We write in response to your letter of 11 October seeking further clarification on the following issues arising from the meeting of 9 October, when the Private Bill Committee heard oral evidence from PPAG and PFANS:

- The height of the proposed school building
- Access to football pitches
- Alternative approaches
- Traffic management issues and planning permission

1. Height of the proposed school building

The attached drawing shows the height of the proposed school building at several ‘cross sections’ relative to the corresponding houses and existing tree line on Park Avenue. The height of the school would vary relative to different properties, as the park and street slope downhill away from Milton Road. Relative to the ten houses on Park Avenue which would face on to the western elevation of the school, the proposed school building in respect of the first four and part of the fifth would be lower in height, by approximately four metres. For the remainder of the fifth house and the last five houses facing the school, the proposed building would be approximately two to three metres higher compared to those properties, but would also be set back some sixty-seven metres from the Park Avenue front elevations (this being an additional twenty three metres further than for the first five houses). The Section Key shows the location of the three cross sections taken through Park Avenue. The Section Key also shows the north-south cross section through Milton Road, illustrating that the school building would be lower than all the houses and the existing tree line on Milton Road.

2. Access to football pitches

The pitches would be available for booking by those in the local area, free-of-charge, when not otherwise in use by the school (or having already been booked by another party). In this context, there is no difference between “the local area” and “the local community”, and we apologise for any confusion resulting from the use of the two different phrases in our oral evidence. The relevant area is the area to which the information leaflet was distributed as part of the Public Bill consultation process; this area is shown in paragraph 2.7 of the Council report of 14 March 2013. Those living outside this area would also be able to book the pitches, but would have to pay to do so.

These access arrangements were agreed by the City of Edinburgh Council at its meeting of 25 October 2012, and there is no intention that this would change in the future.

The process for how access will be managed is still to be considered in detail and there is currently a review taking place of management arrangements across the city for community access to all schools.

Opening times for the pitches are still to be finalised, but we envisage that these would be similar to those currently operating at other schools with similar high quality sports facilities. In such cases, schools have exclusive use during the
school day and up to 6pm each weekday for extra-curricular activities including Active School programmes. This means that on weekdays, we would expect the pitches to be available for community use from 6pm to 10pm. At weekends, school use is typically on a Saturday morning, and therefore we would expect the pitches to be available for community access from 1pm to 10pm on Saturdays and 9am to 10pm on Sundays. During school holiday periods we would expect the pitches to be available for booking between 9am and 10pm as is the case at existing schools.

Informal access to the pitches through ‘cat flaps’ would also be available at any time when there were no pitch bookings. Again, the actual management of this will be finalised at a later date should the project be able to proceed.

It should be borne in mind that, notwithstanding the need for the school to have exclusive use of the pitches at certain times, the pitches would still enable much greater use than is made of the existing pitches on the park. The new pitches could be used all year round and, because the land would be levelled out, would not suffer from the sloping terrain that affects the existing pitches.

3. Alternative approaches

Following the decision of the Inner house of the Court of Session in 2012, the Council fully and exhaustively considered other potential approaches that might have permitted the use of the park as the site for the new high school, the Council having identified that as by far the best location for the replacement Portobello High School in terms of location, quality of facilities and speed of delivery.

The potential alternatives considered are set out at paragraphs 17 to 42 of the Promoter’s Memorandum. The potential alternatives were also set out in the Council reports of October and November 2012 (we provided electronic links to these reports on page 4 of the Promoter’s Memorandum, and submitted a hard copy of the November 2012 report with our letter of 30 August 2013). The Council sought specialist legal advice on these various options, and fully assessed the prospects of each, before concluding that none of the alternative approaches would likely be capable of delivering the intended outcome.

The Private Bill process offers a degree of certainty (in terms of being capable of delivering the intended outcome, if not in terms of the outcome of the Bill process itself) which none of the other alternatives could match. Further, and as noted in the Promoter’s Memorandum, the Private Bill process also has the advantages of being open, transparent and participative. It requires significant consultation and notification of interested parties, and it is considerably easier and cheaper for those with an interest in the proposals to object or otherwise participate in the Private Bill process than it would be to participate in any court-based process. This was felt to be particularly important with this matter, given the amount of public interest in the Council’s proposal.

