Park. It would also accommodate a roll of 1,150 pupils on a floor space of 13,100m², but this would be achieved by extending the existing building. Access to all outdoor sports facilities would remain at Meggetland. Due to the extensive refurbishment works proposed, it would be necessary to decant pupils offsite for the duration of the works. The site of the former Burdiehouse Primary School had been proposed as the location of the decant site. This was principally due to the location on a bus route from the existing Boroughmuir catchment area. The decant site was located 4.3 miles from the Boroughmuir school building and it would be necessary to create a decant village on the site. Fountainbridge was not an option for the decant location as it had been purchased for the location of the potential new school and if it was not chosen for the school the Council intended to sell the site on as soon as possible. This option was expected to be completed by January 2018.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
5 March 2012

There were catchment implications associated with Option A as the Fountainbridge site currently lay just outside the high school catchment area. Two residential streets, Gibson Terrace and Murdoch Terrace would require to be added to the Boroughmuir catchment area which would have a knock on effect on the catchment areas of Tynecastle High School and Bruntsfield and Dalry Primary Schools.

The Council officials felt that the new build site offered far more educational advantages than the refurbishment and extension option. The design would be able to fully respond to the educational brief and offer outdoor learning opportunities as well as space for outdoor sports facilities. The refurbishment option would also fit the design brief and would allow the whole school to be located on a single site. It would also be a significant improvement on the existing facility. However it did compromise the educational space and the external social space and would create significant disruption through the decant.

The Scottish Futures Trust would be providing two thirds of the funding for the project on a like for like basis, up to a cost and space limit. They would not provide any support towards the cost of any land for Option A nor for any decant costs associated with Option B. It was estimated that the new build option would be £5m cheaper than the refurbishment, mainly as a result of decant costs of £7.76m. The Council had identified capital funding for the project, however, revenue funding for the decant would have to be found through budget savings.

The consultation exercise would run up to 30 March 2012 after which the Council would seek Education Scotland's views. All comments which had been received and the points that had been raised at the meeting tonight would be considered and responded to in a report that would go to the full Council. The report would be published on 7 June 2012 and would be considered at the Council meeting on 28 June 2012.

Questions and Answers

Tom Wood invited the audience to ask questions of any representatives of the Council or to articulate any concerns they might have about any aspect of the proposals.

The questions and answers, in summary, were as follows –

Question 1 – Had any research been done on how the decant would affect the education of children taught in temporary classrooms?

Answer (L Glasgow) – It was very difficult to compare different cohorts of children who had gone through a decant and those who had not. A number of schools who had experienced a decant had been visited to ascertain the effects on pupil's attainment but it was difficult to come to any conclusive results.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
5 March 2012

Answer (J Hamilton) – The most recent decant in Edinburgh was from St Thomas of Aquin's where there had been no real negative or positive impact on attainment levels. He believed that the children of Boroughmuir High School would perform in almost any circumstance and should be able to learn effectively in a decant situation.

Question 2 – Why could the full site at Fountainbridge not be used for the new school? There was already a compromise before picking this option.

Answer (B MacIntyre) – There were two main reasons why the whole site could not be used, one was planning and the other was financial. When the Fountainbridge site came up for sale there were numerous discussions internally in the Council whether the site should be bought for a new school. This was coupled with the significant constraints on the Capital budget due to reduced funding. However, the Council felt that with the site available a fantastic development for the school could be accommodated.

Answer (R Marini) – The Fountainbridge site had been subject to master planning for a long time and the Planning Authority had approved a masterplan for that area. When the subject of a school being on the site arose, it did not comply with the planning objectives for that site. It was thought that a school on this site would mean that a mixed use for the site which created a vibrant, lively place could not be delivered. However, with an urban school which did not have “unfriendly” fenced playing fields with restricted access but a public green space instead, it would be able to provide a fantastic school and a vibrant lively place where people would want to live, work and visit.

Question 3 – What benefits are there in the refurbishment of the old school option compared to building a new school?

Answer (Billy MacIntyre) – The Council officials believed that the educational benefits of a new school far outweighed the educational benefits of the refurbishment option.

Answer (R Marini) – The benefit of refurbishing the old school was in maintaining the collective memories that exist with the school. The memories of people who had an understanding of what the school meant. The new build though provided opportunities and would provide a fantastic learning environment, using the canal adjacent to it and providing a destination which people would want to be a part of.

Tom Wood at this juncture asked a member of the public who had been involved in plans for refurbishing the school previously to provide his view.

Question 4 – I have concerns with the restriction of space at the new site and would encourage the Council to explore whether the park could be placed at the other side of the road with the current park area being utilised for the school. The school should not be compared, as we have seen today, with schools in London but with its nearest comparator. That would be James Gillespie's School which was to be built on a large

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
5 March 2012

site, surrounded by the nice shops of Bruntsfield rather than a tight site across the road from a bowling alley and a cinema. The sustainability of the old building was also excellent and would last far longer than the new build. I also can not understand why the refurbishment would take two years longer than the new build? If the Council did decide to go with the refurbishment option then the decant should take place on the Fountainbridge site.

Answer 4 (A Wallace) – The refurbishment option would take longer than the new build option for a variety of reasons. The refurbishment option would require Listed Building Consent as well as Planning Consent which would take longer to gain approval. In addition, on-site surveys would have to be undertaken such as structural and asbestos surveys. There also had been time built in for the refurbishment itself where issues such as moving an existing sub-station would involve dialogue with Scottish Power. Additional to that a refurbishment of an old building always contained unseen work which had to be planned for. The combination of these factors explained the additional two year period of time for the refurbishment option.

Answer (B MacIntyre) – The refurbishment option was more costly because of the decant and the need to build a temporary village. These costs had been produced and analysed by external consultants. In regard to the concern about the sustainability of a new building, the funding from the Scottish Government required that the building was fully maintained over that period. It was the Council's opinion that the new building would last longer than 50 years and would be no less durable than the old building. The decant to Fountainbridge was not an option due to the significant financial burden of the site if it was not sold on immediately.

Question 5 – How well does the financial position of the new build stack up? How would the decant affect the pupils at the school and which option did the Senior Management Team of the school prefer?

Answer (B MacIntyre) – The Council believed that the new build would be considerably cheaper than the refurbishment option.

Answer (D Dempster) – David Dempster indicated that the School's Senior Management Team's preferred option was the new build. A considerable disadvantage of the refurbishment option was the need to decant to an area four miles away. The school had consulted with children and discussed the various options. Initially the children were split 50-50, on whether to go for the new build or the refurbishment option, but after hearing details of the decant almost everybody felt that the refurbishment option was unpalatable and supported the new build option.

Answer (J Hamilton) – In 2008, there was real interest in the refurbishment option due to the number of false dawns for a new site for Boroughmuir High School. The current school was tired and Roy Jobson (former Director of Children and Families) had previously stated that it was not fit for purpose. The refurbishment option did not provide adequate provision of school social space and there were great possibilities in a new site which could create a school for the 21st and hopefully 22nd century.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
5 March 2012

Question 6 – The existing school, if properly maintained, would last considerably longer than the 50 years stated for the new school. You could possibly have two new schools within the lifetime of the existing building. Surely this made a difference to the cost comparison?

Answer (B MacIntyre) – The new school, if that option was chosen, would be high quality and would be engineered to last. The new build option was not a building for the short-term and there was no reason why it could not last as long as the existing school.

Question 7 – One of the advantages that had been talked about for the new location was outdoor learning opportunities. What did this actually mean?

Answer (D Dempster) – The current outdoor space and social space of the existing school was insufficient. The schools in London that had been recently visited were innovative and highly exciting. In one of the schools in Hackney almost every curricular area had an outdoor learning space. The new build option could allow field work near the canal, art classes on the roof terraces and would provide a new way of working for the children and the teachers. In discussions with Head Teachers in London, they all said it was a significant change for the children, providing them with further and new opportunities. The new build option for Boroughmuir was also not like the recent new builds in Edinburgh and would provide far more in terms of facilities and opportunities.

Question 8 – The refurbishment option seemed to be a practical solution that could maintain the collective history of the school. An urban school would change the ethos of the school and damage the society that had grown up around the school. This was not purely a financial or an educational issue and a range of factors would be damaged by choosing the new build.

Answer (B MacIntyre) – Finance was not the only reason that the Council favoured the new build option. However, the educational reasons were the overriding priority for the Council. Educational advantages of the new school far outweighed the refurbishment of the old school and it was the priority of the Council to provide a better education for the children.

Question 9 – I would request that the decant to Burdiehouse was reconsidered as it was a non-starter and meant that the refurbishment option would be rejected solely because of the decant. Additionally, St Oswald's Hall in Montpelier Park was a useful resource and much could be achieved if this was included in the refurbishment option.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
5 March 2012

Answer (B MacIntrye) – The Council officials had already explained why the Fountainbridge site had been discounted as a decant site and those reasons still stood but your point was noted. Neither option assumed the retention of St Oswald's Hall, although its future had not yet been decided. This was because there was a wish to have the accommodation of the High School all on one site. In regard to St Oswald's Hall the Council would be interested in hearing the public's views on what its future should be.

Question 10 – I am unsure and unhappy about why the park had been included as an area of the school. I am still not convinced about the argument about it being an outdoor space for the school and originally I believed it was dedicated space for the school rather than a public park. Could you shed light on the circumstances surrounding the park?

Answer (L Glasgow) – A student housing development had gained planning consent for the area prior to the purchase of the land for the school. A condition of that consent was that there should be a public park in the vicinity. Since the option to site a school there had arisen further discussions were necessary with Planning to see what the options were surrounding the park. One of those options would be to investigate if there could be extra dedicated space for the school within the park. However, even if the space was not dedicated then the school was likely to open up into the park so it would inevitably be used by the school. Parents could be assured though that the officials in Children and Families would be pushing Planning to determine how much of the park the school could use.

Question 11 – I work for Historic Scotland and in my job I have come across many instances of successfully refurbished buildings. You have provided information on the new schools that were visited but have you visited any refurbished schools? Would the decant site be one with muddy fields with portacabins or would the high costs provide better accommodation?

Answer (J Hamilton) – Trinity Academy was an example of a refurbished school in a historic building. The benefit that Trinity Academy had though was space, which was one commodity that Boroughmuir did not have. Moreover, the specifications which could be provided by the new school would be far superior to those provided at Trinity Academy.

Answer (B MacIntyre) – The quality of the decant accommodation would be high. If this option was chosen there would be consultation with the school on facilities but he could confirm that there would not be a muddy site and there would be hard standing flooring.

Question 12 – Would the decant accommodation look like a school?

Answer (B MacIntyre) – The decant accommodation would look like a school and an example could be viewed in Aberfeldy. The quality of the decant accommodation was much improved over that available in previous years.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
5 March 2012

Question 13 – I am concerned that the school roll was almost full and that consideration should be given to increasing the school roll.

Answer (L Glasgow) – The intake at Boroughmuir was currently 200 pupils per year and it was proposed that this remained at 200 per year. The school roll was currently high due to the higher stay on rates of pupils and many placing requests from non-catchment pupils. It was expected that school rolls would rise in the future but the school would be of appropriate size to accommodate all catchment pupils. It was not expected that the school roll would go above 1,150.

Question 14 – Was it not true that catchment pupil numbers may increase with the new school as parents chose the new school over private schools?

Answer (L Glasgow) – Council policy would be to accommodate all catchment pupils and this would be at the expense of the non-catchment intake. It was the Council's aim that catchment pupils went to their catchment school.

Question 15 – Would the number 11 bus be subsidised and how would it cope with 1,150 children?

Answer (L Glasgow) – It was envisaged that the school children travelling to Burdiehouse would be going in the opposite direction to the main commuter traffic and it was considered that there would be sufficient capacity. The Council policy for free school travel would be applied, which meant that pupils who lived three or more miles away from the school would be issued with free bus passes. Pupils living in Bruntsfield and significant parts of South Morningside would be eligible for free travel.

Comment – The existing building was completely unique. There were not many buildings like this in Edinburgh and a refurbished building could provide a radical change but still maintain a historic building in its current setting.

Question 16 – Did the Council own the park and the area marked A in the map provided in the presentation?

Answer (L Glasgow) – The Council owned the area designated as a park and the two areas marked A which were both identified to be part of the new school.

Question 17 – Should we be letting the decant make the decision on whether we should have a new school or refurbish the old school? The Council should wait to see if it could find a superior decant site. Additionally, what was the plan for the existing building if the option chosen was the new build?

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
5 March 2012

Answer (B MacIntyre) – Burdiehouse was the best site that the Council currently had for the decant and it was not considered viable to hold on for an indeterminate period for a better decant site to become available. There was also an expectation from the Scottish Government that the Council deliver a new school and a need to do this sooner rather than later. The intention would be to sell the existing building and this had been included in the financial projections.

Question 18 – If the Council owned the whole site was there a possibility of using the area not earmarked for student housing?

Answer (B MacIntyre) – The Council only owned part of the site, which was the park area and that which was marked A on the map. The student housing and the area at the top of the site was owned by a party other than the Council.

Closing Statement by Councillor MacLaren

The Council was facing severe financial pressure over the next three years but there was an opportunity to provide the best possible school with the money that the Council had. The new building at Boroughmuir provided the opportunity for people to think big and to be ambitious and to fully take advantage of the Curriculum for Excellence. The design of the building should not define how it would be used but the use should define the design of the building. The most fantastic designs had been looked at which were completely different from anything else that existed in the city.

The Chair of the Parent Council stated that a range of different views had been provided tonight but it was clear that everyone had the best interests of the school and the pupils at heart.

Tom Wood thanked everyone for attending and for their contribution.

Record of Meeting

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the Location of Boroughmuir High School

The meeting was held on 6 March 2012 in Buckstone Primary School

Present:- There were approximately 80 members of the public.

In Attendance:- Tom Wood (Independent Chair), Bill MacIntyre (Head of Resources, Children and Families), Lindsay Glasgow (Asset Planning Manager, Children and Families), David Dempster (Acting Head Teacher), Jack Hamilton (Seconded Head Teacher), Alastair Wallace (Project Manager, Thomas & Adamson) and Riccardo Marini (City Design Leader, Services for Communities).

Introduction

Tom Wood explained that he had been invited by the Council as an independent person to chair this consultation meeting. The meeting was the second of four meetings being arranged as part of the consultation process on a proposal for the location of Boroughmuir High School. Officers from the Children and Families Department would be asked to give a presentation explaining the proposals in more detail and then to answer any questions.

Convener's Statement

Councillor MacLaren, as Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee, stated that she was pleased to be at the consultation and presenting two options for the location of Boroughmuir High School. This had been a longstanding issue during her time as a Councillor and it had been frustrating for staff, pupils and parents as a variety of sites had been discussed and debated over the years but had resulted in nothing. Because of the longstanding search for a new site for Boroughmuir High School, the Council took the opportunity when the Fountainbridge site came up for sale to purchase the site and then to consult on whether this was the best option for the school. Councillor MacLaren confirmed that the recommendation in the report was the responsibility of Council officials but that the final decision would be taken by Councillors at the full Council meeting on 28 June 2012 when the report, including the results of the consultation, was considered. She asked all involved in the discussions on the proposals for the location of Boroughmuir High School to think ambitiously about what the school should be and what facilities it could have.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
6 March 2012

Presentation

Lindsay Glasgow (Children and Families) outlined the background to the proposals and explained that the Council had been looking for an appropriate site for Boroughmuir High School for a number of years.

In December 2010, the Scottish Government had announced that Boroughmuir would receive funding support from the Scottish Schools for the Future Programme. An Investment Steering Group had been established to oversee delivery of the project and an educational design brief had been developed. The Steering Group had identified two options: Option A – a relocation to a new building on the Fountainbridge site and an associated catchment change (this was the preferred option of the Council), or Option B – a refurbishment and extension on the existing site with an associated temporary decant to Burdiehouse.

The two options were then outlined in more detail.

Option A – The Council had purchased the Fountainbridge site as a potential site for the new High School. The site was located around 430m from the existing high school and comprised 1.3 hectares in total, including 0.3 hectares currently designated as space for a public park. The Council was currently investigating if it was possible to reconfigure the area set aside for the public park. The proposed new building would have a floor space of 13,100m² and would accommodate a school roll of 1,150 pupils. The Fountainbridge site did not comply with the minimum school size regulations from the Scottish Government, however, it was felt that the overall benefits of the proposal represented a significant improvement on the existing site. Access to full sized pitches would remain at Meggetland. There was potential to accommodate a sports pitch on the roof deck of the building as had been achieved successfully in some schools in London. A visit to London had shown that incorporating sport pitches on upper levels was a matter of course for many schools in urban locations. If approved, the timescale for the completion of the new build option was summer 2016.

Option B – was the refurbishment and extension of the existing school building. The existing building was located on a 0.9 hectare site. It would also accommodate a roll of 1,150 pupils on a floor space of 13,100m², but this would be achieved by extending the existing building. Access to all outdoor sports facilities would also remain at Meggetland. Due to the extensive refurbishment works proposed, it would be necessary to decant pupils offsite for the duration of the works. The site of the former Burdiehouse Primary School had been identified as the location for the decant, principally as it was on a main bus route from the Boroughmuir catchment area. The decant site was approximately 4.3 miles from the Boroughmuir High School building and it would be necessary to construct a temporary decant village. The Fountainbridge site was not an option for the decant as it had been specifically purchased for the potential new school and, if this option was not chosen, the Council

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
6 March 2012

intended to sell the land as quickly as possible. If Option B was selected, the timescale for completion was January 2018.

There were catchment implications associated with Option A as the Fountainbridge site currently lay just outside the high school catchment area. Two residential streets, Gibson Terrace and Murdoch Terrace would require to be added to the Boroughmuir catchment area which would have a knock on effect on the catchment areas of Tynecastle High School and Bruntsfield and Dalry Primary Schools.

The educational benefits of both options were then outlined. Overall the Council officials felt that Option A (new build) offered more educational benefits than Option B (refurbishment and extension).

The Scottish Futures Trust would be providing two thirds of the funding for the project on a like for like basis, up to a cost and space limit. They would not provide any support towards the cost of any land for Option A nor for any decant costs associated with Option B. It was estimated that the new build option would be £5m cheaper than the refurbishment, mainly as a result of decant costs of £7.76m. The Council had identified capital funding for the project, however, revenue funding for the decant would have to be found through budget savings.

