



Report to the Scottish Ministers

PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS)(SCOTLAND) ACT 1997

Report by Dannie Onn and Scott M Ferrie, reporters appointed by the Scottish Ministers

- Site Address: New Parliament House, 5-7 Regent Road, Edinburgh EH7 5BL
- Appeals by Duddingston House Properties and Urbanist Hotels against the decisions by the City of Edinburgh Council
- Appeal reference LBA-230-2076
- Application for listed building consent, ref. 15/03990/LBC dated 31 August 2015, refused by notice dated 21 December 2015
- The works proposed: Refurbishment (external and internal), alteration and extension of principal former Royal High School buildings (to include works to north elevation to create new door openings and works to east and west elevations to create new corridor links), demolition of former Lodge, Gymnasium Block, demolition of 2 curtilage buildings (former Classroom Block and Luncheon Hall), demolition of existing gates, wall (in part), new service access to facilitate development of a world class hotel
- Appeal reference: LBA-230-2118
- Application for listed building consent, ref. 17/00587/LBC dated 13 February 2017, refused by notice dated 7 September 2017
- The works proposed: Refurbishment (external and internal), alteration and extension of principal former Royal High School buildings (to include works to north elevation to create new door openings and new corridor links), demolition of former Lodge, Gymnasium Block, demolition of 2 curtilage buildings (former Classroom Block and Luncheon Hall), demolition of existing gates, wall (in part) to facilitate development of a world class hotel
- Dates of inquiry sessions: 18 September - 19 October 2018
- Date of hearing session: 23 October 2018
- Dates of accompanied site inspections: 10-11 May 2018

Date of this report and recommendations: 2 June 2020

CONTENTS

Page

Summary Report	4
Preamble	7
Abbreviations used in the report	10
Part 1 - Background	11
Chapters	
1. Statutory duties and national policies	12
2. Description of the building and its surroundings	17
3. Special interest	18
4. Setting	23
5. The New Town conservation area	25
6. Other considerations	26
Part 2 - LBA-230-2076 (Scheme 1)	
Chapters	
7. Introduction and background	28
8. The cases for the parties	30
9. Reporters' findings	42
10. Conditions	47
11. Conclusions and recommendations for Scheme 1	49
Part 3 – LBA-230-2118 (Scheme 2)	
Chapters	
12. Introduction and background	50
13. The cases for the parties	52
14. Reporters' findings	64
15. Conditions	69
16. Conclusions and recommendations for Scheme 2	71

Appendices

Appendix 1: Note of pre-examination meeting

Appendix 2: Schedule of documents

Appendix 3: Inquiry session 1: precognitions
--

Appendix 4: Inquiry session 2: precognitions
--

Appendix 5: Hearing session statements (conditions and planning obligation)

Appendix 6: Closing statements

Appendix 7: Representations from Mr Black

Appendix 8: Schedule of proposed conditions

Appendix 9. Schedule of drawings



Appeal reference LBA-230-2076

Refurbishment (external and internal), alteration and extension of principal former Royal High School buildings (to include works to north elevation to create new door openings and works to east and west elevations to create new corridor links), demolition of former Lodge, Gymnasium Block, demolition of 2 curtilage buildings (former Classroom Block and Luncheon Hall), demolition of existing gates, wall (in part), new service access to facilitate development of a world class hotel

Appeal reference LBA-230-2118

Refurbishment (external and internal), alteration and extension of principal former Royal High School buildings (to include works to north elevation to create new door openings and new corridor links), demolition of former Lodge, Gymnasium Block, demolition of 2 curtilage buildings (former Classroom Block and Luncheon Hall), demolition of existing gates, wall (in part) to facilitate development of a world class hotel

• Case type	Listed building consent appeals
• Reporters	Dannie Onn and Scott M Ferrie
• Appellants	Duddingston House Properties and Urbanist Hotels
• Planning authority	The City of Edinburgh Council
• Other parties	Historic Environment Scotland The New Town and Broughton Community Council The Architectural Heritage Society Of Scotland The Edinburgh World Heritage Society The Cockburn Association The Royal High School Preservation Trust The Regent, Royal and Carlton Terraces and Mews Association
• Date of applications	3 September 2015 and 21 February 2017
• Dates cases received by DPEA	17 March 2016 and 8 November 2017
• Methods of consideration and dates	Written submissions Accompanied site inspections on 10 and 11 May 2018 Unaccompanied site inspections on various dates before, during and after the inquiry Inquiry sessions from 18 September 2018 -19 October 2018 Hearing session on 23 October 2018
• Date of report	2 June 2020
• Reporters' recommendations	That appeal reference LBA-230-2076 be dismissed That appeal reference LBA-230-2118 be dismissed