The Council also notes that Andrew Ferguson and Professor Robert Rennie, two of the property law experts asked by the Committee to provide written evidence in connection with the Bill, did not identify any other alternative courses of action that were reasonably open to the Council, and indeed appeared to agree that the Private Bill was the only viable option to achieve the intended outcome given the terms of the Inner House’s decision. While the third expert, Roderick McGeoch,
appeared to question the Council’s decision not to ask a court to decide categorically whether the park was in fact inalienable Common Good land (stating that the matter has not been put beyond doubt), the Council does not believe there would have been any realistic possibility of a court reaching the view that the park was not inalienable Common Good land. We would refer you to our additional submission of 5 September 2013 which addressed this issue in detail, and we also note that Roy Martin QC, in his evidence on 9 October as part of the panel for Portobello Park Action Group, agreed that such an approach is not one he would have advised.

The Council understands that between 2002 and 2013 there have been five non-works Private Bills, which each took a period of between 79 and 266 days to progress from introduction to Royal Assent. The Council was, of course, aware that this Bill might be more contentious than those previous Bills, but in estimating the likely timescale for the Private Bill process took into account the high degree of existing awareness of this matter among those most directly affected by it, and the fact that the draft Bill would itself be extremely short and deliberately restricted in its effect. The Council, therefore, estimated that the Bill would be capable of consideration within a relatively short period, and in particular within a much shorter timescale than any of the other potential alternative approaches.

We assume that the Committee’s reference to timescales for Public Bills concerns the potential for legislation reforming Common Good Law generally. The process for such a Bill would, as the Committee will be aware, be quite different to that for a Private Bill, and would include a considerable amount of work even in advance of any Bill being introduced to the Scottish Parliament. It would require a national policy decision by the Scottish Government that such legislation should be pursued, followed by a wide, and no doubt lengthy, nationwide consultation on any proposals. It would, therefore, be very unlikely that a Public Bill process would be resolved any earlier than two or three years after the proposal was first initiated.

Furthermore, it would be a process in which the Council could only have a minimal involvement beyond lobbying the Scottish Government to initiate a change, as one of a potentially very large number of consultees. The Council itself has no ability to pursue or initiate legislation to reform the general law relating to Common Good.

Whilst the outcome of this Private Bill process can be no more guaranteed than the outcome of a Public Bill, taking forward this Private Bill enables the Council to take a central role, including consulting on its specific proposals and drafting the Bill specifically to achieve its intended outcome (and nothing further). The Private Bill route ensures that that outcome is central to the process, and can be specifically considered and decided upon by elected and democratically accountable MSPs.

It is important to stress that the Council is not pursuing the Private Bill as a means to reform the general law of Common Good (which we accept would be outside the scope of the Private Bill process) nor to establish any sort of precedent that could be used in respect of any other inalienable Common Good land. It should also be emphasised that public legislation reforming the law on appropriation of inalienable Common Good land would be very unlikely to restrict appropriations to the very narrow circumstances in which this Private Bill would permit appropriation of the park. There could, therefore, be no guarantee that any Public Bill process would deliver the Council’s intended outcome, but a very real prospect of it having more wide-ranging effects on the law of Common Good than the present Private Bill.
Relying on a Public Bill being taken forward could, therefore, result in several years of further delay without any certainty that the legislation would even deal with the issue facing the Council, much less allow the Council to deliver its intended outcome. That further delay would by itself mean that a Public Bill process would not be capable of delivering the Council’s intended outcome, as Portobello High School needs to be replaced sooner than that would be likely to allow.

As narrated at paragraphs 37 to 40 of the Promoter’s Memorandum, the Council did consider the possibility of seeking to have appropriate legislative measures included in the Scottish Ministers’ draft Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill, or asking the Scottish Ministers to otherwise take forward a legislative solution via separate primary or secondary legislation. However, in respect of both it was clear that, even if the Scottish Ministers were so minded to assist, which could of course not be presumed, for the reasons given above it was very unlikely either option could be pursued within the timescale necessary for the Council to achieve its intended outcome.