The consultation exercise would run up to 30 March 2012 after which the Council would seek Education Scotland's views. All comments which had been received and the points that had been raised at the meeting tonight would be considered and responded to in a report that would go to the full Council. The report would be published on 7 June 2012 and would be considered at the Council meeting on 28 June 2012.

Questions and Answers

Tom Wood invited the audience to ask any questions of any representatives of the Council or to articulate any concerns they might have about any aspect of the proposals.

The questions and answers, in summary, were as follows –

Q 1 – Why was no report provided on how to make the maximum potential of the site which did not appear to be much different to the current site, before the consultation process started? Was the proposed style of construction the best type to be provided in the site available?

Q2 – Why could more land not be made available and why were Finance and Planning considerations taken into account and no detailed report on these matters provided?

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
6 March 2012

Q3 – Why were urban schools in London looked at and not those in the Edinburgh and surrounding areas and what were the actual financial projections for the development?

Answers 1, 2 and 3 – Billy MacIntyre indicated that the approach taken to the design development had been school driven. He explained that this was the maximum size of the site that was available and that the Council had had to move at a quick pace in assimilating a business plan and taking this forward to secure the site. He indicated that they had undertaken some of the work on the maximum size of the site available before the consultation commenced. This had been inconclusive and he had taken the view to take a bit longer and carry on this work while the consultation ran in tandem would provide the best result by exploring all the options available. It was important to move the project forward and if they delayed the consultation until June this would then delay the project start by three to four months. He indicated that the refurbishment project would be more expensive and that if the Fountainbridge land was not used for new build it would be sold and committed to funding new schools. He stressed that they had inspected schools in London to see what opportunities there were to do something different and that it was not about attainment or achievements within those schools. It was not possible for the Council to obtain additional land as they were constrained by financial implications.

Riccardo Marini explained that the development was constrained by its very urban location and they were eager to provide the very best environment possible. He indicated that a single or two storey school within an urban context would not be suitable for the area and that this was an opportunity to deliver a fantastic learning environment.

Q4 – How could parents be asked to make a decision on ideas on what “might” be possible as there were no guarantees and no in-depth thought as to how the outdoor space may be used?

Q5 – What approach was being taken for long-term needs and the maximising of space?

Q6 – Would it be possible to purchase a larger part of the site available?

Answers 4, 5 and 6 – Billy MacIntyre indicated that at the moment there was no design for either new build or refurbishment of the old building. They were unable to give guarantees of what may be possible but there was sufficient capital investment set aside to deliver a fabulous school. The costings had been based on the projects at James Gillespie’s and Portobello. He indicated that the need for the future had been driven by the school (Head Teacher/Pupils/Parents/Staff). At the moment they had received 35 notes of interest from throughout the world from various Companies interested in acting as the design team for the project. He stressed that the Council were dealing with a number of factors that would determine what would happen next and at the moment it would be wrong of them to set expectations that could not be delivered.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
6 March 2012

Riccardo Marini explained that he felt that it could be one of the best new school projects as it responded to the needs of the users and area surrounding. He felt that it had the potential to be a creative use of the site. He also explained that the idea of providing a sports pitch on the roof of one of the buildings had been met with scepticism but this was an element which was provided worldwide and he felt that this could provide some of the best facilities on the size of site available.

Q7 – Can we not make the new building even better by having sports facilities available on site?

Q8 – Do we expect to sprout temporary huts in the area surrounding the new school?

Q9 – Did they anticipate any problems with continuing the use for sports facilities at Meggetland?

Answers 7, 8 and 9 – David Dempster advised that at the moment 60% of sports facilities were provided off site and that a new campus would mean that they had room for improvement of this. If they were to agree the project for refurbishment of the current site it would deliver a vastly improved school but not sports facilities. A new facility would work well with the use of more outdoor space but the school would always have to use Meggetland for its sports facilities. He indicated that attainment at Boroughmuir was good and could improve and it was their intention to integrate technology at the design phase.

Jack Hamilton indicated that it was important that physical education was provided for all pupils and he stressed that the building of a new school would be a great opportunity for the physical health and wellbeing of all pupils. He advised that they did not require huge facilities on campus and Meggetland would enhance the provision available there.

Q10 – While supporting a new build it had been disheartening to hear that a previous consultation meeting had been reluctant to accept this.

Q11 – At the moment the school roll stood at around 1,128, would a new building have the flexibility to increase this?

Q12 – The school at Boroughmuir was currently about 99 years old and with the introduction of the curriculum for excellence the way of teaching had moved to five facilities, what risks to the building were there for going down this line?

Answers 10, 11 and 12 – Lindsay Glasgow indicated that Boroughmuir currently had an intake of 200 pupils at S1 per year. There were currently a significant number of out of catchment pupils and they did not foresee a problem in the future for catchment area pupils. It was expected that the roll would sit at around 1,130 with a maximum capacity of 1,150.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
6 March 2012

David Dempster indicated that the school had moved to a formal faculty structure in the past month which meant at the moment they had 10 faculties. He felt that this would give more flexibility to learning with cross departmental and cross curriculum work across subject areas.

Jack Hamilton provided his support to Head Teachers in the change to faculty working to support the structures for the Curriculum for Excellence. He stressed that this was a great opportunity for Boroughmuir High School to put the faculties together within a brand new building.

Riccardo Marini indicated that Portobello and James Gillespie's had moved from standard classrooms to much more social spaces.

Councillor MacLaren advised that she sympathised with worries regarding the space on site. She indicated that the first recommendation had been that the Council should only bid for part of the site but that it had then been agreed to bid for the whole site. The planners were to be flexible in their approach and investigate the possibility of sharing facilities such as libraries/drama/sport.

Q13 – Whichever option is chosen, can it be guaranteed that the education of the children will not be compromised during the project?

Q14 – What are the problems of building a sports facility on top of the building regarding light entering the building and are there any problems regarding car parking availability at the proposed new facility.

Q15 – Is it anticipated that revenue could be generated at the new building by the use by local community of the building?

Answer 13, 14 and 15 – David Dempster explained that there would be little disruption if a new build was to be provided. If however they were to agree to refurbish the current building the pupils would be decanted for four years. He indicated that St Thomas of Aquin's had been decanted during their rebuild and attainments had not reduced. However, he expressed concern at the use of portacabins in the long-term and would prefer if that could be avoided.

Jack Hamilton indicated that over the past 12 years they had maintained the building and facilities to the best of their ability and at the same time Boroughmuir had been the highest attaining school in the City of Edinburgh. He stressed that the building of a brand new school could provide fantastic opportunities for something great in the future.

Lindsay Glasgow explained that they would be investigating the avenues for car parking within the area and that this would be done in conjunction with the school at the detailed design stage and looking at the various levels of the site.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
6 March 2012

Billy MacIntyre indicated that the Council were taking a large leap of faith and that had already been shown with the purchase of the site. It was clear that parents would prefer more space on the site and therefore it would be up to the design team to seek to maximise the best potential for the school's benefit.

Conclusion

Tom Wood thanked everyone for attending and their contribution to the debate. He reminded everyone that the consultation process would run up to 30 March 2012.

The Parent Council Chair thanked everyone for attending and their respective contributions to the debate which she felt had been very useful.

Record of Meeting

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the Location of Boroughmuir High School

The meeting was held on 13 March 2012 in South Morningside Primary School

Present:- There were approximately 100 members of the public.

In Attendance:- Tom Wood (Independent Chair), Billy MacIntyre (Head of Resources, Children and Families), Lindsay Glasgow (Asset Planning Manager, Children and Families), David Dempster (Acting Head Teacher, Boroughmuir High School), Jack Hamilton (Seconded Head Teacher), Alastair Wallace (Project Manager, Thomas & Adamson), Riccardo Marini (City Design Leader, Services for Communities) and Morris Smith (Committee Services).

Apology – Councillor MacLaren (Convener, Education, Children and Families Committee).

Introduction

Tom Wood advised that he had been invited by the Council to act as an independent Chair of the consultation meeting. This meeting was the third of four meetings being arranged as part of the consultation process on the proposal for the location of Boroughmuir High School. He welcomed members of the public and officers to the meeting and explained that it was his intention to make sure that as many members of the public as possible had a chance to ask questions of the officials present.

He explained that officers from the Council would give a presentation outlining the proposals in more detail and then members of the public would be given an opportunity to ask any questions.

Presentation

Lindsay Glasgow (Children and Families) outlined the background to the proposals and explained that the Council had been looking for an appropriate site for Boroughmuir High School for a number of years.

In December 2010, the Scottish Government had announced that Boroughmuir would receive funding support from the Scottish Schools for the Future Programme.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
13 March 2012

An Investment Steering Group had been established to oversee delivery of the project and an educational design brief had been developed. The Steering Group had identified two options: Option A – a relocation to a new building on the Fountainbridge site and an associated catchment change (this was the preferred option of the Council), or Option B – a refurbishment and extension on the existing site with an associated temporary decant to Burdiehouse.

The two options were then outlined in more detail.

Option A – The Council had purchased the Fountainbridge site as a potential site for the new High School. The site was located around 430m from the existing high school and comprised 1.3 hectares in total, including 0.3 hectares currently designated as space for a public park. The Council was currently investigating if it was possible to reconfigure the area set aside for the public park. The proposed new building would have a floor space of 13,100m² and would accommodate a school roll of 1,150 pupils. The Fountainbridge site did not comply with the minimum school size regulations from the Scottish Government, however, it was felt that the overall benefits of the proposal represented a significant improvement on the existing site. Access to full sized pitches would remain at Meggetland. There was potential to accommodate a sports pitch on the roof deck of the building as had been achieved successfully in some schools in London. A visit to London had shown that incorporating sport pitches on upper levels was a matter of course for many schools in urban locations. If approved, the timescale for the completion of the new build option was summer 2016.

Option B – was the refurbishment and extension of the existing school building. The existing building was located on a 0.9 hectare site. It would also accommodate a roll of 1,150 pupils on a floor space of 13,100m², but this would be achieved by extending the existing building. Access to all outdoor sports facilities would also remain at Meggetland. Due to the extensive refurbishment works proposed, it would be necessary to decant pupils offsite for the duration of the works. The site of the former Burdiehouse Primary School had been identified as the location for the decant, principally as it was on a main bus route from the Boroughmuir catchment area. The decant site was approximately 4.3 miles from the Boroughmuir High School building and it would be necessary to construct a temporary decant village. The Fountainbridge site was not an option for the decant as it had been specifically purchased for the potential new school and, if this option was not chosen, the Council intended to sell the land as quickly as possible. If Option B was selected, the timescale for completion was January 2018.

There were catchment implications associated with Option A as the Fountainbridge site currently lay just outside the high school catchment area. Two residential streets, Gibson Terrace and Murdoch Terrace would require to be added to the Boroughmuir catchment area which would have a knock on effect on the catchment areas of Tynecastle High School and Bruntsfield and Dalry Primary Schools.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
13 March 2012

The educational benefits of both options were then outlined. Overall the Council officials felt that Option A (new build) offered more educational benefits than Option B (refurbishment and extension)

The Scottish Futures Trust would be providing two thirds of the funding for the project on a like for like basis, up to a cost and space limit. They would not provide any support towards the cost of any land for Option A nor for any decant costs associated with Option B. It was estimated that the new build option would be £5m cheaper than the refurbishment, mainly as a result of decant costs of £7.76m. The Council had identified capital funding for the project, however, revenue funding for the decant would have to be found through budget savings.

The consultation exercise would run up to 30 March 2012 after which the Council would seek Education Scotland's views. All comments which had been received and the points that had been raised at the meeting tonight would be considered and responded to in a report that would go to the full Council. The report would be published on 7 June 2012 and would be considered at the Council meeting on 28 June 2012.

Statement by the Acting Head Teacher of Boroughmuir High School

David Dempster advised that he had been liaising closely with the Parent Council regarding the proposals for the high school. The school's Senior Management Team fully supported the new build option (Option A). Given the choice between refurbishment and a brand new bespoke building he would prefer the new build option as issues such as ICT could be incorporated into the construction. He had spoken to Head Teachers from other new schools all of which had been very enthusiastic about their new surroundings. Moreover, they had indicated that it had revolutionised the way they, and their school, worked. On the visit to London he had seen many new school buildings on tight urban sites and he was convinced that the new build was the correct option for Boroughmuir. If he had any doubts, the decant option had made up his mind as it would be totally unpalatable for him and his pupils.

Statement from Seconded Head Teacher

Jack Hamilton felt this was a fantastic opportunity for Boroughmuir and his preferred option would also be for the new build option. This offered the possibility of creating 21st century facilities from scratch without the need for a decant. In his opinion, the decant could have a negative impact on attainment levels at the school.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
13 March 2012

Questions and Answers

Tom Wood invited the audience to ask any questions of the officials present or to articulate any comments or concerns about any aspects of the proposals.

The questions and answers, in summary, were as follows:-

Questions/Comments

Q1 – One of the presentation slides showed the different school faculties and their relationships. How does this fit in with the slide showing the building on the Fountainbridge site being split into one main building and other ancillary buildings?

Q2 – What is the life expectancy of the new building?

Q3 – Why can't the public park area be incorporated into the school proposal?

Answers 1, 2 and 3

Lindsay Glasgow explained that the drawing showing the buildings on a split site at Fountainbridge was only indicative. A design team had not yet been appointed so it was still possible for the school to be configured into a single building. It was the officer's view that some faculties could be provided in ancillary buildings and the dining facility in particular might work well if located beside the canal.

David Dempster advised that he was not keen on satellite buildings and there was still much work to be done on the design of the new building. The split nature of the building shown in the presentation slide would not be his preferred option.

Jack Hamilton advised that a campus style layout was being proposed for the new James Gillespie's High School and the nearby George Watson's College also had some satellite buildings. He suggested that art, drama and music might work well in a separate building. However, he stressed that at this stage nothing had been determined as regards the layout of the new building.

Alastair Wallace advised that the new building had been modelled on a 50-60 year life cycle. The building would be subject to a 25 year life cycle maintenance contract before being handed back to the Council. Riccardo Marini pointed out that the structural elements of the new building should last much longer if maintained properly.

Lindsay Glasgow explained that the area designated as a public park space was as a result of a planning condition for the nearby student housing. This consent was in place before the site for the school had been purchased. A consultant had been engaged to revise the master plan for the entire Fountainbridge area and the Council would look at the possibility of reconfiguring the park as part of that process.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
13 March 2012

Q4 – Assuming the park could be reconfigured, was the Council committed to delivering a replacement green space of the same size?

Q5 – Part of the children's school day is spent off-site. Has any thought been given to where the children will spill out to?

Q6 – The virtues of the refurbishment option had not been put forward vigorously enough. The new building seemed extremely constrained compared to the proposal for the new James Gillespie's school. There was no reason why the Council could not allocate the site at Fountainbridge as the decant site and still sell the site at a later date. Also, there did not appear to be any reason why Option B should take 18 months longer than Option A.

Answers 4, 5 and 6

Lindsay Glasgow explained that she would be speaking to the Planning Division to see what was required in terms of a replacement park. It was hoped that the size of the park could be reduced with further space provided on the other side of the road to school site. However, this would have to be looked at in greater detail.

David Dempster indicated that it was the school's desire to encourage children to remain onsite by providing improved catering facilities with more desirable menus. He was convinced the new site was the better option particularly as the current site was surrounded by residential properties on three sides which occasionally led to conflict with residents.

Jack Hamilton advised that many of the schools they visited in London did not allow pupils out at lunchtime at all. He felt it was important to educate the children to manage their behaviour and be respectful of their surroundings.

Riccardo Marini explained that there were often tensions between schools and local residents in urban settings. If the school was to be built at the Fountainbridge site there would be an opportunity to create a new mixed use neighbourhood consisting of the school, shops, offices and houses. The canal was a fantastic resource and the school would enhance the area significantly.

Billy MacIntyre confirmed that, for educational reasons, the officers' preferred option was the new build. He disagreed with the suggestion that the James Gillespie's site was far larger and pointed out that it had its own constraints and had also not been able to accommodate a full sized sports pitch. The reason the refurbishment option would take longer was because issues around obtaining listed building consent would significantly delay the project. If the Fountainbridge site was not utilised for the new build it was important that it was sold on quickly, otherwise the capital would be tied up and not available for other important educational projects.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
13 March 2012

Q7 – The park did not appear to offer much utility therefore it made sense to relocate it to another part of the site. Given the Council's previous history on contracts, it was unlikely the new school would be provided on budget so why not just use the Fountainbridge site for the decant?

Q8 – How long would planning or the landowners be given to sort out the issue of the park?

Q9 – What is the land to the right of the proposed school site to be used for, and what is the process for the decant?

Answers 7, 8 and 9

Billy MacIntyre advised that it was his responsibility to make sure that the school was provided on budget. The new schools for Portobello and James Gillespie's were currently under-budget and he was confident that the budget set-aside for the new Boroughmuir High School was sufficient, based on the budgets for those other two schools.

Lindsay Glasgow reiterated that the Council was keen to reconfigure the park but highlighted that it had its challenges. Dialogue with the planners was scheduled to start later this week. Discussions would also be held with the consultant engaged to revise the master plan. The master planners were required to set the boundaries of the school by the end of June 2012 and a large amount of effort would be put into resolving the issue of the park. With regard to the question about land to the right of the school site, this section was included in the existing master plan and planning permission had been granted in principle for a number of uses such as commercial and residential use.

The site of the former Burdiehouse Primary School had been identified as the location for the decant. The previous primary school building had now been demolished. The site was located approximately four miles from the current High School building. It was envisaged that portacabins would be provided to act as temporary classrooms, with a separate gym facility. The Council had looked at a similar decant in Aberfeldy which had worked very well. Pupils would be asked to use the number 11 bus service with the decant site located a ½ km walk from the bus stop.

Jack Hamilton pointed out that the decant area would be outwith the school catchment area and one serious disadvantage was likely to be the provision of basic facilities.

Q10 – Are there any plans to make major changes to the current Boroughmuir catchment area?

Q11 – The most important thing was to do what was right for the children in the area. As all the major areas of concern were within the Council's control it was important

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
13 March 2012

that the children were not denied the correct outcome because of issues that the Council could, and should, have resolved.