Background to the proposals:

The appeal site is the former Royal High School on Regent Road, Edinburgh and its immediate grounds. It occupies a prominent position on the southern slopes of Calton Hill. The former Royal High School is a category A listed building in the New Town Conservation Area of Edinburgh and within the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site. This report examines two separate listed building consent appeals against the refusal of applications to convert and extend the building, essentially to provide a hotel. Both appeal proposals entail the conversion of the main Hamilton building and the provision of modern extensions to either side. The Scheme 1 appeal would provide 147 bedrooms; the Scheme 2 appeal is of reduced scale and would provide 127 bedrooms. Concurrent appeals into the refusal of planning permission for the same developments are the subject of a separate report to Scottish Ministers.

The appellants' case:

A luxury hotel is needed and beneficial to the economy; the building would be restored with minimal intervention and brought back into use; the rear retaining wall and belvedere would be exposed and celebrated; the setting would be improved because the new building would reinforce how Hamilton intended his building to be seen. This approach says that the restoration is so desirable and the design so exemplary, that the impact overall would be beneficial.

City of Edinburgh Council's case:

The appeal scheme would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area. There is no exceptional case which would justify overriding that presumption on the basis of the benefits the hotel would bring, or the lack of other options to bring the building back into use with less harm.

Historic Environment Scotland's case

The former Royal High School is one of the most important listed buildings in Scotland and of international significance for its architecture and setting. The proposed extensions would not protect the character and appearance of the listed building; they would not be subordinate in height, scale or form; the Hamilton building would lose its primacy on the carefully designed and assembled site. This does not support a case for departing from the presumption against the works set out in the HES policy statement.

The New Town and Broughton Community Council/ The Edinburgh World Heritage Society/ The Cockburn Association's case

A new, sustainable use for the listed building is supported, given its deteriorating condition. It also accepts that change will be required to support that. The proposed hotel extensions would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building. The integrity of the listed building would be adversely impacted. The apparent offer of a more sympathetic and less intrusive development by the Royal High School Preservation Trust is relevant to the consideration of the proposals here.

The Architectural Heritage Society Of Scotland's case

The Royal High School is one of the relatively few Scottish buildings that are recognised as being of international standing by the wider architectural community. AHSS supports appropriate, sympathetic, high quality modern architecture and initiatives to bring historic buildings back into economic and social use. However, the proposed schemes would result in over-development of the site. The design and materials of the proposal would not be appropriate to the special interest of the listed building.

The Royal High School Preservation Trust's case

The Trust objects to the proposed works because of the impact they would have on the listed building and its setting.

The Regent, Royal and Carlton Terraces and Mews Association's case

Of principal concern to the association is the impact of the proposed development on the special interest and significance of Calton Hill and the two listed terraces to the east. The unique combination of landscape and buildings was no accident and is recognised by the World Heritage Site inscription. The elegant Regents Terrace would be debased by becoming the only service entrance for the development.

Reporters' conclusions:

The restoration of the building and part clearance of later additions to expose and enhance the original setting are desirable outcomes. The architects' approach to the proposed extensions is exemplary and would produce high quality contextual modern architecture. However, for both appeals, this does not add up to an acceptable or beneficial solution. The impact of the scale of the extensions is harmful to the integrity and setting of this nationally and internationally important listed building in its highly valued setting. The proposed works would not preserve the listed building or its setting and the character and appearance of the Edinburgh New Town Conservation Area would be neither preserved nor enhanced. That would be contrary to Sections 14 and 64 respectively of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.

Recommendations:

That appeal reference LBA-230-2076 be dismissed

That appeal reference LBA-230-2118 be dismissed

Scottish Government
Planning and Environmental Appeals Division
4 The Courtyard
Callendar Business Park
Callendar Road
Falkirk
FK1 1XR

DPEA case references: LBA-230-2076 and LBA-230-2118

The Scottish Ministers
Edinburgh

Ministers

In accordance with the minutes of appointment dated 4 April 2016 and 4 December 2017 we have examined two planning permission appeals and two listed building consent appeals at New Parliament House, 5-7 Regent Road, Edinburgh. The building is more commonly known as the former Royal High School and we use that name throughout our reports.