The Council does, however, wish to clarify that the Private Bill route was not chosen purely for reasons of timing. The possible timescale afforded by the Private Bill was a relevant factor, particularly given the urgent need to replace Portobello High School, but the decision to proceed with this option was only taken by the Council after considering all the relevant factors together, including also the outcome of the consultation and the prospects of success and accessibility to interested parties of the potential alternative options.

4. Traffic management issues and planning permission

In response to the Committee’s request that the oral evidence given by John Baker is expanded upon in relation traffic matters, the current planning permission is attached. We would draw your attention to informative 2 (on page 4) which relates to road safety measures that would have to be implemented prior to the occupation of the school.

As the Committee knows, the Council is currently seeking to renew the planning permission and all associated documentation can be accessed on the Council Planning Website through the following link:

There are three documents which have been submitted as part of the planning application renewal process which we believe will be of particular relevance relating to traffic management issues, which are as follows:


- The detailed Transport Assessment (https://citydev-portal.edinburgh.gov.uk/idoxpa-web/files/9C01F943FC8AEE51B2EFCC12C85A0F4D/pdf/13_03200_FUL-TRANSPORT_ASSESSMENT-1650127.pdf). This assessment considers the
sustainability of the proposed school development in transport terms and its impact upon the local area, with all relevant modes of transport having been assessed in order to deliver a school which can be accessed safely and easily.

- The Pre-Application Consultation Report (https://citydev-portal.edinburgh.gov.uk/idoxpa-web/files/25DA1A03F7FC12FA740678A83ADFC059/pdf/13_03200_FUL-PAC_REPORT-1650132.pdf), with paragraph 3.3 dealing with the potential requirement for an additional crossing at the north end of Hope Lane. As is stated in this report, this matter was raised and reviewed fully with the Council Highways Department who re-iterated their view that the conditions in the originally approved proposal remain sufficient, and no further measures are required on Hope Lane. Accordingly, the updated Traffic Assessment could not include any new works at Hope Lane. However, the project team responsible for delivery of a new High School building on the Park will, if the Bill is enacted, keep this issue under review with the Council Highways Department during the next stage of the project.

Other Issues

The Council notes that the Committee’s officials are gathering information on Field in Trust status, and also going to contact Edinburgh Leisure in relation to usage of the Park prior to it first being suggested as a possible site for the new school. However, and as briefly discussed in a telephone conversation between the Council’s Legal Services and the Bills Unit, the Council would be happy to assist in providing any specific information, should this be required.

Gillian Tee
Director, Children and Families
6 November 2013
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACTS
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING
(GENERAL DEVELOPMENT) (SCOTLAND) ORDERS

DECISION NOTICE

With reference to your application for Planning Permission registered on 30 September 2010, this has been decided by Committee Hearing. Please see the guidance notes for further information, including how to appeal or review your decision.


The development is for

The erection of new Portobello High School and associated ancillary buildings, site works, car parking, landscaping, pitches and floodlighting

At

Portobello Park And Golf Course
20 Stanley Street
Edinburgh
EH15 1JJ

The Council in exercise of its powers under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts and regulations, now determines the application as Granted in accordance with the particulars given in the application.

Docketed plans, relative to this permission, are attached if your application was made on paper. If your application was submitted online, drawings 01-17, as shown on the Planning & Building Standards Portal, represent the determined scheme. Any condition(s) attached to this consent, with the reasons for imposing them, or reasons for refusal, are shown below: -

The reason why the Council made this decision is as follows:

Although the proposal is contrary to the development plan in terms of the land use allocation, a departure can be justified in this instance as the community benefits of a new school outweigh the loss of open space. The development represents an opportunity to redevelop the high school on a suitable site within the catchment, without creating any adverse impacts in terms of residential amenity or road safety.
Conditions:-

1. A detailed specification, including trade names where appropriate, of all the proposed external materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning before work is commenced on site; Note: samples of the materials may be required.

2. No development shall take place on the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work (excavation, analysis and reporting, publication) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Head of Planning.

3. During the construction phase, dust mitigation measures as stated in Chapter 11 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Report Table 11.20 of the Environmental Statement dated September 2010 shall be carried out as stated, to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning.

4. The design, installation and operation of any plant, machinery or equipment shall be such that any associated noise complies with NR25 when measured within any nearby living apartment.