Q12 – Has the impact of the Craighouse residential development been taken into consideration?

Q13 – How far did the size of the school deviate from the Scottish Government's regulations?

Q14 – Could the Council exercise its statutory powers to acquire adjacent sites to the left of the proposed school site for use as part of the school?

Answers 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14

Lindsay Glasgow confirmed that the slight changes to the catchment as a result of the Fountainbridge site would affect less than 5 pupils. She confirmed that there were no plans to make any major changes to the remaining Boroughmuir catchment area. With regard to the Craighouse development, the Council expected it to generate approximately 20 children which the school would be able to accommodate as catchment children.

The regulations stated a size of site for a 1150 pupil school roll would be 2.6 hectares, which was larger than the proposed new site and bigger than the existing school site. She pointed out that the new school would not simply replicate existing spatial configurations but offered an opportunity to optimise space to the curricular and organisational requirements of the school.

While the Council did own the land to the left of the school site boundary, these buildings had been let on a 99 year lease. It was possible that they might become available in future, however, there was very little opportunity at the moment and it would be advisable not to delay the project.

Billy MacIntyre reiterated that this was a once in a lifetime opportunity for the school. He accepted that the space at Fountainbridge was less than people had wanted, but the Council was doing its best to work within the parameters and constraints of the site. The focus of Children and Families was to provide the best facilities for the children of Boroughmuir.

Q15 – I have concerns about the possible disruption to children from the proposed decant. What facilities would the Burdiehouse site provide for science, music and sport?

Q16 – Why are the master planners not present at this meeting to answer questions?

Q17 – Could St Crispin's Special School also be included as part of the development on the Fountainbridge site?

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
13 March 2012

Q18 – Can a straw poll be taken on both the options being proposed?

Answers 15, 16, 17 and 18

Lindsay Glasgow advised that as the former Burdiehouse Primary School had been demolished, there was no possibility of using any of its previous facilities. If the decant was to go ahead, appropriate facilities for music, science and sports would be provided.

Billy MacIntyre advised that the master planners had not been invited to this meeting as it was primarily a consultation about the educational benefits of the proposed move. The master planners would be looking at the issues raised at the four consultation meetings, taking into account the competing drivers for the overall Fountainbridge site.

St Crispin's was on the Wave 3 school's project but was ranked fifth out of the five sites identified. It would not be possible to incorporate St Crispin's within the site identified for Boroughmuir.

Tom Wood agreed that a straw poll of the two options would be a good idea and indicated that he would conduct a poll at the conclusion of the meeting.

Q19 – The current catchment roll at Boroughmuir is around 770 pupils. Is it an option to build a smaller school to accommodate a roll of say 900?

Q20 – I am not sure that Option B has been fully explored or that the Council has looked closely enough at using the Fountainbridge site for the decant. I have visited the site of the Aberfeldy decant which works very well, so do not be put off by the thought of using portacabins as temporary classrooms.

Q21 – It has been stated that the proposed new site is smaller than the Scottish Government regulations. Does the school meet the Head Teacher's needs and, if not, is it constrained by site, budget or planning issues?

Answers 19, 20 and 21

Lindsay Glasgow explained that building a smaller school would mean that some of the existing children who currently attended Boroughmuir would have to be relocated. It was not Council policy to uproot children mid-year. Even if the size of the school was reduced to accommodate 900 pupils, it would not save much floor space as many of the same facilities would have to be provided.

Billy MacIntyre felt that Option B had been fully explored by the Council. As he had previously explained, using Fountainbridge for the decant would tie up funding that could be used for other educational projects.

While the overall school site did not meet the minimum Scottish Government standards, each pupil would be provided with 11.4m² of space. This was in excess of

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
13 March 2012

the Scottish Government standard of 11m² per pupil. He was aware of some schools in other parts of the country who were only delivering 9m² per pupil and he was very happy with the levels of space being provided which was similar to the levels at the new Portobello and James Gillespie's High Schools.

David Dempster pointed out that the current Boroughmuir site had a floor space of approximately 10,000m² whereas the new site would be providing a significantly greater floor space of approximately 13,100m².

Jack Hamilton advised that he had previously been offered the possibility of refurbishment if the school roll was reduced. This offer had been refused on the grounds that it would result in a reduction in teaching posts and school facilities, with the breadth of curriculum on offer being reduced.

Q22 – The local boating club was looking to secure new facilities along the canal which they would be happy to let the school make use of.

Q23 – I note that as part of the decant proposals it is suggested that children use the number 11 bus service out of town. It is my experience that this service is very busy and will almost inevitably result in an increase in the school run. As the children from Boroughmuir would be out of the catchment for the Burdiehouse area, could it result in conflict with the other children in the area?

Q24 – Is there an Option C, i.e. to wait for another, better, site to come along?

Answers to questions 22, 23 and 24

Lindsay Glasgow welcomed the offer by the boating club but pointed out that it would for the school to determine if they wished to take up the offer. She accepted that the decant would be difficult and that issues of transport and potential problems that may arise from the mixing of the children from the Gracemount catchment area would have to be addressed.

If the Council waited for a new site to come along it could possibly be another generation before anything suitable was identified.

Straw Poll

Tom Wood referred to question 18 above where he indicated that a straw poll would be taken at the end of the meeting. He asked the public present to indicate their preference for the two options. On a show of hands the majority favoured the new build at Fountainbridge (Option A).

Following the straw poll it was suggested that a further option should have been presented which would have been a refurbishment and extension of the existing building with a decant to Fountainbridge. Slightly more hands were shown in favour of this scenario but the majority continued to favour new build.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
13 March 2012

Conclusion

Tom Wood thanked everyone for attending and their contribution to the debate. He reminded everyone that the consultation process would run up to 30 March 2012.

Elizabeth Grierson (Head Teacher, South Morningside Primary School) also thanked everyone for attending and for their respective contributions to the lively debate.

Record of Meeting

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the Location of Boroughmuir High School

The meeting was held on 14 March 2012 in Bruntsfield Primary School

Present:- There were approximately 90 members of the public.

In Attendance:- Tom Wood (Independent Chair), Billy MacIntyre (Head of Resources, Children and Families), Lindsay Glasgow (Asset Planning Manager, Children and Families), David Dempster (Acting Head Teacher, Boroughmuir High School), Jack Hamilton (Seconded Head Teacher), Alastair Wallace (Project Manager, Thomas and Adamson), Riccardo Marini (City Design Leader, Services for Communities), Carol-Anne Kyle (Head Teacher, Bruntsfield Primary School) and Blair Ritchie (Committee Services).

Apologies – Councillor MacLaren (Convener, Education, Children and Families Committee).

Tom Wood welcomed everyone to the consultation meeting, the last of four such meetings. The purpose of the consultation process was to discuss the proposals for the relocation of Boroughmuir High School. There had been good, robust debates at the previous meetings. He explained his role as the Independent Chair which was to ensure that everyone present was given the opportunity to express their views. He described the process whereby officers from the Council would give a brief presentation, outlining the proposals in more detail and then members of the public would be given the opportunity to ask questions.

He explained that there had been many questions for the School Management Team as the parents of school children were keen to find out what the school establishment thought of the proposals.

Presentation

Lindsay Glasgow (Children and Families) outlined the background to the proposals and explained that the Council had been looking for an appropriate site for Boroughmuir High School for a number of years.

In December 2010, the Scottish Government had announced that Boroughmuir would receive funding support from the Scottish Schools for the Future Programme.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
14 March 2012

An Investment Steering Group had been established to oversee delivery of the project and an educational design brief had been developed. The Steering Group had identified two options: Option A – a relocation to a new building on the Foutainbridge site and an associated catchment change (this was the preferred option of the Council), or option B – a refurbishment and extension of the existing site, with an associated temporary decant to Burdiehouse.

The two options were then outlined in more detail.

Option A – The Council had purchased the Foutainbridge site as a potential site for the new High School. The site was located around 430m from the existing high school and comprised 1.3 hectares in total, including 0.3 hectares currently designated as space for a public park. The Council was currently investigating if it was possible to reconfigure the area set aside for the public park. The proposed new building would have a floor space of 13,100 square metres and would accommodate a school roll of 1,150 pupils. The Foutainbridge site did not comply with the minimum school size regulations from the Scottish Government, however, it was felt that the overall benefits of the proposal represented a significant improvement on the existing site. Access to full sized pitches would remain at Meggetland. There was potential to accommodate a sports pitch on the roof deck of the building, as had been achieved successfully in some schools in London. A visit to London had shown that incorporating sport pitches on upper levels was a matter of course for many schools in urban locations. If approved, the timescale for the completion of the new build option was summer 2016.

Option B – was the refurbishment and extension of the existing school building. The existing building was located on a 0.9 hectare site. It would also accommodate a roll of 1,150 pupils on a floor space of 13,100 square metres but this would be achieved by extending the existing building. Access to all outdoor sports facilities would also remain at Meggetland. Due to the extensive refurbishment works proposed, it would be necessary to decant pupils offsite for the duration of the works. The site of the former Burdiehouse Primary School had been identified as the location for the decant, principally as it was on a main bus route from the Boroughmuir catchment area. The decant site was approximately 4.3 miles from the Boroughmuir High School building and it would be necessary to construct a temporary decant village. The Foutainbridge site was not an option for the decant as it had not been specifically purchased for the potential new school and, if this option was not chosen, the Council intended to sell the land as quickly as possible. If Option B was selected, the timescale for completion was January 2018.

There were catchment implications associated with Option A as the Foutainbridge site currently lay just outside the high school catchment area. Two residential streets, Gibson Terrace and Murdoch Terrace would require to be added to the Boroughmuir catchment area which would have a knock on effect on the catchment areas of Tynecastle High School and Bruntsfield and Dalry Primary Schools.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
14 March 2012

The educational benefits of both options were then outlined. Overall, the Council officials felt that Option A (new build) offered more educational benefits than Option B (refurbishment and extension).

The Scottish Futures Trust would be providing two thirds of the funding for the project on a like for like basis, up to a cost and space limit. They would not provide any support towards the cost of any land for Option A nor for any decant costs associated with Option B. It was estimated that the new build option would be £5m cheaper than the refurbishment, mainly as a result of decant costs of £7.76m. The Council had identified capital funding for the project, however, revenue funding for the decant would have to be found through budget savings.

The consultation exercise would run up to 30 March 2012 after which the Council would seek Education Scotland's views. All comments which had been received and the points that had been raised at the meeting tonight would be considered and responded to in a report that would go the full Council. The report would be published on 7 June 2012 and would be considered at the Council meeting on 28 June 2012.

Statement by the Acting Head Teacher of Boroughmuir High School

David Dempster indicated that his Parent Council had asked for his position in December and he had made his views clear to them. The School Management Team supported the proposed new build (Option A). The existing structure was a fine building, but it was old and he was convinced that the new building was what was needed. He had spoken to Head Teachers in new builds who had indicated that the pupils' lives had been transformed for the better. Additionally, the tour by officers of new schools in London underpinned his views. He had spoken to various Head Teachers in these schools and they were enthusiastic about them. In respect of Option B and the proposed decant to Burdiehouse, he would not support this as he did not want his pupils to be educated in portacabins.

Statement from Seconded Head Teacher

Jack Hamilton advised that there had been high expectations and no outcomes regarding the routes explored since 2001 in relation to Boroughmuir High School. The Director of Children and Families said then that the school was "not fit for purpose" and since then there had been no improvement. There had been the possibility of the school being included in the Public Private Partnership project, but this did not come to fruition. Various sites had been considered, but these had not been progressed. The proposal was a great opportunity to take Boroughmuir into the 21st century, he therefore urged that the parents should support Option A.

Tom Wood thanked the Panel Members for their presentation and statements. In respect of the consultation tonight, there was the welfare of thousands of children to be considered, this process was therefore very important. He asked for questions

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
14 March 2012

from parents of children from the feeder primary schools first, as they were the ones who would be most affected.

Questions and Answers

Question 1 – Could the status of Option A for the proposed new build at Fountainbridge be clarified and how certain was it of being approved?

Question 2 – The new build did not meet Scottish Government regulations, would the site therefore still be approved? If not, what could be done?

Question 3 – There had been discussion in relation to the public park. What was the likelihood of the area being set aside for the public park being reconfigured?

Question 4 - What was meant by there being potential for a pitch on the roof of the new school?

Answers to Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

It was advised that Option A was the preferred site and the authority would not ask elected members to commit to a site which would incur great expense without that preference. An assessment had been undertaken, taking into account both the positive and negative aspects of the proposals and the proposed new build had emerged as the best option. If this option was not supported by officers, it would not have been recommended to the elected members.

For the next stage of the process, the public meetings provided an opportunity to get feedback from parents, whose views would be included in the report to the elected members in June 2012. The authority also wanted to be informed if anything had been omitted from the consultation paper. This was a genuine consultation.

It was explained that the authority was trying to progress matters in respect of the new build's compliance with Scottish Government regulations. A design team would be appointed and it would be necessary to set out the case and obtain the views of the Scottish Government. It could be assured that the authority would present a good case.

Supplementary Question – What would happen if the Scottish Government did not approve Option A?

Answer

If the Scottish Government did not approve Option A, then it could not be implemented. It was difficult to confirm what the alternative would be, as there had been no precedent for this occurrence.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
14 March 2012

It was explained that the authority was considering the possibility of reconfiguring the area set aside for the public park. It might be possible to reduce the size of the park. The existing plan would allow for the delivery of a public park alongside the school as part of the student housing development. As part of the master planning exercise, it was intended to review the exact reconfiguration of the park.

It was advised that there was no design team yet to finalise the details in respect of the potential for a pitch on the roof. However, it was possible for a pitch of this type to be included in the design as had been demonstrated in schools in London.

Question 5 – In respect of the Master Plan, had other locations for the new build been considered?

Question 6 – The Council had a track record in procuring quality schools. What issues had been learned in respect of quality related procurement?

Question 7 – Would it be possible to have a full school assembly in the new school?

Question 8 - Should the capital saved be put back to improve the quality of schools and what would be the funding arrangements?

Question 9 - If Option A was implemented, the capital saved should be put back in to the schools. Would this therefore be derived from a central fund?

Answers 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9

It was explained that officers had considered plans of schools at different locations within the Fountainbridge area and Option A was the final location as detailed in the proposals. In September 2011, various locations for the proposed new school had been considered and it might have been one of these locations that the member of the public was referring to. The consideration of a number of possible locations was part of the planning process. There had been extensive discussions in respect of the location of the school and a considerable amount of work had been carried out.

It was advised that lessons had been learned from the procurement of quality of schools and from the replacement of schools in the 2004 second schools Public Private Partnership (PPP) project. The design of the proposed new build was different from schools associated with the PPP project. It was necessary to get the views of the school and this would help form the design brief for the architect. In respect of quality, the same process would apply for Boroughmuir High School as applied to the other current “Wave 3” secondary schools; James Gillespie’s High School and Portobello High School. Jack Hamilton and other senior officers would be involved in the process and the quality of the new build would be of the highest standard.

In respect of funding, the estimated net overall cost of the new build would be £5m cheaper than the refurbishment option. There would be significant gains from the

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
14 March 2012

sale of the present site at Boroughmuir. There were significant challenges presented by the revenue budget. The refurbishment option would, however, still require significant revenue funding to be identified to meet the decant option for which no current provision currently existed. This was in the context that there was already a projected budget deficit in Council revenue funding over the next few years. The disposal of surplus land at Fountainbridge to developers was part of the business case.

It was indicated that to deliver the required accommodation requirements, the new school needed to have minimum available space of 13,110 square metres, which equated to 11.4 square metres per pupil. This was in excess of the Scottish Future Trust's benchmarks.

It was advised that school assemblies were held every day in Boroughmuir, therefore, assemblies could be held in the new build. Assembly space, social space and exam space was also required for preliminary and national exams. There was ongoing consultation with the feeder primary schools about the space proposed in the new building; this was a unique process to Edinburgh.

Question 10 – What about the question of the “spill out” of pupils into the street at lunchtime? It was not desirable for pupils to spill out to retail outlets in Fountainbridge. What, therefore, would be done to address this?

Question 11 – In respect of design for schools, what was the cost of schools in London and what were their budgets?

Question 12 - There should be a balance to the discussions, however, there was a clear bias towards Option A. Why therefore was Option B being considered at all?

Question 13 - The proposed site in Option A was much more constrained than the existing site. With the exception for the canal, the location at Fountainbridge was not so desirable. Additionally, where exactly would the park be located in Option A?

A member of the public was not convinced that Option B would take longer to complete. The diagram suggested that the existing school building would be transformed for the better. The site size was compared with the larger site of James Gillespie's High School.

Burdiehouse Primary School was not a good site for a decant and the Council would not lose out financially. Something “inspirational” could therefore be achieved. Could a decant at Fountainbridge, an “Option C” not be considered?

Answers to questions 10, 11, 12 and 13

It was explained that it made good sense to involve the Planning Division, regarding the control of activities around the site. The authority did not want a excess of fast food shops to emerge. In respect of “spill outs” at lunch time, the school would prefer

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
14 March 2012

the pupils to remain at school and have their lunch at a school facility. Schools in London did not allow pupils out at lunchtime, with the exception of senior pupils. The authority would be looking at ways to manage the spill out and encourage healthy eating. This was an issue with every school.

Significantly, when St Thomas' of Aquin's RC High School decanted, educational attainment was not affected, but in overall terms, it was not an ideal experience for pupils and staff.

In respect of the budget for schools in London, it was difficult to provide exact figures as the schools, the consultants and the builders all provided different figures. The City of Edinburgh Council was delivering high quality schools and creating budgets for that purpose. Fountainbridge had an assumed construction cost of approximately £2,240 per square metre.

There was no developer who would offer the free use of a decant site. The Council was working with EDI, the arms length development company of the Council, to dispose of the land at Fountainbridge if it was not chosen for the school. There was an amount of capital tied up in the site and if this capital was not released, there would be adverse consequences for the Children and Families Department funding. If the site was not sold, this would affect the programme for the Children and Families Department who needed the release of the funds. The authority therefore had a preference for Option A. From the educational point of view, this would create the best learning environment for the future. The panel also wanted to hear the views of the pupils and asked the members of the public to share them with the panel.