The planning permission appeals are dealt with in a separate report to you under DPEA references PPA-230-2178 and PPA-230-2213.

Both listed building consent applications were refused by the City of Edinburgh Council and then appealed by Duddingston House Properties & Urbanist hotels. You recalled the appeals for your own determination because they raise issues of national importance in terms of potential impacts on the historic environment, including the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site, and in relation to potential economic and tourism benefits.

We held a pre-inquiry meeting on 20 July 2016 in relation to the first planning and listed building consent appeals. The appellants requested that we sist the examination of those appeals pending the decision by the City of Edinburgh Council on the revised proposal for the site. We agreed to this. The revised proposal was refused, appealed and recalled. We then held a second pre-inquiry meeting on 1 February 2018. Links to the notes of both pre-examination meetings are included at Appendix 1 of this report.

Following those meetings and a review of the information before us, we issued a procedure notice on 8 February 2018 covering all four appeals. We requested further written representations on one matter. Inquiry sessions into the other specified matters were held between 18 September and 19 October followed by a hearing session on 23 October 2018. At our inquiries, three of the objecting parties were represented as a coalition, which formed in the spirit of paragraph 5(4) of the inquiry session rules set out in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Appeals) (Scotland) Regulations 2013. This was helpful to our running of the inquiry and hearing sessions. In this report we have nevertheless reported the gist of each party's case separately.

We undertook accompanied site inspections on 10 and 11 May 2018 and a number of unaccompanied inspections from places around the site on various dates before, during and after the inquiry sessions.

We invited the parties to make closing statements with the final of these submissions lodged on 14 December 2018. Hyperlinks to those statements are contained in Appendix 6.

In March 2019, Historic Environment Scotland issued revised policy and guidance in relation to the historic environment. By procedure notice of 10 April 2019, we requested the views of the inquiry parties on how the new policy should be applied in the context of the appeals. The last of the submissions was received 15 May 2019.

At our first pre-inquiry meeting and also in writing, Mr Black made representations to the effect that the inquiry should not proceed because the applications were not made in compliance with the proposals resulting from the appellants' selection as the preferred developer for the site by the City of Edinburgh Council. Mr Black cited European law to contend that the appellants in these cases are not legally competent to make the applications and that Scottish Ministers should not proceed to a decision in either case. We note that our powers are restricted to reporting to you on the merits of the cases before us, within the scope of the Planning Act and the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act.

In those circumstances, it matters not to us who submitted the applications or the extent of their interest in the land, provided the required notification had been made to the landowner. In this case the landowner is the City of Edinburgh Council itself, which has been properly notified of the applications and appeals. We therefore continued with the examination of the appeals. It is a matter for you, Ministers, whether you wish to seek further legal advice on this matter. We responded that, in our opinion, these were matters outwith the scope of our consideration of the appeals, but that we would forward Mr Black's representations to Scottish Ministers together with our reports. Hyperlinks to those representations are included at Appendix 7.

We note also that there have been some critical comments, accusations and counteraccusations between some of the parties. We have preferred to concentrate on the facts, the expert evidence as tested in cross-examination, and our own judgement in reaching the conclusions in our reports.

At the pre-inquiry meeting, the Edinburgh World Heritage Trust made an application for expenses against the appellants. This application was withdrawn at the close of the inquiry sessions. Also at the close, an application was intimated by the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland against the appellants, and a separate application for expenses was intimated by the appellants against the Edinburgh World Heritage Trust. These applications are the subject of a separate report to ministers.

To the extent that they are relevant to the listed building appeals, this report takes account of the precognitions, written statements, documents and closing statements lodged by the parties, together with the evidence given at the inquiry and hearing sessions.

We have structured our report in three parts: Part 1 covers the relevant statutory duties and issues common to both appeals. Our conclusions in Part 2 (the Scheme 1 appeal) and Part 3 (the Scheme 2 appeal) are informed by our conclusions at Part 1 of the report.

We now report to you in respect of the two listed building appeals and invite you to make separate decisions in respect of each. Mindful of the separate requirements for recovered planning and listed building consent appeals, we have issued a separate report in respect of the two linked planning appeals which are essentially for the same schemes. We

respectfully suggest that you consider each of the four appeals with reference to the others and issue separate decisions, but at the same time.