5. Deliveries and collections, including waste collections, are restricted to 0700 - 1900 hours Monday to Saturday.

6. The floodlighting system shall be controlled so that there is no direct illumination of neighbouring land, and so that any light spillage onto neighbouring land does not exceed 25 lux.

7. Hours of operation of the floodlighting system is restricted to between the hours of 0800 and 2200 hours daily.

8. That prior to the commencement of works on site, details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority for subsequent implementation:

(i) An environmental management plan, including all mitigation measures relating to the ecology and nature conservation, as detailed within the Environmental Statement. All mitigation measures will be implemented in full prior to the commencement of works on site;

(ii) A fully detailed landscape plan and habitat management plan, including full details of the extent of removal of the Millennium Planting on the site's northern boundary. All recommendations and mitigation measures identified in these documents shall be implemented as per the agreed timetable;

(iii) A site waste management plan, identifying all waste streams and proposals for their management, including materials excavated on the site and the importation of any waste materials to the site. The implementation of the waste management plan shall continue throughout the duration and life of the development;
(iv) A plan showing details of all fences, walls and gates to be erected on site. The plan shall include details of the type and height of all fencing to be erected.

9. Prior to the commencement of works on site, a surface water management plan, showing flood risk from all sources at the 1:200 year runoff shall be submitted for approval by the Head of Planning. It should show the location of the land drains, and demonstrate that there is no increase in flood risk to adjacent property.

10. For the avoidance of doubt, the path as shown on the north edge of the golf course is not consented.

11. Prior to the commencement of works on site, full details of the location of the floodlighting columns shall be submitted for approval to the Head of Planning. Thereafter, the columns shall be erected as approved. For the avoidance of doubt, the floodlighting system shall be so controlled to ensure no floodlighting bulb or floodlighting bulb reflecting surface shall be visible within any residential premises.

Reasons:-

1. In order to enable the planning authority to consider this/these matter/s in detail.

2. In the interests of cultural heritage.

3. In the interests of residential amenity.

4. In the interests of residential amenity.

5. In the interests of residential amenity.

6. In the interests of residential amenity.

7. In the interests of residential amenity.

8. To ensure these details are submitted in the interests of natural heritage and amenity.

9. In the interests of flood prevention and amenity.

10. In the interests of amenity.

11. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of residential amenity.

INFORMATIVES

It should be noted that:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.
2. Prior to the occupation of the school, the applicant is to arrange for the design, construction, works and necessary traffic orders:

a) to introduce or amend school keep clear markings, part time 20mph speed limits, bus lane operation times, waiting and loading restrictions and bus lanes and to redetermine sections of footway, carriageway and cycle track. The current estimate of costs for progressing each such order is £2,500; and

b) for a toucan crossing in the vicinity of the main school entrance on Milton Road. The crossing to be operational prior to occupation of the school and to be subject to Road Safety Audits at appropriate stages;

3. Prior to the occupation of the school, a Travel Plan will be submitted, the terms of which are to be agreed with the Head of Transport, and the management agreement shall be in place prior to the occupation of the school.

4. No development shall take place on the site until a ‘Notice of Initiation of Development’ has been submitted to the Council stating the intended date on which the development is to commence. Failure to do so constitutes a breach of planning control, under Section 123(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

5. As soon as practicable upon the completion of the development of the site, as authorised in the associated grant of permission, a ‘Notice of Completion of Development’ must be given, in writing to the Council.

This determination does not carry with it any necessary consent or approval for the proposed development under other statutory enactments.

24 February 2011
John Bury
Head of Planning

Should you have a specific enquiry regarding this decision please contact [...] directly on 0131 [...].
NOTES

1. If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the planning authority to refuse permission for or approval required by a condition in respect of the proposed development, or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, the applicant may appeal to the Scottish Ministers under section 47 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 within three months from the date of this notice. The notice should be addressed to the Directorate of Planning and Environmental Appeals, 4 The Courtyard, Callendar Business Park, FALKIRK FK1 1XR.