It was explained that the new site was small compared to James Gillespie's High School, however, the schools were not in competition. Both were good facilities and had high achievement rates.

Regarding the size of the Fountainbridge site, it had been demonstrated that much could be achieved with small sites in London. The authority was also considering ways to configure the site with the park.

Regarding the refurbishment option, the Planning Division had given written comfort indicating that it should be possible to add floor space to the existing site, if this option was approved. However, the design and details of the proposed extended space was not yet available, so a risk remained. Planning had been asked about the gym hall and had stated that it would not be possible to use the roof of the gym hall for outdoor space because of the proximity of residential properties.

Both options were significant projects, but Option B would take many months longer and there were currently no designs for either site. Fountainbridge was a brownfield site and was therefore a known quantity, however, there was greater uncertainty with the refurbishment option. A considerable amount of work would be required before the design could progress with Option B. Option A required only planning consent, however Option B required planning consent and listed building consent. The

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
14 March 2012

existing building had an electricity sub-station located within the school grounds and no works could be carried out until this and any other unforeseen issues had been addressed.

The Fountainbridge site could not be considered for the decant, as it had been specifically purchased for the potential new school and if this was not chosen, the land would have to be sold as soon as possible.

Question 14 – The Senior Management Team was firmly in favour of the new build. But were there any disadvantages to the new build?

Question 15 – Was Upper Gilmore Place a viable option for a decant?

Question 16 – Would the proposed school at Fountainbridge be of adequate size and did the Senior Management Team take into account the number of children in the catchment area increasing in future? Was there scope for expanding the school?

Answers 14, 15 and 16

It was explained that those advocating the decant option seemed to be hopeful that more open space would be available in the area for pitches, however, it had not been established that this would be the case. The Senior Management Team (SMT) was convinced of the merits of Option A because they had spoken to Head Teachers who had moved to new schools who had confirmed that they were a big improvement on the older schools. The SMT had also seen new schools operating successfully in London. Every effort would be made to further improve the design of Option A over the coming months.

It was advised that with Option B, if Darroch in Upper Gilmore Place was used as a decant site, this would accommodate only 500 pupils and would delay the project for at least one year.

The catchment roll at Boroughmuir was currently 770 pupils. In future, as catchment numbers rose, there would be fewer non-catchment pupils attending, which was in accordance with Council policy.

Question 17 - A member of the public stated that she was not convinced that there would be a one year delay if the Darroch decant option was adopted. At the school she attended 40 years ago, there was a decant and she was happy that her school went through the process.

Regarding the longevity of the school and the proposed timescale, Bruntstfield Primary School had lasted for 150 years, however, the proposed new build would have a much shorter lifetime.

Question 18 – What was the extent of outdoor space for the second option?

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
14 March 2012

Question 19 – What was the future of “After School Hours” and adult education classes in the new build?

Answers 17, 18 and 19

It was explained that the new build would endure for much longer than 20 years. The official figures were based on building quality schools which would last 50 or 60 years. One of the options available to the Council for the new build was a Design, Build, Finance and Maintain Model. The contractors would build the school and the authority would pay an annual charge to ensure that the building was maintained. After the contract expired, the building should still be in a good condition. The building would not therefore suffer from lack of repair.

In respect of the decant option, a significant amount of funds were bound up in the Fountainbridge site which would not be available for a period of time. Alternatives were to either tie up capital for a long time or put it towards better use. There were projects for the replacement of other schools and if the decant was adopted this would push the replacement of these schools into the future.

It was explained that it was not possible to carry out an estimate of outdoor space for Option B as there were no designs yet for either options A or B.

It was advised that the new build would have “After School Hours” and adult education. It was essential to ensure that the communities should benefit from the new school.

Question 20 – The proposals were difficult for most people to understand, therefore, there was a need to know the fuller picture. It was felt that neither option A or B was satisfactory.

Question 21 - How would the proposals be affected by the absence of the Master Plan?

Question 22 - From an environmental point of view, what message was given by building a new school that conflicted with the ethos of this neighbourhood? After 30 years, would more work not be required to repair the fabric of the building?

Answers 20, 21 and 22

There were challenges to be addressed with both options. Local opinion was clearly divided and there were issues regarding the use of the local park and how this was linked in to the planning process. If the refurbishment option was adopted, it would be necessary to enlarge and increase the mass of the existing building. The Fountainbridge site was a brownfield site and would be easier to deliver, however, there was no design team established yet for either option.

Consultation Meeting on the Proposals for the
Location of Boroughmuir High School
14 March 2012

It was advised that the Indicative Master Plan for the area had been approved. This area was vibrant and Fountainbridge could become an equally vibrant area. The canal could be used to expand and transform Fountainbridge and upgrade the area, and the new school could be a catalyst for this process. The existing structure was a fantastic building, however, the new build could be an exiting addition to the Fountainbridge area.

In respect of sustainability, the new build could have sustainable power generation and would last at least 50 years. If the authority did not invest in the existing building, it would have to be demolished, or in 20 years, there would have to be extensive replacement of components. But the new build would provide quality of space, would be great environmentally and the pupils would enjoy the school. For the new build, sustainability and energy efficiency were at the forefront of the agenda and the authority would promote renewables as far as possible. The new build would be carbon friendly and energy efficient.

Conclusion

Tom Wood indicated that 350 people had attended the four consultation meetings, which was the best response in his experience and there had been a great quality of debate. The newly elected council would make a decision on the proposals in June 2012. He reminded those present that the consultation process would run until 30 March 2012.

The Chair of Parent Council thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and for asking questions. This would encourage people to contribute to the consultation.

Carol-Anne Kyle, the Head Teacher, thanked the members of the public and the panel for attending the meeting and would tell the school children about the well thought out questions from their parents.

Abbreviations

BHS = Boroughmuir High School

CEC = City of Edinburgh Council

DBFO = Design, Build, Fund and Operate

HS = High School

PS = Primary School

SEDB = Strategic Education Design Brief

SMT = Senior Management Team

APPENDIX 3

| ID | Address | Comments |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | Buckstone, Buckstone PS Parent | 20 February 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A (New Build at Fountainbridge location). |
| 2 | Boroughmuir HS Feeder Primary Catchment Area Parent | 20 February 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry relating to Feasibility Report prepared by Malcolm Fraser. |
| 3 | Local resident | 20 February 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry re: provision of sporting facilities at Fountainbridge Site. |
| 4 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | 20 February 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option B (Refurbishment at existing location). • Proposed site is not suitable in terms of transport/ distance. • Proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to increased distance and time. • The proposed Fountainbridge site is not acceptable. • Concerned about the use of public finances to purchase land without public consent. • Concerned that the consultation exercise is a cosmetic exercise. |
| 5 | Unison Edinburgh | 21 February 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiry: Assuming that some dialogue has already taken place with the affected staff and parents, - do they have a preferred option? |
| 6 | Bruntsfield, Boroughmuir HS and Bruntsfield PS Parent | 21 February 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Proposed site is next to the Canal and close to the existing site. • Option A achieves economies of scale and presents an opportunity to have a brand new school. • Opposed to Option B. |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing building is not of exceptional historic value. The building will not be demolished and will be re-used. The existing site is constrained with no opportunity for expansion. Concerned about the quality of education associated with the decant option. Proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to increased distance and time. Increase in car journeys. Increase in lateness and absenteeism. Temperature and sound issue at decant school. Adverse impact on extracurricular activities. School children would have less time and energy for homework due to excessive travel. Potential friction between the Boroughmuir children and local children. Staff recruitment issues. Parents less likely to engage with general 'life of the school' due to distance and travel time issues. Discipline issues associated with teaching in temporary units. Potential adverse impact on relationship between feeder primary and associated secondary schools. Parents of children in S4 and above will not be affected by the decant. They are therefore less likely to oppose this option. |
| 7 | Address not Supplied | <p>23 February 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Option B as there is no change to school catchment areas. |
| 8 | Balgreen, Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>1 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Option A. Proposed Burdiehouse decant not acceptable due to disruption to children and increased distance and travel time. School children would have less time and energy for homework due to excessive travel. The existing site is constrained with no opportunity for expansion. Sports facilities will still be inadequate under Option B – at least there will be some provision under Option A. |
| 9 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>6 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed site is not suitable in terms of transport and travel times. Walking to school would not be an option for many with associated youth obesity concerns. School forms an integral part of the local community and its removal would undermine the social 'fabric' of the area. A new location will have an adverse impact on the "name" and "reputation" of Boroughmuir High School. Disposal of the existing site will be problematic. |
| 10 | Local resident | <p>6 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both options are inadequate. Fountainbridge site is constrained and does not represent parity with the extensive site for James Gillespie's HS. The vicinity and surrounding amenity of James Gillespie's will be superior to that of Boroughmuir HS. |

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fountainbridge site could be used as a decant to refurbish existing site. • A refurbished Boroughmuir would be more economical as the building has a longer projected life-time. • Option B could be an exemplar project showcasing modern innovative building renewal/ refresh techniques. |
| 10A | Local resident | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fountainbridge is suitable for a decant. • CEC’s presentations of the options have been unbalanced. • Fountainbridge: the site is tiny and surrounding area would be unlikely to attain the vibrancy of the small businesses and setting of Bruntsfield. • Timescale: The CEC assessment of the Viewforth programme taking 18 months longer is simply incorrect. Unlike the Fountainbridge option the design for Viewforth is well-developed with a ‘letter of comfort’ from CEC Planning Dept. • Decant Impact: It was recognised that a decant causes no disruption to pupil’s educational attainment and even, on occasion, a small rise in it. • Decant site: denying the school the obvious decant option, and instead directing it to a very difficult and unpopular alternative, is hugely - and entirely unnecessarily damaging to CEC’s “non-preferred” option. • Cost and Longevity: Option B would have hundreds of years of life in it. Option A would have not much more than 40 years. Aside from the inherent “sustainability” of Option B any financial model based on long-term good would recognise its long-term good-value. • Viewforth site: the Council team visited tight urban schools, but did not visit any joyfully and comprehensively renewed old one – because such a thing does not really exist. This option presents the ability for Edinburgh to lead the way, producing an environment for learning that combines the best of the past with a visionary future. |
| 11 | Address not supplied | <p>6 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enquiry regarding the funding model for redeveloping Boroughmuir. • Concerned that the new school would be mortgaged to a private company in the long run. |
| 12 | Address not supplied | <p>6 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to disruption to school children. • New site offers more scope for developing the new school. |
| 13 | EH10 | <p>6 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption. • Supportive of relatively minor catchment changes associated with Option A. • Would urge CEC to maximise the space available at the Fountainbridge site to create a flagship school. • The new school has the potential to harmonise with its surroundings and generate income from sports and adult/ evening educational activities. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 14 | EH10 | 6 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • New build represents better value for money and is logistically deliverable as it would not require an educationally disruptive decant which would threaten children's life chances. • The Fountainbridge site offers sports opportunities and a healthier environment. • New school must be built to the highest design standards. Wood cladding is not suitable to withstand the rigours of the Scottish climate. |
| 15 | Buckstone, Buckstone PS Parent | 7 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Option A is an opportunity for a new and innovative school with modern flexible facilities. • Feels that the majority of parents are in favour of Option A. |
| 16 | Buckstone, Boroughmuir HS Feeder Primary Catchment Area Parent | 7 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Option A is an opportunity for a new and innovative school with modern flexible facilities. • Supporting Option B on basis of nostalgia is not progressive and limits educational opportunities. • Proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. |
| 17 | Address not Supplied | 7 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am probably in favour of the rebuild. • If Option A proceeds, will construction noise on surrounding development sites impact on pupils? |
| 18 | Buckstone PS Parent | 7 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The majority of parents are in favour of a new school. • New build is the only viable and sensible option. • Proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. • There would be social tensions between the Boroughmuir pupils and local youths in the Burdiehouse area. • The local shops would not be able to cope in the event of a decant to Burdiehouse. |
| 19 | Boroughmuir HS & Bruntsfield PS Parent | 8 March <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Requests the maximum sports/ open space provision throughout the whole of the available space at the Fountainbridge site. • Notes that Meggetland remains the main sports facility for both Options. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The refurbishment option would not provide the same educational opportunities offered by new build at Fountainbridge. • The existing Boroughmuir building is prime location for housing, offices or other use. |
| 20 | Boroughmuir HS & Bruntsfield PS Parent | 8 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. |
| 21 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | 9 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • New build represents better value for money and is logistically deliverable as it would not require an educationally disruptive decant which would threaten children’s life chances. • Concerned that Fountainbridge site is almost as constrained as the existing one. • Requests the maximum sports/ open space provision throughout the Fountainbridge site. |
| 22 | Craiglockhart, Boroughmuir HS Parent | 10 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • A new build will allow aims of Strategic Educational Design Brief to be met. • The School Senior Management Team supports Option A. Their expertise puts them in a unique position to make a recommendation which other interested parties cannot be in. Trust their professional recommendations. • To maintain the character of the school it is important to utilise a site near to the existing school building. • Agrees with CEC’s view that providing full-sized pitches at Fountainbridge would make it harder to build up a vibrant community in the area which is currently under development. |
| 23 | Buckstone, Boroughmuir HS & Buckstone PS Grandparent | 11 March 2012 Supports Option A for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages a ‘faculty’ based educational approach. • Park and Canal area presents opportunity for creative use of space. • ‘Campus’ style atmosphere could be created. • Overlap between pupils and site construction can be avoided. • Option A delivers SEDB more easily than Option B. • Innovative design has to compensate for site being only 50% of School Premises Regs size. • Roof sports deck would have safety issues which would need to be addressed. • Adjacency to the canal would have safety issues which would need to be addressed. Comments on Option A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximise use of the Park Area and fully explore space sharing at east side of the site. • Optimise use of the site as the available space is limited. • Investigate scope to create “basement” space. |