Abbreviations used in this report

AHSS	Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland
CA	Conservation Area
CEC	City of Edinburgh Council
DHP -	Duddingston House Properties (joint appellant)
EWHT	Edinburgh World Heritage
DPEA -	Planning and Environmental Appeals Division (Scottish Government)
GDL	Garden and Designed Landscape
HES	Historic Environment Scotland
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
NPF3	National Planning Framework 3
OUV	Outstanding Universal Value
RHS	Royal High School
SLA	Special Landscape Area
SNH	Scottish Natural Heritage
SoOUV	Statement of Outstanding Universal Value
SPP	Scottish Planning Policy
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
TCA	Townscape Character Area
TVIA	Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment
UH -	Urbanist Hotels (joint appellant)
WHS	World Heritage Site

PART 1 BACKGROUND

This part of our report applies to both listed building appeals before the Scottish Ministers.

The appeal site is the former Royal High School on Regent Road, Edinburgh and its immediate grounds. It occupies a prominent position on the southern slopes of Calton Hill, overlooking the Waverley Valley towards the distinctive townscape of Edinburgh's Old Town. It is located about 500 metres to the east of Waverley Station, just beyond St. Andrew's House – the imposing Scottish Government administrative building on Regent Road.

The former Royal High School is a category A listed building in the New Town Conservation Area of Edinburgh and within the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site. This report examines two separate appeals against refusal of applications to convert and extend the building, essentially to provide a hotel.

Concurrent appeals into the refusal of planning permission for the same developments are the subject of a separate report to the Scottish Ministers.

CHAPTER 1 Statutory duties, national policies and other guidance

1.1 Listed building consent applications and appeals are governed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (the listed building Act) as amended. Buildings are listed for their special architectural or historic interest. Section 14 (2) requires that the Scottish Ministers have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.

1.2 Conservation areas are designated for their special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. Section 64 (1) of the listed building Act requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. This applies to the conservation area in which the building sits, which is the New Town Conservation Area.

1.3 The Scottish Ministers policy is set out in [National Planning Framework 3](#) (NPF3) and [Scottish Planning Policy](#) (SPP). NPF3 recognises that the historic environment is an integral part of our well-being and cultural identity. It seeks proactive and innovative environmental stewardship. It looks forward to a planned approach to development to help strike the right balance between safeguarding assets that are irreplaceable and facilitating change in a sustainable way.

1.4 In respect of listed buildings, paragraph 136 of SPP states that the historic environment is a key cultural and economic asset and a source of inspiration that should be seen as integral to creating successful places. Culture-led regeneration can have a profound impact on the well-being of a community in terms of the physical look and feel of a place and can also attract visitors, which in turn can bolster the local economy and sense of pride or ownership.

1.5 Paragraph 137 of SPP states that the planning system should promote the care and protection of heritage assets and their contribution to sense of place, cultural identity, social well-being, economic growth, civic participation and lifelong learning. At the same time, it seeks to enable positive change in the historic environment which is informed by a clear understanding of the importance of heritage assets affected, and to ensure their future use. It says that change should be sensitively managed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the fabric and setting of the asset, and ensure that its special characteristics are protected, conserved or enhanced.

1.6 SPP also expects, at paragraph 141, that change to a listed building should be managed to protect its special interest while enabling it to remain in active use, and that it should be protected from demolition or other work that would adversely affect it or its setting.

1.7 SPP expects that proposals for development within a conservation area and proposals outwith which would impact on its appearance, character or setting, should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Proposals that do not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area should be treated as preserving its character or appearance.

1.8 Policy guidance on the application of the listed building Act can be found in the [Historic Environment Policy for Scotland](#) of 2019 (HEPS). This is a non-statutory statement directing decision-making that affects the historic environment. It is not the policy of the Scottish Ministers, but that of their specialist advisors on the historic environment.

Nevertheless, we note that the Scottish Ministers consider that it sits alongside national policies in NPF3 and SPP. It must therefore be a guiding document of some weight in these decisions.

1.9 HEPS sets out six policies for managing the historic environment, which seek to ensure understanding (HEP1), enjoyment, protection, enhancement and promotion of the historic environment (HEP2, HEP3, and HEP4). If detrimental impact is unavoidable, policies HEP3 and HEP4 seek to minimise it, saying that steps should be taken to demonstrate that alternatives have been explored, and mitigation measures should be put in place. We discuss the value of these below in relation to the principles within HEPS.