2. If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions, whether by the planning authority or by the Scottish Ministers, and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by carrying out any development which has been or would be permitted, the owner of the land may serve on the planning authority a purchase notice requiring the purchase of the owner of the land’s interest in the land in accordance with Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

3. In respect of 1. above, a period of six months from the date of this notice is allowed to submit appeals on listed building consent, conservation area consent and advertisement consent.
New Portobello High School

Traffic - Existing

Proposed Traffic Measures

Part time 20mph zone along Milton Road.
Improved timings for bus lanes
Restricted parking timings on Park Ave.
Traffic and Vehicles

The Traffic Impact Assessment and proposals contain the detailed traffic statistics for existing and proposed traffic measures, and we detail below a brief summary of the existing and the proposals.

Existing Traffic

The existing traffic along Milton Road is controlled by the traffic light sequences at its junctions with Sir Harry tedder Road and Duddingston Park, and between these points by a 30mph and 40 mph road sign.

There are also loading and waiting restrictions and bus lane restrictions during the morning and evening peak flow periods (7.30 to 8.30 am and 4.00 to 6.30 pm respectively).

In addition there are 20mph restrictions on Hope Lane and Park Avenue, and road tables/humps on these roads to reduce traffic speed.

Proposed Traffic Measures

As part of the development it is proposed to promote the introduction of a part time 20mph limit on Milton Road for the extent of the frontage of the site, to reduce traffic speed and increase road safety.

As part of this proposal we would also suggest the moving of the 30/40mph limits further to the east so that the part time 20mph would be within the 30mph zone.

We would also promote the alteration to the existing bus lane times so that they began one hour earlier i.e. at 3.00pm in the afternoon period to cover the school finishing time and reduce possible traffic congestion outside the school.

In Hope Lane and Park Avenue we would suggest the retention of the 20mph limits and in addition in Park Avenue, on its east side, we would suggest the introduction of restricted parking timings on Park Avenue, adjacent to the school boundary to limit drop-off and parking.

Refer to plans on following pages :-
8 Summary and Conclusions

8.1 Introduction
AECOM has been commissioned by City of Edinburgh Council's Special Development Team to undertake a Transport Assessment (TA) and investigate possible site access arrangements in conjunction with proposed relocation of Portobello High School, Edinburgh.

The existing high school caters for 1450 pupils, 103.5 full time equivalent teaching staff and 35 other staff (such as janitors, classroom assistants). The School is currently situated in a largely residential area within Duddingston which is approximately 0.8km south west of Portobello town centre. Under the development proposal the school would be relocated approximately 0.9km south east onto the site of existing public parkland adjacent to Milton Road. For the purpose of this TA it is anticipated that the current school pupil catchment area will remain unchanged.

Based on information from City of Edinburgh Council, it is forecast that the proposed school would accommodate up to 1400 pupils and 138.5 full time equivalent staff and would be completed by the year 2016. This translates into no change in staff numbers and a marginal net decrease of approximately 50 pupils.

This report assesses the sustainability of the proposed development in transport terms and considers its impact upon the local area. All relevant modes of transport have been considered and, where appropriate, mitigation measures to minimise the development impacts have been identified with a view to delivering a development which can be accessed safely and easily by all future users.

8.2 National and Local Transport Policy
Both local and national policy for transport planning aims to promote sustainable travel and reduce dependence on the private car. To do this, walking, cycling and public transport should be given priority of road space over private vehicles and a safe and attractive environment should be provided to promote journeys on foot.

The development plans meet the aims and objectives of the local and national guidance in supporting the efforts to move modal split away from private car to more sustainable forms of transport.

8.3 Existing Accessibility
One of the key concepts of the Scottish Executive TA guidance is to assess and maximise the potential use of sustainable travel modes. A review of the adjacent road network has been undertaken within this report, commenting on available facilities for all modes of travel. Access by the following modes has been assessed in order of travel importance: pedestrian, cycle, public transport and private vehicle travel. In addition several routes have been suggested as permitting the safest and most convenient for pedestrian access to the site.

8.4 Existing Travel to School Characteristics/People Trip Assessment
In order to establish people trips to the new school methodologies for pupil and staff trips were adopted for use within the TA.

To forecast a realistic mode share for pupil trips to the new site various data sources and anecdotal evidence has been utilised. The CEC School Travel Surveys for journeys to and from surrounding local primary schools was considered together with the Department for Transports National Travel Survey Factsheet (March 2006). It should also be emphasised that the local school travel co-ordinator intimated that, in comparison with other secondary schools in Edinburgh, Portobello High currently has a high number of males who cycle to school. This data was used to establish a modal split for pupils, and subsequently used to estimate pupil people trips by various modes of travel.