| | | |
|----|------------------------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not realistic to expect much open space on any City Centre site such as this. • The school is completed earlier under Option A. • Option A avoids completely an undesirable temporary decant. • The end result is an all “under one roof” in an attractive configuration. • The continued use of Meggetland applies to <u>both</u> options. <p>Comments on Option B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The present site has a very small footprint and is “landlocked” on all sides. • The “free space” remaining after refurbishment on this site would be minimal. • The proposed decant will have a substantial impact on educational performance and extra-curricular activities are likely to be seriously curtailed. Travel options to Burdiehouse are limited and local shops/services are inadequate. <p>Costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A looks £5m cheaper than Option B. • Future maintenance costs are likely to be higher for Option B. |
| 24 | Address Not Supplied | <p>11 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Provides a significant upgrade in facilities that the school desperately needs. |
| 25 | Forth Canoe Club | <p>12 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting a new boathouse next to a new school would be excellent for us as we thrive on working with the local community and developing young people’s appreciation of sport. • The strip of land next to the canal and Gibson Terrace would be an excellent location for a boathouse. • Jim Lowrie, the local councillor and chair of the planning committee is supportive of this proposal and would align with CEC’s Canal Strategy. • The Scottish Canoe Association is also supportive and a coach from them funded by SportScotland is based at Forth Canoe Club. |
| 26 | EH17 | <p>9 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This community fought to prevent the closure of Burdiehouse Primary School. Most galling to be informed that £7.3M is proposed to provide temporary accommodation for Boroughmuir pupils on the Burdiehouse site. • Grossly insulting to this community who were deprived of their local primary school. • Option B would be deeply resented by Burdiehouse Southhouse residents. • The only sensible option is Option A. |
| 27 | South Morningside PS Parent | <p>12 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Proposed decant would be disruptive. |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 28 | Buckstone, Buckstone PS Parent | 12 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • We believe the educational benefits to be greater with Option A than Option B. • Concerned proposed decant would be disruptive. |
| 29 | South Morningside PS & Nursery Parent | 12 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A in preference to refurbishment. |
| 30 | South Morningside PS & Nursery Parent | 12 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • A modern new building is preferable to a refurbishment. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not viable. |
| 31 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | 14 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The rebuild proposal is unattractive as the Burdiehouse decant option is totally unsuitable due to educational disruption, increased travel times to Meggetland for sports and potential tension with local schools. • In terms of the new build the following points are made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ one building is preferable to a split building approach. ○ Switching the park to the site between the student housing and the canal seems the simplest and most obvious solution. Why not put park up onto the roof space if it can be done for play area? |
| 32 | Address not supplied | 14 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Having seen a view of the (Fountainbridge) site it's not ideal that the park separates the buildings. • CEC should allocate some of this space to the school or move the park area if possible. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not an option. • There would be social tensions between the Boroughmuir pupils and local school children in the Burdiehouse area. |
| 33 | Address not supplied | 14 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • I would like to request that the park is either removed entirely and that land is used for the school, or that it is relocated away from the school site. It will be a small urban park that is not at the heart of either a residential or a commercial area, and such parks have a tendency to be unloved and to degenerate, attracting high levels of anti-social behaviour. I do not thin it is likely to benefit either the area or the school. |
| 34 | Address not supplied | 14 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A • The presentation and Q & A session was well organised and provide a good outline of both options. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEC needs to ensure the new build has as much space as possible from the area designated as public park space. • Significant analysis should be carried out to try to resolve the issue of lack of outdoor space to avoid the use of other venues e.g. Meggetland as far as possible. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. |
| 35 | Bruntsfield, Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>15 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Issues to address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Integrating of the proposed park with the school ○ Dundee Street is a very busy road. Pupil access to the school should be designed to minimise spill directly onto this road. ○ It is a concern that it is not currently known what will be built on the remainder of the brewery site on the other side of Viewforth. I would hope that the presence of a school would influence ant planning decisions on that site, particularly as any housing would be “in catchment” for Bruntsfield and Boroughmuir. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. • The decision should be made on educational grounds only. Opinions relating to architecture and geographical prejudices are not relevant to the decision-making process. • The proposed location for Option A would benefit the local area/ community. |
| 36 | Buckstone PS Parent | <p>16 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 37 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>16 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both options still require children to have their sports at Meggetland, Meadowbank and Niddrie. • Unacceptable to invest in a new build option that would have inadequate sports ground available to the new school. • CEC need to obtain all the land around the proposed new school site in order to provide adequate sports facilities. • The Water Board site at Buckstone is the best and only solution as this will have sufficient space for sports provision which negates the need for bus travel. • The area around Tollcross is unsafe and dangerous and not suitable for secondary age children. • Travel time from the Buckstone area to the location of the proposed catchment school would be unacceptably long. |
| 38 | EH10 | <p>16 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A is favoured subject to resolving the park issue. • Maximum use has to be made of available space and buildings co-located. • The proposed park needs to be utilised by the school due to the already constrained nature of the site. |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. Also potential for local rivalry. • “Option C”: This option assumes that the park issue in B cannot be removed satisfactorily. This option was not presented, but was discussed at the meeting. Refurb the existing school, but used the new school site for a temporary school instead of the Burdiehouse site. The reasons for not being able or willing to do this were insufficient when compared to the simplicity it provides the school children affected. |
| 39 | Buckstone PS Parent | 16 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 40 | Buckstone PS Parent | 16 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 41 | South Morningside PS Parent | 16 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why was the Fountainbridge site chosen and purchased by CEC for the new build option, when it is clearly not suitable? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is not located within the current Boroughmuir HS catchment area. ○ traffic safety concerns with the school ‘spilling’ on to the Viewforth, Fountainpark, Dundee St and a canal ○ the proposed site is only 0.1ha larger than the existing one. ○ There are more suitable sites for a new build such as the Scottish Water site at Fairmilehead and the Craighouse Campus. |
| 42 | South Morningside PS Parent | 16 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No decant required (or if decant required it will be for very short time). ○ The pupils deserve the very best start in their secondary education and a new, state of the art building certainly allows for this. ○ Believe the views of the Head Teacher at Boroughmuir need to be taken into consideration and they are strongly in favour of the new build. |
| 43 | Address not supplied | 16 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Also requests that some of the adjacent land currently designated for public park space be used to increase the size of the new build. |
| 44 | Boroughmuir HS Feeder Primary Catchment Area Parent | 16 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The new-build option should include adequate sporting facilities. • There is land available for providing adequate sports facilities. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 45 | Buckstone, Buckstone PS Parent | <p>16 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Refurbishment of existing school would take longer, cause greater disruption and would be a poorer end result. • Should explore acquisition of more land at Fountainbridge site to provide more sports and outdoor recreation space. • Consider cost and environmental impacts of the continued bussing of pupils to Meggetland for sports, when facilities could be sited on the school grounds on a larger use of the overall site. • The pupil generation of the residential development at Water Board site should be considered too. |
| 46 | Buckstone, Boroughmuir HS Feeder Primary Catchment Area Parent | <p>16 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every effort must be made to change the size of the site and to increase the sports facilities provision at the Fountainbridge site. • It is unacceptable that schoolchildren should have to waste time sitting on buses between the school and sports facilities for PE lessons. The new school should incorporate a swimming pool as well as sports pitch. |
| 47 | EH10 | <p>16 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every effort must be made to change the size of the site and to increase the sports facilities provision at the Fountainbridge site. • It is unacceptable that schoolchildren should have to waste time sitting on buses between the school and sports facilities for PE lessons. • The new school should incorporate a swimming pool as well as sports pitch. |
| 48 | Boroughmuir HS & Buckstone PS Parent | <p>16 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Refurbishment would be too complicated. • A move to a new school would be relatively simple and good for morale of both staff and children. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to disruption and additional cost. |
| 49 | EH10 | <p>16 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to comprehend why the refurbishment option should take an extra 18 months as opposed to the new build option and CEC should engage with a Main Contractor to study how the programme can be reduced. • CEC's reasoning for not using the Fountainbridge for decant is weak. • The Option A site is too small. • The canal is a potential Health and Safety risk. • People will move to James Gillespie's catchment as Fountainbridge area is deprived and regeneration a long way off. • There will be insufficient budget for decked sports pitch. • CEC are unwilling to enlarge the site by using neighbouring CEC owned land (currently used by Kwik Fit). • The refurbishment option could be a very exciting solution which retains the history by remaining on the site. If |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | the barriers could be lifted and the solution which is already in place be presented then this may well be a better solution than a squeezed new build. |
| 50 | Address not supplied | 17 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 51 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | 18 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A as least disruptive. • Very against decant option. • The relocation of the school may also regenerate Fountainbridge area which seems an additional positive benefit. • Appalled by parent who suggests that Fountainbridge area is 'downmarket' - no reason to refurbish current school. |
| 52 | Buckstone, Boroughmuir HS Feeder Primary Catchment Area Parent | 18 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feel strongly that new build will add to the learning experience. • Every effort should be made to acquire additional land to provide more outdoor recreation and sports space. • Renovation of the current site would be expensive, disruptive and will not achieve the degree of improvement in environmental enrichment that our children deserve in an urban school. |
| 53 | South Morningside, Boroughmuir HS Parent | 18 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed new site is so small. Urge CEC revisit master plan with aim of increasing space and identifying possible shared facilities. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable. |
| 54 | Buckstone, Catchment Primary School Parent | 19 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. |
| 55 | Address not supplied | 19 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and additional costs. • Every effort should be made to acquire additional land to provide more suitable outdoor recreation and sports space at the Fountainbridge site. • If the up front cost of the land is an issue (which I suspect in current time it is) I am sure that the parent council of Boroughmuir, past pupils, feeder schools and prospective pupils could form a fund-raising initiative, which when viewed alongside a saving of £40k per annum would meet a significant part of this cost. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 56 | Catchment Primary School Parent | 20 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the SMT and wider Project team actively listening to teachers and support staff, how has this been done to date? And what are the issues being raised by the staff group? What opportunities do Boroughmuir teaching and support staff have, other than the Education Spec, to engage and participate in the renewal of the school? To ensure that all school staff continue to be involved throughout all the project phases? |
| 56A | Catchment Primary School Parent | 30 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We ought to actively promote sustainability and deliver an exceptional building for an exceptional school. Not to seriously consider the alternatives to a new build is short sighted, short term economics and poor reflection on Edinburgh with its lack of vision. • Recycle, reinvigorate and refurbish NOT reduce, regress and regret. • Burdiehouse decant is an unacceptable option • Use of the Fountainbridge site for a decant to facilitate the refurbishment should be re-visited and considered further. • Without Malcolm Fraser's informed and constructive comments in both 'consultation' meetings I attended many parents would have come away with quite a depressing view of the initiative. |
| 57 | Buckstone PS Parent | 20 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Can see no purpose in spending £7m on decant when funds could be used elsewhere. |
| 58 | Buckstone PS Parent | 20 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The following should be considered at the project planning stage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School sustainability, eco friendly use of solar panels and the canal as resources to keep bills down a free education budgets for other uses. ○ Links with other related facilities to ensure the site is used in conjunction with the school i.e. new library and sporting facilities. |
| 59 | South Morningside, South Morningside PS Parent | 20 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. Rationale for this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential increase of 'outside' space. ○ Support of the School Leadership team. ○ Time and cost benefits. ○ Avoidance of Burdiehouse decant. • Recommend following actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Investigate requirement for public park to see if this can be made available to increase the available footprint for the school. ○ After the forthcoming catchment change no more catchment changes for 10 years. ○ Creative and innovative thinking is used to maximise and optimise the use of space available to new |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | | <p>school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure the strict management of this project within work programme and project budget. |
| 60 | Boroughmuir HS & South Morningside PS Parents | <p>20 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The cost of decant strengthens the case for option A and the proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to the travel. |
| 61 | Boroughmuir HS Grandparent | <p>20 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to the travel. • There would be social tensions between the Boroughmuir pupils and local youths in the Burdiehouse area. |
| 62 | Boroughmuir HS & South Morningside PS Parents | <p>21 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Option A offers a superior educational environment for the pupils and the teachers. • Option A offers a better social/ recreation/ sporting environment for the pupils. • Any proposed decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. • Every effort should be made to acquire additional land to provide more suitable outdoor recreation and sports space at the Fountainbridge site. |
| 63 | Boroughmuir HS Feeder Primary School Parent | <p>21 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every effort should be made to acquire additional land to provide more suitable outdoor recreation and sports space at the Fountainbridge site. • I would like it to be made mandatory that all S1-S4 pupils are not allowed out in breaks and lunch. I would be concerned about their safety due to the proximity of the canal to the proposed school site. • Satisfaction expressed with regard to the consultation process. |
| 64 | Morningside PS Parent | <p>21 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Every effort should be made to acquire additional land to provide more suitable outdoor recreation and sports space at the Fountainbridge site. • New school MUST have adequate catering facilities to discourage pupils accessing local 'fast food' catering establishments. Consideration should be given to keeping pupils within the school perimeter during the school day to encourage healthy eating. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 65 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>22 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. • Every effort should be made to acquire additional land to provide more suitable outdoor recreation and sports space at the Fountainbridge site. |
| 66 | Boroughmuir HS Feeder Primary School Parent | <p>22 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • It is not ideal that the small part separates the 2 new school buildings. It would be sensible that CEC allocates all of the current Park space for the new school build and move the park space elsewhere. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable – potential for friction and disruptive. |
| 67 | Boroughmuir HS & Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>22 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. • I feel that CEC offers the Burdiehouse decant option in the knowledge that most parents will not countenance this so that Option A (the preferred option) garners most support. • Reservations with Option A with regard to proposed level of sports provision. • It is not ideal that the small part separates the 2 new school buildings. It would be sensible that CEC allocates all of the current Park space for the new school build and move the park space elsewhere. • I feel that CEC's priority is more about money than education needs. • I would like a guarantee that the new site will be bigger than the one CEC is currently offering. • I would like assurance that the new build school will not fall apart after 10 years. • I would like the assurance that more will be done in terms of sports provision. |
| 68 | Boroughmuir HS & South Morningside PS Parent | <p>22 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. |
| 69 | Address not supplied | <p>22 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • If there is significantly higher stay on rates in S5/S6 would this mean that there was a lower intake at S1? • A criticism of the existing BHS site is the lack of space. Why should a new school be built if the school is going to suffer from a lack of space? • It is imperative, therefore, that as much space as possible should be allocated to the new school site. The school should be the priority for the Fountainbridge site rather than a mixture of secondary school education and other economic objectives. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks associated with travelling such distances. |
| 70 | Boroughmuir HS Catchment Parent | <p>22 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The only real options are the new build (my preference) or a decant to the Fountainpark site concurrent with re-ferb. The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. I would take my children out of Boroughmuir and pursue other schools such as James Gillespie's in the event of the Burdiehouse decant. |
| 71 | Primary School Catchment Parents | <p>22 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Option A. Satisfaction expressed with regard to the consultation process. |
| 72 | Primary School Catchment Parents | <p>22 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Option A. The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased costs. Acquire additional land to provide more suitable outdoor recreation and sports space at the Fountainbridge site. |
| 73 | Address not supplied | <p>23 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Totally against decant option. Every effort should be made to acquire additional land to provide suitable gym and drama space at the Fountainbridge site. RC High School new developments have had no problem getting full quota of land so why not act in a fair manner. |
| 74 | South Morningside PS Parents | <p>23 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Option A. Although there remain drawbacks (plans for the sports areas and student housing) it would appear to be a less disruptive option for all pupils. |
| 75 | Boroughmuir HS & South Morningside PS Parent | <p>23 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option A minimises potential disruption to children's education. |
| 76 | Address not supplied | <p>23 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Option A. We would like as much space as possible for the school on the new site to include sports facilities which could be used for the whole south side of the city, which is lacking in such facilities. The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | | travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. |
| 77 | Buckstone PS Parents | <p>24 March 201</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to disruption and limited learning environment. • Other reasons for support are the following weaknesses of refurbishment (Option B): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Difficulty in providing maths and sciences faculties. ○ Classroom sizes and provision of adequate ‘collaboration spaces’ are likely to be compromised under the refurbishment option. ○ There are no opportunities to create any type of outdoor sporting facility. ○ Limited scope for enhancement of the outdoor learning environment. ○ Requirement for any new buildings will further reduce the already limited outdoor space. ○ Disruption to the community education that is currently hosted at Boroughmuir HS. • Raise the following concerns as regard Option A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The are limitations with size of the site at Fountainbridge. ○ Incorporating a further 0.3ha (currently designated as public park space) would allow more space specifically for outdoor education. ○ Lack of availability for dedicated outdoor spaces. |
| 78 | Address not supplied | <p>25 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. It will cost less and be more suitable. • The traditions and identity of the old school have not been lost in the new building. • A Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and poor learning environment. |
| 79 | EH10 | <p>25 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Every effort should be made to acquire additional land to provide more space for exercise. • We would like as much space as possible for the school on the new site to include community and sports facilities which could be used for the whole south side of the city, which is lacking in such facilities. • Future-proofing: What strategy is being considered for a replacement of the new build school in 25 years? • With regard to the Water Board site what plans are there to ‘manage’ the additional school children generated by potential residential development? |
| 80 | Bruntsfield, Bruntsfield PS Parents | <p>25 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to confirm our support of Option A but concerned that the justifications of the new build are not guaranteed (in that the timescales are movable, the costs can escalate and the available land can be reduced in size). • Is it possible to provide assurances that these issues do come with some sort of guarantee, including that the |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | | monies allocated by the Scottish Executive cannot be re-allocated away from this project? |
| 81 | Primary School Catchment Parent | <p>25 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • I don't think even the smartest architect could provide as good a school on the existing site due to various constraints including Listed Building status. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. • I would like as much space as possible for the school on the new site to include improved sports facilities such as a football space and additional recreation space. |
| 82 | Local resident | <p>25 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no compromise made in the new build, in order to accommodate large spaces for collaborative/ group learning, which would mean a reduction in the size of "teaching spaces" i.e. classrooms for individual subjects and individual teachers. • A larger site footprint should be considered along with the need for additional green spaces for community uses. These areas should be as large as possible to accommodate spill out at break times during the school day. • A constrained site at Fountainbridge will be to the detriment of both the school and the wider community. |
| 83 | Primary School Catchment Parent | <p>26 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not an option. • I believe that the new school building has a priority for space, amenities and safety – over any other business that takes space in the complex. |
| 84 | Boroughmuir HS & Buckstone PS Parents | <p>26 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • No amount of refurbishment can detract from the outdated existing building. • The new build should have as much space as possible given over to PE or outdoor activities. • CEC needs to allocate more space to the school for play and sport. |
| 85 | Brunstfield PS Parents | <p>26 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A is flawed as the site purchased is too small and constrained. This makes this option unattractive. • Option B is also flawed due to the proposed decant to the former Burdiehouse PS. • We would support Option A if more land is acquired for the new-build. |
| 86 | South Morningside PS Parents | <p>26 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Less disruptive, quicker and cheaper option. |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 87 | Bruntsfield, Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>26 March 2012</p> <p>Supports Option B for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocation of school to the north of the canal significantly changes the identity of the school which will become Fountain Park High School. • The setting of Fountainbridge and the canal area is far less appealing than the Bruntsfield/ Links area and will result in increased truancy and anti-social behaviour to the detriment of education. • The proposed site is smaller than the existing grounds and the loss of St Oswald's Hall would be unacceptable. • The sports provision under Option A would be inadequate. • Fountainbridge is a hugely polluted area with heavy lorries whilst Boroughmuir enjoys a tranquil setting. • Fountainbridge will remain an unattractive building site for years to come. • The positive connection with Bruntsfield Primary School will be broken and will inevitably be linked to James Gillespie's. • A refurbished and extended Boroughmuir would retain all the historical benefits (including the generous class room's daylight provision) and be a new school with state of the art facilities. We do not need a new site to achieve this. • The impact on the community and businesses in Bruntsfield will be devastating. The school kids bring a massive amount of business to the independent retailers. • Statistics show that educational attainment does not suffer in a decant – in fact it improves. The Fountainpark site could be used for a temporary decant building. • Travelling to the new school from Buckstone will be tortuous. • Option B offers everything a new building can and more because there is an amazing historic purpose built building <i>in situ</i>. In fact it has been the poor quality alterations in more recent times which have compromised its fine stature. • It would be extremely sad to see this fine school disappear. |
| 88 | Boroughmuir HS & Buckstone PS Parent | <p>27 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Many problems when converting old property and often new costs are uncovered as the project progresses. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant would be disruptive and a poor learning experience. |
| 89 | Boroughmuir HS & feeder PS parent | <p>27 March 2012</p> <p>Supports Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It sounds marvellous |
| 90 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>27 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Old building can be re-used and new building 'green' design. • Heartened that all pupils would remain with school grounds during the school day. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable and an unbudgeted cost. • The new-build presents an opportunity to regenerate the Fountainbridge area. |
| 91 | Boroughmuir High School submission | <p>27 March 2012 Supports Option A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current building has been identified as ‘not fit for purpose’ by a variety of organisations, most recently HMLe in 2008. There is no debate about the need for a total refurbishment of the existing building or a new build. • Educational Design Brief: staff consultation exercise forms the basis of desired outcome. • As a result of the London visit and regularly attending new build schools in Edinburgh, surer than ever of the quality and flexibility that a new build can deliver. • Convinced that the Fountainbridge location will provide a new dynamic to the school and provide us with an environment which is urban but with the canal and park being enhancing elements of this regenerated landscape. • Option A avoids the decant of pupils. The educational experience that pupils would receive in a decant situation would be hugely diminished from that they currently receive. • Despite the affinity and connection we have with this lovely old building, it is bound by the constraints of being a listed building which limits the extent of any refurbishment. • Option A offers a better setting that being hemmed in by residential neighbours on all four sides. • We believe the great tradition and reputation of the school will only be enhanced in a state-of-the-art new build. |
| 92 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>27 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. Impact on extra curricular activities. • I would prefer that school children were able to stay on the existing site while the new build option is pursued. |
| 93 | South Morningside PS Parent | <p>27 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 94 | Buckstone, Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>27 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • No amount of refurbishment can detract from the outdated existing building. • There can be many problems when converting old property and often new costs are uncovered as the project progresses. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. • Delighted to see the open green spaces proposed at the new site. |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 95 | South Morningside PS Parent | 27 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 96 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | 27 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Is it possible to fit the new school with solar and wind technology, ground heat source pumps, heat converters and brown water collection and numerous other ideas that could be incorporated into the school. • Maximise and optimise use of space to deliver curriculum for excellence and sports opportunities. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. |
| 97 | South Morningside PS Parents | 27 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 98 | EH10 | 27 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Economic concerns for the Bruntsfield area should not be taken into consideration on the basis that the quality of education provision should take precedence. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and additional costs. |
| 99 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | 27 March 2012 Supports Option A. However I am concerned about the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site sports facilities/ playing fields/ greenspace: new facilities at the new school would make a positive contribution to the local community. Urge CEC to look at every possibility for creating new greenspace on part of the remainder of the Fountainbridge site not already identified for the school. • Lunch-time 'spill-out': improved dining facilities are to be welcomed along with preventing pupils exiting school grounds and staggering lunchtimes to improve access to school dining options. • Overall insufficient space: making more of the site available for the school would provide greater scope for the provision of on-site sports facilities/ playing fields/ greenspace. • Decant: I find the idea of my children having to attend a decant school in portacabins in Burdiehouse for a significant proportion for their secondary school careers totally unacceptable. |
| 100 | Buckstone, Buckstone PS & Nursery Parent | 27 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. • The Option A site would provide slightly more space than is currently the case. |