1.10 Policy HEP5 expects decisions to contribute to sustainable development of communities and places. This has little impact in terms of the requirements of the listed building Act, but we recognise that finding a suitable use for a listed building is key to a sustainable future for the building. Policy HEP6 expects that decisions will be informed by an inclusive understanding of the potential consequences for people and communities. It adds that decision-making processes should be collaborative, open, transparent and easy to understand.

1.11 The policies set out in HEPS are underpinned by principles. There is no dispute that the evidence in support of the proposed works is well-researched and comprehensive. Our inquiry has allowed us and other participants in the process to contribute further to our understanding. In our view we have sufficient information to identify the significance of the listed building and its setting. The principles underlying policy HEP1 are met in these cases.

1.12 Policies HEP2, HEP3 and HEP4 relate to managing change. HEP2 expects that decisions affecting the historic environment should be approached in a way that protects and promotes the historic environment. In these cases we have applied this policy in the context of the statutory duties in the listed building Act.

1.13 Policy HEP3 relates to plans, programmes and resource allocation rather than decisions. Policy HEP4 applies the same principles to managing change. This policy is directly relevant in these cases and is underpinned by the core principles that:

- Some change is inevitable.
- Change can be necessary for places to thrive.
- Caring for the historic environment benefits everyone, now and in the future.
- Good decisions take a long-term view.
- Good decisions reflect an understanding of the wider environment.
- Good decisions are well-informed, transparent, robust, consistent and proportionate.
- Good decisions make sure that nothing is lost without considering its value first and exploring options for avoiding its loss.
- To manage the historic environment in a sustainable way, its cultural significance and the cultural significance of elements within it have to be understood.

1.14 Where decisions must be made, the principles advise decision-makers to:

- Avoid negative impact where possible.
- Minimise any impact that cannot be avoided.
- Keep intervention to a minimum.
- Ensure changes to a site or place are proportionate to its cultural significance.
- Consider less detrimental alternatives if they can deliver the same objectives.
- Identify opportunities for mitigation throughout, and as early as possible.

- Identify opportunities for furthering our knowledge and understanding where possible

1.15 The policies and principles in HEPS are supported by published [Interim Guidance on the Principles of Listed Building Consent](#). The guidance largely restates earlier HES guidance in the now superseded policy statement examined at our inquiry. In particular, the current guidance includes recommendations that:

- 6. The majority of listed buildings are adaptable and have met the needs of successive generations while retaining their character. Change should therefore be managed to protect a building's special interest while enabling it to remain in active use. Each case must be judged on its own merits, but in general terms, listing rarely prevents adaptation to modern requirements but ensures that work is done in a sensitive and informed manner.
- 8. Once lost, listed buildings cannot be replaced. They can be robbed of their special interest either by inappropriate alteration or by demolition. There is therefore a presumption against demolition or other works that adversely affect the special interest of a listed building or its setting.
- 9. Listed buildings will, however, like other buildings, require alteration and adaptation from time to time if they are to remain in beneficial use, and will be at risk if such alteration and adaptation is unduly constrained. In most cases such change, if approached carefully, can be managed without adversely affecting the special interest of the building.
- 10. Knowing what is important about a building is central to an understanding of how to protect its special interest. Applications should demonstrate that, in arriving at a strategy for intervention, the importance of the building has been clearly understood and those features which contribute to its special interest have been identified.
- 11. In general, the more extensive the intervention which is proposed, the more supporting information applications should provide. Where proposals involve significant intervention, evidence that less intrusive options have been considered should be provided. Where the application would have a significantly adverse effect on the building's special interest but is believed to offer significant benefits to economic growth or the wider community, applicants should prepare a statement which justifies the intervention in relation to these benefits. This statement should demonstrate that the benefits could not be realised without the intervention proposed.
- 14. Where a proposal involves alteration or adaptation which will sustain or enhance the beneficial use of the building and does not adversely affect the special interest of the building, consent should normally be granted.
- 15. Where a proposal involves alteration or adaptation which will have an adverse or significantly adverse impact on the special interest of the building, planning authorities, in reaching decisions, should consider carefully:
 - the relative importance of the special interest of the building;
 - the scale of the impact of the proposals on that special interest;
 - whether there are other options which would ensure a continuing beneficial use for the building with less impact on its special interest; and
 - whether there are significant benefits for economic growth or the wider community which justify a departure from the presumption against demolition or

other works that adversely affect the special interest of a listed building or its setting.