In order to establish a modal split for staff at the new school the 'travel to work' data from the 2001 Census Data has been used. This data has been taken for the ward of Duddingston, which is the location of the existing & proposed school. The predicted
number of staff at the site is 138, equivalent full time, positions. This number was applied to the modal split taken from the Census data for travel to work in the Duddingston ward. It is assumed that all Staff trips will be incoming in the AM peak and outgoing in the PM peak, in line with school work patterns.

The total people trips for the new school are obtained from adding the pupil and staff people trip rate results together.

8.5 Measures to Influence Travel Behaviour
This Transport Assessment does not present a definitive Travel Plan for the application site, but sets out the framework for developing a Travel Plan for the school. The use of a Travel Plan offers the potential to positively influence the travel behaviour of staff, visitors and pupils of the school development through the use of a combination of measures and initiatives.

A Travel Plan for the proposed development aimed at reducing trips by single occupancy vehicles and based on the framework outlined in this chapter, and the existing one for Portobello High School, should be provided in advance of the new school opening.

8.6 Traffic Impact Assessment
The assessment of the school relocation on the wider road network has shown that there will be minimal impact. The school access analysis has shown that the proposed junction will work within normally acceptable parameters. The location of the junction for the car park has been discussed with CEC Roads and is understood to be acceptable in terms of junction spacing and form.

The proposed changes to the parking restriction and speed limits on roads around the school are aimed at enhancing the safety of the area and dispersing any drop off and pick up trips to minimise their impact. The changes are not predicted to have a significant effect on the capacity of the road network.

8.7 Proposed Transport Infrastructure
The Transport Assessment has investigated transport infrastructure which would be required to support the school development. One of the key concepts of the Scottish Executive TA guidance is to assess and maximise the potential use of sustainable travel modes. Access by the following modes has been assessed: pedestrian, cycle, public transport and private vehicle access.

The internal site will be arranged in such a way that car parking will be segregated from pedestrian movements. The main car park area will be located to the east of the site away from the main school building entrance and segregated from any concentrated pupil activity.

Within the site, there a number of direct pedestrian routes from Hope Lane, Park Avenue and Milton Road. An internal footway linkage is proposed from these locations to provide continuous connections to the school entrance to minimise the need to cross roads and access points. The pathways adjacent to the school access road will be proved to be disability discrimination act (DDA) compliant e.g. considering gradients, crossfalls, widths, street furniture and surfacing.

The definitive parking numbers and layout for the development were included within the approved Planning submission and sit within the bounds suggested within CEC (maximum standards) and at an appropriate level to prevent external overspill parking. With reference to the aforementioned standards it is apparent that between 69 and 92 car parking spaces would be deemed appropriate by CEC.

Cycle parking has been designed in line with the Councils' 'Cycle Friendly Design Guide', which is included in the Movement and Development document. As previously highlighted the definitive parking numbers and layout for the development are included within the approved Planning submission. The standards intimate that a minimum of 140 cycle parking opportunities will have to be created for Pupils and 20 for staff.
Provision for travel by cycle will be extensive due to the network of existing and proposed routes in the vicinity of the site. Provision will also include cycle routes along Hope Lane and the toucan crossing of Milton Road.

Proposed traffic measures will include a reduction in traffic speeds along Milton Road to a part time 20mph zone in order to increase safety of both pedestrians and cyclists undertaking journeys to the site.

8.8 Conclusions
This Transport Assessment has assessed the existing accessibility of the application site, completed a people trip assessment and predicted the impact of additional traffic on the road network and it is considered that, in addition to existing levels of access to the application site by public transport, the infrastructure measures proposed will provide the development with appropriate access and transport provision.

Overall, in transportation terms, having reviewed the TA previously included within the original approved Planning submission; having attended the residents workshop as part of the Pre-Application Consultation; and having had further dialogue with The City of Edinburgh Council’s Highways department, there are considered to be no overriding objections to the proposed mixed use development to preclude the renewal of the existing planning permission.