| | | |
|------|--|---|
| 101 | Boroughmuir HS Parents | 27 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. • Maximise and optimise use of space to deliver curriculum for excellence and sports opportunities. |
| 102 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | 28 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option B. |
| 102A | Boroughmuir HS Parent | 30 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option B. • Refurbishment is a far more sustainable option as the existing building can provide many more years of use on the existing site. I question the value of investing millions of pounds in a new school that will deliver only 0.1 of a hectare of additional space. This appears to be very poor value for money and contrary to the Scottish Government recommended requirement of 2.6ha. • I am extremely concerned that the consultation process appears to be weighted in favour of the new build option. • Parents are being pressurised by the scare tactic of the Burdiehouse decant and CEC had not provided a creditable reason why the decant to Fountainbridge could not take place. • The weighting of the consultation options is frankly unfair and an abuse of the democratic process. |
| 103 | South Morningside PS Parent | 28 March 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option B. • Refurbishment is a far more sustainable option as the existing building can provide many more years of use on the existing site. • Building a new school will be more expensive than refurbishing an existing one. • Options for sports provision in neighbouring buildings should be investigated. |
| 104 | Boroughmuir HS Feeder PS Parents | 28 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 105 | James Gillespie's, Boroughmuir HS Feeder Catchment Parent | 28 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • A new school would best serve the educational needs of children providing an opportunity for CEC to deliver a facility that is bespoke, modern, innovative and best suited to educational provision in the 21st century. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. It is also potentially unsafe with greater health and safety risks related to travelling such distance. |
| 106 | Bruntsfield PS Parents | 28 March 2012 Supports Option A for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The logistics and expense associated with the Burdiehouse decant are not sustainable for CEC, school staff and |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | | <p>pupils.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decant would have a detrimental impact on our children's education. • New build is better suited to delivering the Curriculum for Excellence whereas a refurbished Listed Building presents too many constraints. • There will be a sustainable re-use for the existing school building in the form of flats. |
| 107 | Buckstone PS Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and not conducive to learning. |
| 108 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • A new school would best serve the educational needs of children providing an opportunity for CEC to deliver a facility that is bespoke, modern, innovative and best suited to educational provision in the 21st century. • Increase area for sporting activities. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not desirable. |
| 109 | Boroughmuir PS Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • A new school would best serve the educational needs of children providing an opportunity for CEC to deliver a facility that is bespoke, modern, innovative and best suited to educational provision in the 21st century. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not desirable. |
| 110 | Address not supplied | <p>28 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Budget – new school will be cheaper than refurbishment of existing school. • Timeframe – new build would be completed well in advance of the refurbishment. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not desirable. • We would like as much space as possible for the school on the new site to include community and sports facilities which could generate income. |
| 111 | South Morningside, Boroughmuir HS & South Morningside PS Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Refurb would be a compromise. • A new school would best serve the educational needs of children providing an opportunity for CEC to deliver a facility that is bespoke, modern, innovative and best suited to educational provision in the 21st century. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not desirable and would be expensive. |
| 112 | Address not supplied | <p>28 March 2012</p> <p>Supports Option A and would like to make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed site is too small for the proposed building. |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal needs to allocate parking/ bus drop and pick up. • The school should have its own playing field with this supplemented by Meggetland. • Concerns regarding the proposed roof top sports pitch: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prevents natural daylight ○ Increase in structure weight and expense ○ Long term water ingress due to flat roof construction ○ Net will be required over the pitch to prevent sports equipment landing on road etc. • The proposed building will be several storeys high which will prevent natural light entering the centre of the school. • Could land for the sports/ outdoor recreation be reallocated from the canal/ barge basin area? • Has closing Viewforth at the canal and using this space for the school been considered? • The new school needs to be allocated the space it requires. There is only one chance to get this right. • Consider location the new school on the site between Viewforth and Gilmore Park as it appears to be a bigger site. • I got the impression at the Buckstone PS meeting that CEC has already reached its position. I found the planner was there to justify the smaller site and I found him unconvincing. |
| 113 | Boroughmuir HS and Feeder Primary School Parent | <p>28 March 2012 Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointment that a top priority project identified in 2004 remains in such a preparatory stage. • Frustration that the impressive structural and educational facilities to be enjoyed by future Boroughmuir generations have been denied to the current generation. • Reservations about the capability (professional and financial) of CEC to commission the project within the proposed timescale, budget or funding conditions. • It seems probable that the economic environment and specific CEC capital and revenue funding facilities will continue to deteriorate, leading to inevitable delay, re-design, dispute and overspend. <p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We urge CEC to secure as much land as possible in order to maximise the potential of the site. • We reject the proposal to refurbish the existing school, primarily on the grounds that decanting the population of the schools is educationally and logistically disruptive, impractical and unacceptable. • How do CEC and teaching staff allay parents concerns that the present and next generations of pupils are not inconvenienced, overlooked or even sacrificed in the understandable rush of enthusiasm for the new school project? |
| 114 | Boroughmuir HS & Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • A new school would best serve the educational needs of children providing an opportunity for CEC to deliver a facility that is bespoke, modern, innovative and best suited to educational provision in the 21st century. |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not desirable. • With regards to sports facilities alternatives to bussing to Meadowbank should be considered such as using Harrison Park and utilising sports pitches associated with George Watson's College. |
| 115 | South Morningside PS Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A as no decant needed. • A new school would best serve the educational needs of children providing an opportunity for CEC to deliver a facility that is bespoke, modern, innovative and best suited to educational provision in the 21st century. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not desirable. |
| 116 | South Morningside, Boroughmuir HS & South Morningside PS Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <p>Supports Option A for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New build option brings significant educational advantages over both the status quo and the refurbishment option. • New facilities would be available considerably earlier under Option A than Option B. • Option A avoids the undesirable decant associated with Option B. • Option A avoids the compromises on educational provision associated with Option B. • Securing planning consent for Option B would be complex, subject to delay and with uncertain outcome. |
| 117 | South Morningside, Feeder Primary School Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 118 | Bruntsfield, Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option B. • Further investigation of utilising Fountainbridge site as a decant option is required. • Refurbishment is a far more sustainable option as the existing building can provide many more years of use on the existing site. • Building a new school will be more expensive than refurbishing an existing one. • Options for sports provision in neighbouring buildings should be investigated. • Refurbishment is a far more sustainable option as the existing building can provide many more years of use on the existing site. • I question the value of investing millions of pounds in a new school that will deliver only 0.1 of a hectare of additional space. This appears to be very poor value for money and contrary to the Scottish Government recommended requirement of 2.6ha. • The location of the Fountainbridge site is not child-friendly. It is, on the north side, near a busy bus route and adjacent commercial entertainment park. On the east side is a narrow road (Viewforth) which at the canal bridge has very poor sight-lines for drivers. • We applaud CEC for planning to commit substantial resources into producing a high quality school, at either site, |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | | and we urge you to choose the existing site for the reasons set out above. |
| 119 | Address not supplied | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A smaller classroom ensures fewer students and a better teacher/ pupil ratio. • Boroughmuir has retained these small classrooms because it is old and I think the parents have a right to demand that any new school does not surreptitiously increase class size because of budget restraints. • Politician after politician has promised smaller classes and failed to deliver. Smaller rooms could be regarded as a pre-emptive stomach stapling – a means of ensuring that the classes don't swell to become lecture halls. |
| 120 | South Morningside, Boroughmuir HS & South Morningside PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed decant would have a negative impact on education. • Encouraged that new build option will increase the size of the school compared to the current Boroughmuir. |
| 121 | Buckstone, Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption. • I am not convinced that that refurbishment of the existing building would be anything more than a compromise to fit what will still be an old shell. |
| 122 | Boroughmuir High School Parent Council | <p>28 March 2012</p> <p>1. The Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the detail on the two options is limited in the Consultation Paper overall the analysis of the two options is slightly biased towards creating positive impressions for the new build and negative ones for the refurbishment. • The Paper does not provide sufficient detail on the academic aspects to allow an informed view on the two options. • The Q and A format did not allow for any follow up to answers given by the panel and not an open forum for debate. <p>2. Parental Views</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The balance of opinion favours Option A. • A number of parents, primarily within the Bruntsfield area, do have a level of attachment to the existing building and support the inherent sustainability benefits of the refurbishment option. • The amount of space being allocated for the new school is a source of major concern. <p>Option A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many parents expect CEC to find a planning solution which allows for a larger area of land. • Many parents call for full sports pitches to be provided, however we do recognise the difficulties of locating outdoor playing fields on an urban site. |

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We acknowledge the need to have open space in the form of a park within the overall Fountainbridge site. Re-location of the park to the east side of Viewforth should be considered. As well as increasing the dedicated space available to the school, such a move would enable more cohesive use to be made of the proposed school site. <p>Option B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is considerable opposition to the Burdiehouse decant proposal. For some parents the prospect of <i>any</i> decant is seen as unacceptably disruptive. <p>3. Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of parents are in favour of Option A. There is only limited support for Option B. Key concerns with Option A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of space for the school; and insufficient sports/ recreation provision; and The siting of the park |
| 123 | Buckstone PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Option A. The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption and increased distance and travel time. Maximise and optimise use of space to deliver curriculum for excellence and sports opportunities. |
| 124 | Merchiston Community Council | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Option A for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New-build allows the chance to optimise the design of the school to fully meet future educational developments. The school should have accommodation of the highest standard. Apart from a sports pitch all of the accommodation would be on one site. An undesirable decant would be unnecessary. Decant would have a detrimental impact on education. Presents better opportunities for use of the facilities by the wider community outside of school hours. A new school in the Fountainbridge area would contribute to its regeneration and social improvement. We welcome the revision of the catchment area to ensure that pupils resident in the Fountainbridge area attend their local high school. We do have a reservation about the new school “spilling over” into the park. We hope that it may be possible to utilise a larger piece of land than is proposed so that a new-build school site would provide adequate recreational opportunities as per the Scottish Government’s Land Use Strategy. We would hope that the Director of Planning, who is on the board of Central Scotland Green Network, would support its principles and argue for creation of a healthy and green environment in the surroundings of the proposed new school. |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 125 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Maximise and optimise use of space to deliver curriculum for excellence and sports opportunities. |
| 126 | Morningside Community Council | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We feel strongly that it would be beneficial to have a full public consultation to gather the views of parents across the several communities involved. • We feel that the financial aspects have been over-emphasised at the expense of the community and environmental perspective. • The space per pupil at the proposed new site is not significantly greater than the status quo. • Unconvinced by the benefits of proximity to a proposed new canal-side park, welcome though a new park will be. • The proposed new site is not well served by public transport making it inaccessible from southerly parts of the catchment including Morningside and Fairmilehead. • We are confident that the expertise and creativity resident in Edinburgh makes Option B technically possible. • Many parents will not support Option B as this will involve the unpalatable proposed decant to Burdiehouse. • We feel that Option B is presented in an unduly limited way. • We would like to see a local decant explored more fully; refurbishment may then be assessed differently by parents. 2 options that occur are Darroch or temporary accommodation <i>in situ</i>. |
| 127 | Buckstone, Boroughmuir HS & Buckstone PS Parent | <p>28 March 2012</p> <p>Main concerns regarding the proposals:</p> <p>Educational Design Brief</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document appears to be dominated by mentions of cafes and restaurants whilst there is no mention of either the playground or disability. Sport is not mentioned much either. <p>Consultation Document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would have expected the financial assessment to be based on whole life costs and benefits (i.e. as per the HM treasury “Green Book”) and also take into account the carbon-intensity of each option. <p>Allocated Site Size</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both options provide a school on sites of very limited size which offer no potential to meet any possible requirement for additional space over the lifetime of the school. • The consultation document suggests that a rooftop pitch may be a possibility. However, there is no analysis of how the noise and light pollution problems associated with such an asset would be considered by the local community. Nor is there any estimate of how often such an elevated facility would be unusable due to adverse weather (particularly high winds). <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public consultation meetings were specifically designed to stifle debate. The chair also allowed panel complete freedom to interpret the questions and answer them (sometimes) at undue length. • I would urge CEC to “maximise the site’s potential for the school. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rather than focussing on in-built costs, consideration should be given to whole life costs AND benefits. Until these points have been resolved I cannot see how CEC can objectively choose between the competing options. • If CEC does opt for a new-build school I would hope that as well as a cultural link to the current building, an architectural link is also maintained. Specifically, I feel that consideration should be given to incorporating the War Memorial into any new-build school. |
| 128 | South Morningside PS Parents | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to disruption and increased distance and travel time. |
| 129 | Boroughmuir HS Parent & Feeder Primary School Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Refurbishment of the existing school is regarded, at best, a short-term fix. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not desirable. |
| 130 | South Morningside PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 131 | Address not supplied | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not desirable. • The proposed design is less constrained than that of Option B meaning that a better school will result. • I feel that the school will have the most flexibility to use the space provided if the site can be brought into one continuous space. Splitting the school site across the park will mean that something is going to be away from the main school. If there is no way to bring the site into one, then more space will no doubt be better than less, but I think that every effort should be made to bring them together. |
| 132 | Buckstone PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • It would be sensible to try to allocate a larger site and full size sports pitches should also be provided. |
| 133 | Buckstone, Boroughmuir HS Feeder Primary Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • I would like it to be one school building housing all pupils and facilities. • I would like to see the school of the maximum size recommended for the number of pupils anticipated to attend. • I would like to see sports facilities (also of sufficient size for the numbers of pupils) on the land next to the school i.e. no travel for the kids to do sports. |
| 134 | Boroughmuir HS & Buckstone PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Refurbishment projects, by their very nature, tend to overrun on programme and on budget. This is a consequence of encountering unforeseen issues that occur when dealing with an existing structure. |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new school on an open site has fewer unknowns and therefore greater degree of cost and programme certainty. • A new build provides a better opportunity to meet the design brief as opposed to an existing building that you are trying to force your aspirations on in order to make it work. • If possible add to the overall footprint of the site by utilising the adjacent council land. |
| 135 | Address not supplied | <p>29 March 2012 Supports Option B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting held at Bruntsfield Primary School regarding the two options was shockingly one-sided. • The new build Option lacks adequate athletics provision. • Old buildings are being adapted in architecturally exciting and innovative ways – why not Boroughmuir HS? • The environmental message CEC is sending out by pursuing new build is totally irresponsible. Adaptive use is always more environmentally responsible than new build. • The new build would not fit with cultural landscape of its surroundings. • The area is unappealing with a student dormitory, a canal and a grim shopping centre in close proximity. • Fountainbridge/ Dundee Street are busy and dangerous. CEC is being wilfully naïve about these issues. • Where did CEC get its budget projections for new build versus an adaptive use project? • How many architects were consulted for an adaptive use project? It seemed CEC used figures that supported their preferred option: a new build. • I strongly believe that historic fabric should be inhabited, adapted and used. Is CEC more interested in turning a profit by selling the old school site for development into luxury flats? |
| 136 | Address not supplied | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • My hope is that the site size and spacing requirement per pupil can be resolved for the best interests for those pupils who will attend. |
| 137 | South Morningside, Boroughmuir HS & South Morningside PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • I hope it will be possible re-think the site, enabling all of the school building to be built together. This will require the planned park to move somewhat and even be reduced in size. • I'm sure a good refurbishment is achievable – however the proposed decant to Burdiehouse is not a desirable solution. An alternative, with the decant taking place at the Fountainbridge site would seem to be a better option. |
| 138 | South Morningside, South Morningside PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The refurb option would be a huge upheaval for the school community for what seems comparatively little overall benefit. The proposed decant to Burdiehouse is not a desirable solution. • The new build option keeps community continuity and is near the same bus routes as the existing school building and provides a better outside space and setting with the canal. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 139 | South Morningside, South Morningside PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012 Supports Option B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no direct public transport link between the proposed Fountainbridge site, and the majority of the catchment area. This is contrary to CEC’s own “safer routes to school” programme. • There is no clear advantage in increased space at the new site. Many sporting activities will still be restricted to by lack of space or will have to take place in facilities elsewhere. The new site will, in fact, be further from the nearest significant green space of Bruntsfield Links and the Meadows. • It is a national planning policy that the best use of a listed building, such as the existing Boroughmuir school building, is for that building to be RETAINED in its original use. • During the last consultation regarding a move to the Fairmilehead site detailed proposals were presented for the refurbishment of the existing school. No explanation has been offered as to why these proposals have not been re-issued as part of the current consultation. • It does not appear that the CEC have considered a single refurbishment scheme for the existing building. It does not seem possible to present a proper recommendation one way or the other without more balanced information. • Burdiehouse has been identified as the proposed decant option. There is no indication of what alternatives, if any, were considered. This information should have been made available as part of the consultation process. • As regards using the Fountainbridge as a site for temporary decant accommodation a phased disposal would not necessarily reduce the overall value of the site, and any costs involved in temporary occupation of the site might be offset by the potential increase in value over the period. • A short delay in the project would mean that Darroch would be available as a decant: there has been no attempt to find out if the option of a short delay would be acceptable to the school community. • To insist, therefore, that the only decant option is at Burdiehouse is inaccurate, and gives the impression that CEC wishes to discourage any interest in the refurbishment option by loading additional disadvantages on it. • From the consultation paper it is clear that full life-cycle costing of the two alternatives has not been carried out. |
| 140 | Boroughmuir HS, & Catchment Primary Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Fountainbridge site is not large enough for its purpose • Reallocation of the park area to the east side of Viewforth and use of the full 1.3 ha on the west side next to the student housing for the school should be considered. It would be a cohesive and sensible use of that piece of land. • With a larger site there will be more design freedom within the project allowing the delivery of facilities which the wider community can also benefit from improving its links with the local community. Once in a lifetime opportunity. |
| 141 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • This option will lead to a better school in a pleasant setting by the canal and, very importantly, it would avoid the need for a decant to Burdiehouse. |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 142 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>29 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • I have considerable reservations about the refurb option as the existing site is small and constrained and overshadowed by surrounding buildings. • If Option A is to proceed and receive support additional land should be acquired to improve its educational viability. • Whilst the decant to Burdiehouse is unacceptable CEC has “loaded the dice” against Option B by proposing it at all. • Why is not an option to use the site to the east for Viewforth? • The full amount of budget should be allocated to this important project. |
| 143 | Address not supplied | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Small site is very limiting - maximise and optimise use of space to deliver curriculum for excellence and sports opportunities. The new school should be drawn into one building rather than split into two on one campus as this has a great bearing on positive behaviour within the school. |
| 144 | Boroughmuir HS & Buckstone PS Parents | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed decant to Burdiehouse would be hugely disruptive and unacceptable. |
| 145 | Boroughmuir HS & Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed decant to Burdiehouse would be disruptive and unacceptable. • A new school would best serve the educational needs of children providing an opportunity for CEC to deliver a facility that is bespoke, modern, innovative and best suited to educational provision in the 21st century. • Maximise and optimise use of space to deliver curriculum for excellence and sports opportunities. • The new school should be brown into one building rather than split into two on one campus as this has a great bearing on positive behaviour within the school. |
| 146 | Address not supplied | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option B. • The existing building should be refurbished – it is a magnificent building and should be preserved for the purpose it was built for. Surely it is of huge importance to the city to protect and care for all existing schools and their pupils and indeed all the history behind them and for their future. |
| 147 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option B. • Refurbishment is a far more sustainable option as the existing building can provide many more years of use on the existing site. |

| | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing school's location is the source of its sense of belonging, tradition and sense of history. All very important to education. • Decanting to the Fountainbridge site would be ideal. Failing that, then perhaps waiting for Darroch to become available is an option. But whatever the location of the decant, I would always support refurbishment over a rebuild. |
| 148 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | <p>30 March 2012 Supports Option B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Burdiehouse decant proposal is disingenuous as it forces parents to support Option A. There are no statistics to support the "fact" that decant will affect attainment levels. It doesn't appear that other site options have been fully investigated. Fail to understand why the purchased site cannot be used as a decant location for temporary buildings. • The Fountainbridge site is small constrained and not significantly better than the current one. The surroundings are less secure and there is no increased provision of sports facilities that could not be proved on the existing site. The canal is potentially dangerous. Harrsion Park is not far from the new school site; I don't understand why options have not been explored for potential sports facilities there to make relocation work better. • I believe Malcolm Fraser when he maintains that the new curriculum can be delivered via refurbishment and adaptation of the existing school. Listed Building status should not pose as much of a constraint as CEC has stated. The current school location benefits from proximity to bus links and proximity to open space at Bruntsfield Links; too much is being played about the proposed pocket park within the emerging masterplan for Fountain Park. There is little comparison to make. The surrounding residential land use of the existing school provides natural surveillance leading to a sense of safety. • The building contributes to the Edinburgh skyline and gives the school a sense of gravitas and place that will not be achieved by a new school within the Fountain Park environment. A small spend from lots of pupils helps the character of Bruntsfield to survive which benefits the local economy. These will be huge losses in the relocation. • In summary, staying on site is a more sustainable solution and short term benefit is being promoted rather than long term investment. |
| 149 | EH10 | <p>30 March 2012 I strongly object to the context of the proposals for the location of Boroughmuir High School as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fountainbridge site is not an appropriate site for Boroughmuir HS as it is almost outside its existing catchment boundary. The school would be in a commercial area away from essential amenities. It is also too small and constrained as a site for a new school. • The park space would be shared with the public and divides the development site. • Object to the so-called commercial sensitivity stated by CEC as grounds to not divulge the purchase price for the Fountainbridge site. • The site could well be utilised as a decant site for the existing school and subsequently sold off. • Promoting Burdiehouse as the only possible decant site for Option B is an obvious strategy for discouraging school |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | | <p>parents from considering Option B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option B is more environmentally sustainable in the long term. • Other sites such as Astley Ainslie should be investigated before proceeding with the one proposed. |
| 150 | Bruntsfield Primary School Parent Council | <p>30 March 2012</p> <p>We do not express a preference for either option but rather seek to reflect the key concerns which have arisen amongst parents about each option.</p> <p>Option A: New build on the Fountainbridge Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is a small area of land relative to Scottish Government guidelines. • Lack of on-site sports facilities. Urge CEC to think creatively about using other local open space such as Harrison Park in addition to space immediately around the school building. • The impact on the school catchment. What plans does CEC have to ensure that Bruntsfield PS does not become repeatedly over-subscribed in years to come with in-catchment pupils at P1 entry? <p>Option B: Refurbishment and extension of the existing building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burdiehouse is not a tenable decant option. Parents find it difficult to understand how a decant site closer at hand cannot be found, and indeed why the Fountainbridge site itself cannot be utilised. • With reference to both options we would ask to what extent teaching and support staff outwith the SMT at BHS have been involved in and been given the opportunity to influence the SMT position. • We feel that the Educational Design Brief is lacking in many respects, and there was no consultation with the Parents Councils during its preparation. • It will therefore be important whichever option is chosen to engage meaningfully over the detailed design of the building, and with Cluster Parents Councils to ensure it meets their needs and aspirations for delivering Curriculum for Excellence (and any successive curricula) over years to come. |
| 151 | Buckstone, Buckstone PS Parents | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • This will have the best educational benefits for all children. • As much of the new site as possible should be used for the school and its outdoor space. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption. |
| 152 | Buckstone PS Parent | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption. • The purchase of additional land at the new site would further enhance the quality of educational life for the pupils. |
| 153 | Address not supplied | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option B. • Whilst appreciating the costs involved, the strength of argument on the grounds of the school's history, its sense of identity and the architecture's aesthetic appeal is far greater. |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option B would be a more valuable use of budget in terms of a legacy to lie down for the school's future generations of pupils. |
| 154 | Address not supplied | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think that CEC is being disingenuous in the way you are deliberately proposing a decant proposal for the refurb option that you know categorically will be unattractive to parents, and I don't think you are open to considering alternatives which you should be. The new site with the split building approach is too small and constrained. This option should not be promoted as it discriminates against the refurb option which given the new build option it is actually preferable. |
| 155 | Buckstone PS Parents | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Option A. This will have the best educational benefits for all children. The proposed Burdiehouse decant is not acceptable due to educational disruption. |
| 156 | Grosvenor Britain & Ireland | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ultimate owner (through a company called Fountain North Limited) of a large element of development land in Fountainbridge. Comment in regard to the proposed catchment boundary It is vitally important for any school to be a hub for community life beyond the normal school hours. The school could divide the community and effectively alienate itself from those who could benefit the most. We would like to see the catchment area considered not just in terms of the location of the new school but with wider consideration for the opportunity surrounding it. I would suggest most strongly that the present recommendation for the school's catchment be amended to include the new Fountainbridge development area, which will significantly benefit the area's new and emerging community. |
| 157 | EH4 | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As residents of Admiral Terrace we are deeply shocked and anxious that we have not been approached, informed or consulted about the proposed change that will impact directly on lives and indeed the value of our property should the school be sold on to developers. If the school is abandoned and sold on to property developers it will no doubt be turned into housing. That will impact directly on all residents. There will be an enormous rise in noise, traffic and of course huge impact on the already ridiculously pressurised parking situation. |
| 158 | The EDI Group | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EDI have a development position in relation to the former brewery site, part of which is the proposed location for the new build option. EDI considers that the catchment area boundary should consider the wider regeneration of the Fountainbridge |

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>area. Further, there are better physical boundaries on which to promote the boundary change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current proposals do not reflect the potential for the school's significant position at the heart of the Fountainbridge area and as a result could result in a lost opportunity to assist the wider regeneration of the area. • To this end the catchment area all the land formerly occupied by the brewery which, collectively, will form the future community of Fountainbridge. The current proposals could divide the community and effectively alienate those who could benefit most. • The proposal should be amended to include the wider new Fountainbridge development area, which will significantly benefit the area's new and emerging community. |
| 159 | DTZ representing West Register | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Register are owners of a site on the south side of Fountainbridge adjacent to and to the west of Edinburgh Quay, part of the former Scottish & Newcastle site, and previously referred to as "The Tartan Club". • The concern is that the current proposal does not reflect a catchment which places the school at the heart of the Fountainbridge community. The new school due to the current catchment boundary could have the effect of dividing the Fountainbridge community. • The revised catchment should take the opportunity to encompass the entire Fountainbridge community, and take the opportunity to help bind it together. • I would propose that the present recommendation for the school's catchment is amended to include the new Fountainbridge development area, which will significantly benefit the area's new and merging community. |
| 160 | EH10 | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irritated by bias towards the new build option. • Many of the facts presented are not only wrong but are a misrepresentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cost of the two options: looking at the comparison of the two options over a life cycle of say 60 years where capital and revenue costs are compared along with life cycle replacement of the building elements would result in the refurbishment option being even more cost effective than the new build. ○ Programme: the reasons given for the difference in programme period are flawed. ○ Sustainability: Option B is the more sustainable option. The reuse of a Victorian/ Edwardian purpose-built school which, if refurbished properly, will last for another 100 years is significantly more environmentally friendly than constructing a new build school using modern methods of construction. ○ In terms of disposal of the current site there is currently no market for residential flats and no appetite from developers. • The consultation paper is heavily weighted in favour of new build. • I am aware of a developer who has an alternative proposal which has been put to CEC which would allow it to refurbish the existing school at no capital cost whilst decanting the school to an alternative site close to its existing location. This has not been mentioned in either the consultation paper or at public meeting. |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 161 | Address not supplied | 30 March 2012- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • I believe this is the strongest option which would best serve the interests of students, present and in the future. |
| 162 | Boroughmuir HS & Buckstone PS Parent | 30 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • A new building will allow a far netter match to the Education Design Brief and as well as allowing for minimum disruption and a shorter development programme. • CEC should consider the increasing the size of the site for the new build as this seems to makes sense i.e. make optimum use of the site purchased by the council. |
| 163 | Boroughmuir HS Catchment Parents | 30 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • This is the best educational option for the children plus the best for our community in helping to regenerate a part of town desperately in need of some soul. • It is encouraging that the new school can accommodate areas for the children to dine on the premises. |
| 164 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | 30 March 2012 Supports Option B for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer term cost projections than 40 year life cycle change projected value for money. • The existing building when refurbished will be the better building in the longer term. • The canal site is too constrained for the purpose of a modern secondary school. • Option B is the more environmentally sustainable option. • Feasible non-Burdiehouse decant options can be investigated and identified. • Demographics/ catchment issues. • Decant is not necessarily harmful to education. |
| 165 | Primary School Catchment Parent | 30 March 2012 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What I am really concerned about is the small area of land available for the new school. • The school should be shared with the community. Classrooms can be used for adult education and sports facilities are useful for local people and nearby primary schools. • During the school holidays schools can be used by the wider community. • I strongly hope that most of the available area will be used for the new school. It will help the environment, health and actually money in the future. • Please ensure that the extent teaching and support staff outwith the Senior Management Team at Boroughmuir HS will be given sufficient time to reflect their suggestion. |
| 166 | Boroughmuir HS Parent | 30 March 2012 Supports Option B for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing building is structurally sound and can be adequately refurbished to meet educational needs. |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option allows the retention of St Oswald’s Hall for a creative arts centre that the wider community can enjoy outside of school hours. • The school should be preserved within the Bruntsfield community in a physical and economic sense. • The small area to the east Viewforth with the Fountainbridge development site should be dedicated to sports facilities to be utilised by the school and the wider community. • A more sensible decant option than Burdiehouse should and can be identified. • With regards to Option A the following problems must be resolved during the planning process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed site is too small ○ The constrained site will produce “spill over” into an area with heavy and dangerous traffic levels. ○ Proximity to a public park and student residences will be a security risk for pupils of the school. ○ The Fountainpark Leisure Park presents a risk to school pupils which must be managed in some way. ○ Local sports facilities must be provided to avoid bussing pupils to Meggetland etc. ○ The wider plan for Fountainbridge redevelopment must account for the particular nature of a high school. |
| 167 | Bruntsfield, Bruntsfield PS Parents | <p>30 March 2012</p> <p>Supports Option A for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are content with CEC’s conclusion that Option A represents the best option in all the circumstances. • The space for the school (esp. green space) must be maximised. • Selection process must give weight to architects with experience of innovative and effective school designs rather than the DBFO delivery route. • Partial use of Harrison Park should be considered with regards to sports provision. • Excited about the proximity of the canal opening up possibilities for outdoor recreation and sport on the canal. • We have very serious concerns about road safety. An additional, dedicated, footbridge over the canal at Viewforth or at the other end of Horne Terrace should be seriously considered. • Should be sensitive ‘disposal’ of the existing building – family housing rather than flats would seem the better option. • Future of St Oswald’s Hall also needs to be considered so that an excellent educational/ concert venue is not lost. |
| 168 | South Morningside Parent | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. |
| 169 | Bruntsfield PS Parent | <p>2 April 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completely opposed to a possible decant to Burdiehouse in the case for the refurbishment option. The complicated, long and inconvenient journey this would impose is untenable. • With regard to the new build option it is imperative that better provision is made for on-site sports facilities. |
| 170 | Buckstone, Feeder Primary School Parent | <p>31 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed decant to Burdiehouse is unacceptable. • I think it would be great if the school site could be bigger and accommodate full facilities on site; however my |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | | focus is on the new build proposal. |
| 171 | Feeder Primary School Parents | <p>30 March 2012</p> <p>In our view both options are flawed.</p> <p>Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size of the site is too small. We do not favour the park splitting the school as currently proposed. • CEC should acquire more land to deliver additional space for the proposed new build school. • The allocation of additional space would also address our concerns about the lack of dedicated outdoor school space. • We are also far from convinced about having outdoor sports facilities on the roof of the building. <p>Option B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option is ill-conceived and of no real merit. • The associated decant proposal is not at all attractive. • We are concerned that Option B could persuade parents not to send their children to BHS and to explore other options. • CEC have promoted Option A to the exclusion of Option B. |
| 172 | Boroughmuir HS & South Morningside PS Parent | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The proposed decant to Burdiehouse is unacceptable. • A new build will be a great environment for the children and would be the less expensive option. • Why could the Fountainbridge site not be used as decant location? • Has the option of using BOTH the existing Viewforth site and the Fountainbridge location to make a 2-site school of far larger area been considered? |
| 173 | Brunstfield PS Parent | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • The thought of a decant to any location and the fact that the refurbishment would not deliver as good an environment for my children and cost more in the long term makes this a “no-brainer” for me. |
| 174 | EH3 | <p>2 April 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I will object very strongly to any “Spill out” of the new school into the public park for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The idea that the new school could “spill out” to the park or the canal side, which is owned by British Waterways and historic building is untested, unapproved and therefore misleading. ○ Attempted “spill out” will lead to a reduction of public amenity which had replaced a public park on Dundee Street which Cityheart was given permission to build on only if they created the new canal side Park. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A new school will require to be secured from public access and the boundaries between it and the park will require to be fenced to exclude the public. Thus any “spill out” will require to have the public excluded and thus reduce the public amenity. |
| 175 | EH10 | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Option A. • Concerned that the proposed site by the canal would still not have sufficient space. • I would hope that if a new school is to be built CEC would make the most of the opportunity to create a state-of-the-art school for our children, providing them with an excellent place of learning. |
| 176 | Feeder Primary School Parent | <p>30 March 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the data collected from the consultation process be processed? Will it be independently collated? • Do views of Boroughmuir SMT reflect wider staff views? • The counter-arguments to the preferred option were not adequately presented. • We have a right to protect iconic assets such as Boroughmuir HS. • Concern that adequate space is proposed for sports facilities. • There is concern that CEC have been disingenuous with the inclusion of the Burdiehouse decant proposal. There are other options that should be considered. • If a new build emerges as the only option CEC has a responsibility to ensure that it is fit for purpose and children are not being transported to indoor and outdoor sports facilities. |
| 177 | South Morningside, Boroughmuir HS Feeder Primary School Parent | <p>30 March 2012</p> <p>Supports Option B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will preserve, update and utilise a listed building which is the heart of a very traditional and successful school. • Moving the school to the north does not make sense in the long term for the school estate. • I do not support the proposed Burdiehouse decant. Why can nearer available premises such as Polwarth CEC buildings or CEC Parks etc not be utilised for a decant? • Why would Option A take apparently so much longer than ‘new build’? • I am concerned that the upper level 7 a side pitch may not be delivered. • I support refurbishment with a revised, more local and time shrunk ‘decant plan’. |

Consultation proposal by The City of Edinburgh Council

Report by Education Scotland, addressing educational aspects of the proposal for the location of Boroughmuir High School and associated catchment area changes affecting Boroughmuir and Tynecastle High Schools and Bruntsfield and Dalry Primary Schools.

1. Introduction

1.1 The City of Edinburgh Council is consulting on options to improve Boroughmuir High School. Its consultation proposal sets out two options. Option A, the council's preferred option, is to relocate Boroughmuir High School to a new building on the Fountainbridge site. This is a short distance from the present building at Viewforth. This option also requires a minor associated catchment area change. Option B is to refurbish and extend Boroughmuir High School on its existing site at Viewforth with an associated temporary decant to Burdiehouse on a site over four miles from the present school.

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

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

- attendance at one of the four public meetings held in March 2012 in connection with the council's proposals;
- consideration of all relevant documentation provided by the council in relation to the proposal, specifically the educational benefits statement and related consultation documents, written and oral submissions from parents and others;
- visits to Boroughmuir High School, including discussion with relevant consultees, and to the sites proposed for the building of a new school under Option A and for the decant arrangements required under Option B.