1.16 HES also publishes more detailed guidance on aspects of intervention in the historic environment in its Managing Change in the Historic Environment series. Of relevance here are those publications on [Setting](#); the [Use and Adaptation of Listed Buildings](#); and the [Demolition of Listed Buildings](#).

1.17 Good practice guidance: '[New Design in Historic Settings](#)' was published jointly by HES, Architecture and Design Scotland and the Scottish Government in 2010. Its stated purpose is to explore how good design in historic settings is achieved. It aims to set out an approach to design which will help to break down the design process into a series of steps involving interrogating, analysing and designing effective solutions that are appropriate for the specific context being considered. Its desired outcome is the high-quality design of new buildings and spaces in historic settings. One of its aims is to showcase good design in historic settings as a way of delivering key objectives, particularly the fundamental Scottish Government objective of sustainable economic development.

1.18 The New Design in Historic Settings guidance supports contemporary design responses, demonstrating an honesty and confidence in our modern architecture which will be valued by future generations, but cautioning against a modern building that disregards its setting. The guidance sets general principles for new design and then goes on to suggest a methodology to ensure the design fulfils those principles.

1.19 HES has published guidance on its [designation policy and selection guidance](#) for listed buildings, which includes criteria for assessing whether a building merits listing. The guidance includes a section on the importance of setting.

1.20 We have read and heard in our inquiry that the philosophy of conservation is relevant to our consideration of the issues. Constructive conservation aims to achieve a balance between sustaining heritage values whilst achieving viable solutions. This suggests that the integrity of a building may be compromised to secure its future and thereby preserve much of its special interest, provided that this understands or is founded on the significance of the listed building and its setting.

1.21 The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh was inscribed as a property on the UNESCO list of World Heritage Sites in 1995. This confirms that the site, because of its architecture, its homogeneity of place and its place in the landscape, is of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science.

1.22 The UK has signed up to obligations under the World Heritage Convention. In these particular cases, that means that the UK, and by virtue of devolution the Scottish Ministers, must endeavour in so far as possible to adopt a general policy to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes. The [Statement of Outstanding Universal Value](#) relating to that inscription includes that the site has adequate protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural properties. Buildings within the World Heritage Site and its special architectural and historic character and appearance are protected by the statutory list and the conservation area designations which cover it. On that understanding, the provisions of the Listed Building Act and the duties it places on decision-makers are deemed sufficient to comply with the obligations under the convention.

1.23 These duties are reinforced by the guidance within the local and national policy set out above. In particular, SPP expects planning decisions to protect and preserve the outstanding universal value of the site. The [management plan](#) for the World Heritage Site

also provides guidance on its protection. It includes that: ‘balancing the needs of the city to maintain its economic vibrancy and the need to protect the heritage is essential to both. The relationship between OUV and economic success needs to be protected, developed and celebrated.’ We have dealt with the balance of economic interest and listed building preservation in our report on the planning appeals for the appeal site.

1.24 Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 does not apply to consideration of an application for listed building consent. We note that the council’s reasons for refusal in each of the listed building appeals refer to relevant development plan policies. In our opinion, these policies add nothing of significance beyond the statutory duties, national policies and guidance set out above. However, an analysis of the relevant policies is contained in our parallel report on the planning appeals should Ministers wish to consider them in these cases.

CHAPTER 2 Description of the building and its surroundings

2.1 The appeal site is the former Royal High School of Edinburgh. The school moved to a new site in 1968, since when the building has had a variety of uses in parts and for different lengths of time. No settled re-use has been found.

2.2 The building was category A listed in 1966. The list includes the lodge, classroom block, retaining/ boundary walls, gateposts and railings. The list entry includes a description of these and a statement of special interest, which have informed our assessment below.

2.3 The building was built for the City of Edinburgh as a replacement building for an earlier High School. It was opened in 1829. The site was extensively remodelled to provide a platform for the building, including rock-blasting. A Greek revival building was placed prominently and largely symmetrically upon the platform, with elaborate steps, gates, walls and railings providing routes between the main building and Regent Road below, and with the backdrop of Calton Hill. Further description of the building is included under special interest in Chapter 3 below.

2.4 The building has been owned and maintained by the City Council. It is on the Buildings at Risk register, where the condition of the parts of the principal building is described as fair and the risk as low but where the lodge and gymnasium block are at higher risk because of the threat of demolition. The listed building is cared for by the council and has been largely closed down since 2010 to reduce running costs, although these remain high.

2.5 The building lies within the New Town Conservation Area of Edinburgh. Across the road to the south of the site is the Old Town Conservation Area. Descriptions of these can be found in the council's character appraisals for the [Old Town](#) and the [New Town](#).

2.6 The building is set on the southern slope of Calton Hill. This prominent Edinburgh landmark hill is included in the national inventory of Designed Gardens and Landscapes. Calton Hill has evolved as a special place in Edinburgh, containing the National Monument, Nelson's Monument and other notable structures. Together these form a place of monuments in a public open space, which offers an excellent viewpoint for appreciating the rest of the city in its wider setting.

2.7 The appeal site is located a little away from the twin hearts of the city but is prominently sited and sits within the dramatic views available from the well-visited Salisbury Crags and Arthur's Seat.

CHAPTER 3 Special interest of the listed building

3.1 The special interest of the listed building is not in doubt. That the building in its setting is of special interest is obvious to all and not in dispute between the parties to our examination. Aspects of significance have been known since before the listing process was established. The appellants have provided detailed historical research, which furthers our understanding, and which was not contradicted to any meaningful degree by other parties. The factual understanding provided does not conflict with that of the Ministers' own specialist advisors, Historic Environment Scotland. The listed building is clearly of national and international importance.

3.2 However, in assessing the proposed works, we find it useful to consider what is of the most significance in these cases and what is of lesser special interest.

Architectural interest

3.3 The statement of special interest attached to the list entry tells us that the former Royal High School is one of the finest examples of Greek Revival architecture in Scotland, designed by Thomas Hamilton, a leading Scottish architect of the early 19th century. Its unique and powerful combination of setting, massing and masterful use of classical architectural language cemented Edinburgh's reputation as the Athens of the North, and also alluded to the academic aspiration and achievement of both the school and Scotland as a nation.

3.4 Inspired by the dramatic setting, and the backdrop of the unfinished National Monument on the hill above (based on the Parthenon at the Acropolis in Athens), Hamilton created a monumental composition based on the temple (the Propylaeon at the Acropolis), the lesser temple (that of Unwinged Victory in relation to the Propylaeon) and the Stoa or market colonnade. In doing so he strongly reinforced the similarities between Calton Hill and the Acropolis, and thus between Edinburgh and classical Athens. The order of the central temple-style pavilion is based on the Temple of Theseus, illustrated in Stuart and Revett's *Antiquities of Athens*, published in 1794. The outer pavilions are loosely based on the monument of Thrasyllus.

3.5 The description goes on to explain that earlier drawings show that Hamilton had experimented with various details such as carved wreaths to the parapets of the outer pavilions, a sculpted tympanum to the central pediment, and oculus windows to the projecting basement of the central pavilion. A pair of statues representing distinguished literary characters associated with the school was to have been installed on the top of the projecting gateways in front of the central pavilion, but this never happened due to a lack of funds.

3.6 We also learn from the description that, aside from its aesthetic impact, the building is also highly successful for the way in which Hamilton solved the main disadvantage of the Greek Revival style, namely that of adapting a windowless Greek temple form to modern use. The central hall is lit by windows high on the wall of the main 'temple', providing cross lighting for the coffered ceiling and yet invisible from the front of the building. The Rector's room and Library are lit from above through octagonal clerestories.

3.7 The principal building on the site is the main school, erected between 1825 and 1829. There is no dispute that this is a unique example of Greek revival architecture and acknowledged to be one of the finest monuments of neo-classicism in Britain. It is designed to sit on a deliberately elevated platform and has a prominent position in the city. It was built to complement an ensemble of architectural monuments intended to display

Edinburgh's enlightenment credentials and its aspirations to be the Athens of the North. Although there are other prominent Greek revival buildings in Edinburgh and across Scotland, this must surely be the most important of them.