1.4 HM Inspectors considered:

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

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

2. Consultation process

2.1 The City of Edinburgh Council undertook the initial consultation on its proposals with reference to the *Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010*. The consultation included an invitation for written submissions. There were four public consultation events, which gave parents and other members of the public the opportunity to hear presentations from and ask questions of council officials and senior members of Boroughmuir staff. The consultation events included presentations showing the location and configuration of the new school at the Fountainbridge site under Option A, and the site proposed for the decant under Option B.

2.2 The council received written responses from 177 groups and individuals to the consultation. Of those expressing a preference, almost 90% were in favour of Option A, the new build at Fountainbridge. However almost half of those who favoured this option expressed varying degrees of concern in relation to aspects of the proposed provision. These concerns mainly related to the constraints of space in the proposed Fountainbridge site, especially for sport, and to the positioning of the proposed public park at Fountainbridge relative to the planned school buildings.

2.3 Just over 10% of those written consultation responses expressing a preference favoured the refurbishment Option B. There were a variety of reasons given for this preference including a view that this option had better long term sustainability than Option A, preserved better the tradition of education in the Viewforth area and that an imaginative refurbishment would produce an exciting educational environment. Some of those favouring Option B, also had concerns in relation to safe walking routes to the Fountainbridge area from the bus stops used by young people and in relation to the physical environment in the area around Fountainbridge.

2.4 Consultation responses demonstrated a high degree of concern over the decant proposal within the refurbishment Option B proposal. Altogether, of the 177 written responses, just under half included expressions of concern about the proposed decant to Burdiehouse. This number included around 60% of those who favoured Option A but also over half of those favouring Option B. The Burdiehouse decant was generally regarded as highly disruptive to children's education as well as being very problematic in terms of travel arrangements. The most common alternative suggested to the Burdiehouse decant was instead to decant to the Fountainbridge site (the proposed location for the new build in Option A).

2.5 Around 15% of the 177 written responses expressed no clear preference for either of the council's two Options. A significant proportion of these, as well as some of those favouring both Option A and Option B, expressed to varying degrees the opinion that the choice of Burdiehouse as the decant site for the refurbishment proposal (Option B), had resulted in the consultation being skewed in favour of the new build at Fountainbridge (Option A). A few of those who stated an overall preference for Option A made it clear that, had there been an alternative

arrangement proposed for the decant, they might have favoured instead the refurbishment option. However other parents explicitly stated that they would not have been in favour of a decant regardless of the location of the site.

2.6 The council had not taken a systematic approach to gathering the views of children and young people on its proposal. However, the main aspects of the two options had been shared with the Boroughmuir pupil council earlier this session. This representative group, after initially favouring a refurbishment of the existing building, changed its preference overwhelmingly to the new build at Fountainbridge option, after taking into account the implications of the Burdiehouse decant. A group of S1–S3 pupil council members interviewed by HM Inspectors were very strongly of the view that a decant to Burdiehouse was not in their best interests. They felt that it would be better to have continuity of education in the present building followed by a smooth transition to a new build school at Fountainbridge.

2.7 As part of the process leading to the council's specification for the new school, teaching staff were consulted on a subject department basis on the type of accommodation they would wish to have to enable them to deliver a modern education. They are to be consulted again at a more detailed level on specific points in the planning for the refurbished or new building following a decision on which option is to proceed. HM Inspectors met with a representative group of teaching staff. This group were all in favour of Option A and felt that other teachers from their departments would take the same view. They felt that the Burdiehouse decant would pose significant problems in terms of its location, travel arrangements, facilities on site and the resulting delay in the move to a modern teaching environment. They also felt that some parents might move their children to another city school rather than have them educated in a temporary site in an inconvenient location. At the same time this group had some concern about the lack of space for outdoor education and sport at Fountainbridge and hoped that a way might be found of allocating more space for the dedicated use of the school. A small group of administrative and support staff interviewed had mixed views but most favoured the refurbishment option for a variety of reasons.

2.8 The headteacher and the senior management team strongly supported the new build at Fountainbridge, Option A. The school's Parent Council provided a written report to the council which also indicated very strong parental support for the new build at Fountainbridge. However, the Chair of the Parent Council confirmed that parents had important reservations in relation to the limitations of space at Fountainbridge, the lack of outdoor sports provision and the location of the park in relation to the school. Many parents felt that the council should now make every effort to find additional space dedicated to school use from the area of land now owned by the council at Fountainbridge. They felt it should be possible to find space to provide the school with additional dedicated outdoor sporting facilities without unduly restricting the ability of the council to use the remaining space in a way appropriate to wider regeneration development. The Merchiston Community Council submission also supported Option A. However, the Morningside Community Council submission expressed concerns about limitations of space and the location of the new build site in relation to Option A. It favoured refurbishment but also requested that the council consider alternatives to the Burdiehouse decant.

3. Educational aspects of the proposal

3.1 There is general agreement that the present quality of the school's accommodation is no longer suitable for 21st Century education. In 2004 the council placed the school as the top priority for replacement in its second schools Public Private Partnership project. This followed an HM Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) inspection in 2001 which evaluated the school's accommodation as having important weaknesses and recommended that the school's accommodation should be improved as resources allowed. The council however experienced great difficulty in finding a suitable and affordable site for a new building. Another HMIE inspection in 2008 recommended that the school and education authority should 'actively address the inadequate accommodation and facilities'. The school had in fact already been included in the council's Wave 3 school replacement programme. Following a Government offer of funding in 2010 towards the cost of the construction of a new school, the council purchased the Fountainbridge site in order to enable the option of a new school to be built.

3.2 In 2011 the council employed an experienced education design advisor to lead a project to develop a Strategic Educational Design Brief (SEDB) for the new school. This development involved consulting school staff so that their vision for learning and teaching and how this might be organised within a new building could be taken fully into account. The resulting SEDB specifies the accommodation requirements to enable young people to experience a quality education fully in line with Curriculum for Excellence. It incorporates an approach to organising and locating subject departments within five faculty zones with a layout which supports interdisciplinary work with larger groups of learners as well as class and individual/smaller group learning. The SEDB would provide significantly enhanced facilities for learners and staff. As such, a school built to the SEDB specification would provide the facilities suitable for a modern education and enable the school to meet fully its aspirations in relation to Curriculum for Excellence. A new build at Fountainbridge would provide a building fully meeting the SEDB specification. However, the council has indicated that, if Option B were pursued, the constraints of the old Viewforth building mean that there would inevitably be compromises in the layout giving a reasonably good but not perfect fit with the SEDB specification. Nevertheless, either of the council's two proposals, Options A or B, would provide learners with a considerably enhanced learning environment over and above the present provision.

3.3 The council recognises that neither of the two options being proposed will result in a school fully meeting the requirements of the Schools Premises Act 1967 with regard to the size of the site. Under either option the council is planning for a school roll of 1150 which it considers sufficient for projected future school intake. The Fountainbridge Option A site would provide 1.0 hectares with access to a proposed 0.3 hectare public park which the council considers the school could utilise for both recreational and learning opportunities. The council has made a submission to Scottish Ministers requesting dispensation for a new build at Fountainbridge under the 1967 site size regulations. The Option B refurbishment proposal would be undertaken within the present and smaller Viewforth site. The overall floor space in the building within the SEDB specification for either option meets or exceeds the requirement of the 1967 Act.

3.4 The facilities proposed under Option A at Fountainbridge represent a significant improvement on the present accommodation. The total area of space for educational use would be significantly greater than at the present Viewforth site without the need for young people to travel to another building for parts of their education. This is presently the case at Viewforth where young people have to cross a road and walk along a public street to reach the building used for aspects of expressive arts provision. The positioning of the park, which is integral to the planning permission already granted for halls of residence for Napier University students at Fountainbridge, was a matter of concern for some parents who would prefer this space to be given to the school for additional sport facilities. The council is presently investigating the possibility of making some alteration to the park configuration. However, even with no change to the present plan, there would undoubtedly be advantage to the school in having a small park area in close proximity to the school to be used at times for educational purposes and for young people to use at lunch times. For the latter purpose the park area would provide a suitable area without any need for young people to cross streets.

3.5 At present the school makes use of outdoor playing fields at Meggetland some 1.4 miles from the Viewforth site, an arrangement which has been criticised in the past by HM Inspectors. Both of Options A and B require a continued need to make use of Meggetland, which is also 1.4 miles from the Fountainbridge site. Although the sporting and changing facilities at Meggetland have been upgraded significantly, the need to bus pupils to and from the school remains a weakness in the school's provision and is costly both in terms of time and money. The importance of improving young people's health and fitness is now a Scottish Government priority. These factors strengthen the argument, supported by a high proportion of those responding to the consultation, that the council should do everything in its power to maximise facilities for sport and outdoor activity at the Fountainbridge site. The council intends that under Option A, the new building at Fountainbridge would have a multi-use games area or outdoor pitch through innovative use of roof decks. It has confirmed the feasibility of this through investigating similar approaches in some London schools. Staff in the school feel it may be possible as part of option A to develop an area which could be used for sport and exercise both by the school and by members of the community at evenings and weekend. Limitations of space and probable planning constraints at Viewforth prevent any comparable additional sports facilities within Option B. Although the roof deck proposal within Option A is a welcome strengthening of the school's sporting facility, the council should continue to explore all options within the Fountainbridge site to provide additional space for sport and outdoor activity.

3.6 The important weaknesses identified in the accommodation at the present Viewforth site continues to place limitations on the quality of young people's educational experiences. In particular, the layout of the accommodation restricts the extent to which teachers are able to employ imaginative and stimulating approaches in line with Curriculum for Excellence. It is therefore desirable that the new school is built as soon as possible. The council's proposal paper outlines a timescale for each option. It is envisaged that the new build at Fountainbridge Option A would start on site in the summer of 2014 with a completion in summer 2016 ready for the 2016/17 school session. As a result, the current S1 cohort would benefit from the new school when in S6. For the refurbishment Option B, the council expects that it would be late

2014 before work could start on-site and that the refurbished building would not be completed until early 2018. As a result, none of the present Boroughmuir High School pupils would benefit from the new building. Those currently in P7 would move into the refurbished building towards the end of their S6 year.

3.7 Under Option B, there would be a need to decant the whole school to alternative premises for the three year duration of the refurbishment. There is reasonable and widespread parental and teaching staff concern about the impact of this on young people's educational experiences. After considering a large number of potential decant sites, the site of the former Burdiehouse Primary School was selected as the location for the construction of a school decant village. This would consist of temporary accommodation including two-storey modular units with a 700 square metre temporary gym hall for sports and assembly. There would be some play space. The council recognises that the location of the site, well outside the catchment area and some 4.3 miles from the present school building is problematic. The area is well served by a bus route connecting it to the Boroughmuir catchment area. However, because of the distance involved over 500 young people would require bus passes for the duration of the decant. At the moment, fewer than 30 require bus passes. Those directly affected under the planned timescale would include young people presently in P2 through to those currently in S3. The most significant impact would be on seven cohorts of pupils from the present P3 to the present S2 who would all be decanted for more than one session.

3.8 At present, Boroughmuir is one of the most utilised schools in the city for adult evening education. Option A would allow these classes to continue at Viewforth and then move to the new school at Fountainbridge without disruption. Under Option B, the situation is less clear as for a three year period accommodation for the evening classes would have to be found elsewhere in the city. The situation under Option B is further complicated by the fact that at the nearby James Gillespie's High School, major construction work and a partial decant would, for at least a year, overlap with the closure of the Viewforth building for the Boroughmuir refurbishment. In consequence the space available in the local area for adult education would be significantly reduced. Alternative provision in other areas of the city may not be attractive or convenient for many adult users.

3.9 The new building at Fountainbridge under Option A would be marginally outside the present catchment area so that this option includes a proposal to extend the Boroughmuir catchment area to the north. This is a relatively minor change which affects only two residential streets with a very small number of school aged children.

3.10 In the case of both options there are factors to be considered in relation to the routes taken by young people to school. In the case of Option A, the proposed Fountainbridge site is some 430m north of the existing site. This means that many young people getting off the bus at Bruntsfield Place would have further to walk to school. The council is aware of the importance, if this option is chosen, of ensuring that any necessary changes to traffic and canal crossing arrangements are made to ensure the safest possible route to school and has begun to investigate the possibility of a new pedestrian bridge to the planned school site. In the case of Option B, the council would have to consider how best to ensure young people's

safety given the likelihood of increased traffic in the area. In addition, there would have to be careful consideration of whether existing bus capacity would be sufficient for the additional volume of young people likely to be travelling to and from one part of the city to another.

4. Summary

4.1 The present Boroughmuir High School building is no longer fit for purpose and there is general agreement that a new school should be built or the present building refurbished. The council has developed a specification for a new school. A building meeting this specification would provide learners and staff with very good facilities for meeting the requirements of a modern 21st century education. Young people would benefit from significantly improved social and educational facilities in a building with well-resourced accommodation designed to promote flexible learning and teaching approaches consistent with Curriculum for Excellence.

4.2 Either of the council's proposals would result in a school campus of limited size and with a continued need to make use of playing fields some 1.4 miles from the school building. However, given that these arrangements for sport are a continuation of the present situation, and that either option would meet the council's SEDB specification, there is no doubt that those young people attending such a school would have a clear educational gain as compared to their being taught in the present building.

4.3 Despite the limitations of space and the continued need for young people to make use of Meggetland for part of their physical education programme, HM Inspectors are of the view that the new build option at Fountainbridge, Option A, is to the overall educational advantage of the young people concerned. A building meeting the council's SEDB specification has the potential to enable staff to deliver a high quality educational experience. The new build option also has the great merit of not requiring any decant thus avoiding any disruption to young people's education as the school can continue to make use of its present accommodation at Viewforth until the new building is ready. This option also allows community users to continue to benefit from the use of a local school. If this option is chosen it will be important for the council, while taking into consideration the needs of the wider community and the need for regeneration of the local area, to seek to maximise the amount of space at the Fountainbridge site for outdoor activity. In taking forward its proposal, the council needs to also give careful consideration to any potential traffic risks to young people and take appropriate steps to minimise these.

4.4 In the case of the refurbishment Option B, despite an eventual educational gain in relation to the present accommodation, there is the potential negative impact of the proposed three year decant to the Burdiehouse site to consider. The overall impact of a decant over such a long period on young people's education is not easy to predict. However, there are several adverse factors associated with the decant which cumulatively raise concerns about the overall impact of this option. These relate to a number of factors. These include the inevitably restricted educational experience in a decant site of the kind proposed, the very limited social facilities for young people and the logistical and travel issues involved in large numbers of young people having to travel over four miles to Burdiehouse. Option B also delays further

the benefit to young people of a move to a learning environment suitable for 21st century education, as this would not take place until 2018, while under Option A the move would take place in 2016. The educational benefits of Option A clearly outweigh the benefits of Option B.

**HM Inspectors
Education Scotland
May 2012**

Boroughmuir High School Design Team Appointment

- 1.1 Procurement of the multi disciplinary design team for the renewal of Boroughmuir High School has been undertaken for two lots; Lot 1 being the new build option at Fountainbridge, and Lot 2 being the refurbishment and extension option on the existing site. The team comprises the core disciplines of architect, structural/civil engineering services, landscape architects/public realm designers and mechanical and engineer services engineer (including sustainability, BREEAM and EPC specialists).
- 1.2 The formal tendering process has now been concluded for both lots with five short-listed teams for each lot returning tenders on 24th April 2012. The process was administered by the Council's Procurement Division and included a two stage process to evaluate quality. The assessment processes and procedures were carried out in compliance with the Public Contracts (Scotland) Regulations 2006. The Council's Legal Services section provided advice during the selection process to ensure compliance with procurement legislation. The weightings for the selection of the team were 70/30 (quality/price) to reflect the aspirations for the project.
- 1.3 A total of 68 teams submitted Pre-Selection Questionnaires for Lots 1 and 2. These were assessed against pre-set criteria. With regard to Lot 1, the five bidders short-listed to the tender stage and invited to submit tenders were:
 - Allford Hall Monaghan Morris
 - Allan Murray Architects
 - BDP
 - Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios
 - John McAslan and Partners
- 1.4 With regard to Lot 2, the five bidders short-listed to the tender stage and invited to submit tenders were:
 - Atkins
 - BDP
 - JM Architects
 - John McAslan and Partners
 - Keppie
- 1.5 The ten tender returns were checked for technical compliance and all were deemed compliant. Interviews were held on 24 May 2012 for Lot 1 and 30 May 2012 for Lot 2 with the panel comprising representatives from the City of Edinburgh Council and the external project team.
- 1.6 The process required all tenders to first be scored for quality. The commercial tenders were then opened for those who passed the quality threshold. The costs were examined and scored in accordance with pre-determined criteria.

1.7 The five short-listed teams' scores for Lot 1 were as follows:

Lot 1 – Design team procurement scores

| Company | Quality Score | Price Score* | Combined Total |
|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Bidder 1 | 57.00 | 29.02 | 86.02 |
| Bidder 2 | 56.00 | 30.00 | 86.00 |
| Bidder 3 | 59.50 | 20.82 | 80.32 |
| Bidder 4 | 45.00 | 0.00 | 45.00 |
| Bidder 5 | 35.50 | 0.00 | 35.50 |

1.8 The five short-listed teams' scores for Lot 2 were as follows:

Lot 2 – Design team procurement scores

| Company | Quality Score | Price Score | Combined Total |
|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Bidder 1 | 59.00 | 24.12 | 83.12 |
| Bidder 3 | 53.00 | 30.00 | 83.00 |
| Bidder 4 | 49.00 | 27.98 | 76.98 |
| Bidder 4 | 45.00 | 0.00 | 45.00 |
| Bidder 5 | 44.00 | 0.00 | 44.00 |

1.9 Following this detailed analysis of the tender returns, the most economically advantageous tender for Lot 1 was that of Allan Murray Architects in the sum of £1,505,680.

1.10 The most economically advantageous tender for Lot 2 was that of John McAslan and Partners in the sum of £1,637,300.

1.11 These fees are lump sums associated with an anticipated contract value of £27m. Should the actual contract value vary by more than +/- 5%, the fees would be adjusted accordingly on a pro rata basis.