3.8 The building is in a pure Greek style derived from antiquity. Hamilton never travelled to Greece, but his work here is heavily influenced by those who went there, studied the remains of ancient Greek structures and brought back faithful drawings of them. Hamilton cleverly adapted the archetypes in producing a bespoke and original composition for the new school. The building is modelled on the propylaea of the Acropolis in the sense that it suggests movement up and though the site to the monuments on the hill above (although such movement was never physically possible). There is a central temple at the heart of the design, with a series of stairs and doorways connecting to Regent Road below. These features were more symbolic than useful. We heard that they were used mostly for the final exit of pupils on graduation.

3.9 The building is designed with a hierarchical approach to elevation and detail. The principal south-facing elevation is clearly the most important, but it should be understood on the basis of how it would be seen. Angled views from the south-east and south-west show how the sculptural form should be read in three dimensions. The elevations to the east and west are therefore integral to the presentation of the building on the site as are the angled pavilions at the lower road level. The north elevation is less monumental and more practical. Nevertheless, the form, materials and detail of construction on all sides are confident and of high quality.

3.10 The detailing of the principal building is consistent with the attention paid to the proportions and composition. It completed the Greek ethos of the architecture, faithfully reproducing the proportions of the ancient examples. There are many features of special architectural interest bound up in the extraordinary quality of the design.

3.11 We noted on our site inspections that the construction of the principal building is of the highest quality. Stonework and detail are constructed using the finest materials and highly skilled craftsmanship, particularly in the columns and entablatures of the prominent southern elevations. The astonishing level of skill evident in the precise cutting of the stonework is testament to the quality of the craftsmen at the time and the ambition of the architect. Despite gradual deterioration and some insensitive alterations, the outside of the building still conveys this sense of perfection. The principal building dominates the site. It is by far the most important part of the listed building.

3.12 The principal building was built with retaining and boundary walls, gateposts and railings. Playgrounds were laid out east and west of the main building. The rear retaining wall recognises the excavation on the site to form the platform for the building. This wall terminates in a belvedere at its easternmost end. The belvedere has been largely hidden from view by the later and extended gymnasium block. Exposing these features by removal of later structures would clearly be of some benefit to appreciating the site in its setting. We find that the boundary walls, belvedere and railings that were included when it was first built are of equal importance to the principal building.

3.13 Internally, the school was configured around the central hall within the temple building. Originally a series of interconnected rooms behind the columned arcades on either side gave access to classroom wings on upper and lower ground floor levels. This general arrangement persists, but over time significant changes have been made to the layout and fabric. In our view, the interior arrangement is an important part of the special interest of the principal building, but the fabric and detail is less so.

3.14 The listed building also includes the outbuildings within the site.

3.15 A gate lodge was added in 1885 (designed by Robert Wilson). This retains much of its original fabric. It is designed to be respectful in its simplified neoclassical style. Its small scale and location limit the impact on the principal building, although it impedes views from Waterloo Place to the rear and side of it. It is clearly part of the special interest of the listed building as a whole. However, it is of considerably less significance than the original building, gates, wall and belvedere, which form a coherent concept for the site.

3.16 A gymnasium was also added in 1885 to Wilson's design. This was later extended, and heavily compromised, by works of 1894. This building masks a part of the high retaining wall and belvedere, which were an integral part of the original design for the site. Although a part of the listing and of respectful design, we consider that the gymnasium block detracts from the integrity and setting of the principal building. It is of lesser significance in our view than the principal building and the gate lodge.

3.17 Further buildings were added to the grounds in the 20th century. There is no dispute from any party that these are of no particular merit and detract from the significance of the listed building and its setting.

3.18 In our view, the boundary walls, gateposts and railings are significant to the overall integrity of the listed building. The gate lodge is less significant to integrity but is an historic addition of architectural merit and in a prominent position. We have found that the gymnasium is of lesser significance, but is of historic interest and, taken with the gate lodge and other demolitions, contributes to a substantial loss of fabric, which should not be lost unless the tests set out by HES policy are met.

Historic Interest

3.19 The former Royal High School is closely linked with the Enlightenment in Edinburgh of the late 18th and early 19th century. It is a product of the politics, arts, science and culture of its time. As a temple to learning, it embodies as a work of art the egalitarian advances of an enlightened Edinburgh. We have already observed that the building has been a prominent part of the historic Calton Hill, as a place of monument and a focus for aspects of city life. It is a significant part of the story of Edinburgh and a cultural contribution to its historic development as a city. We therefore consider that this historic interest is an integral part of the special interest of the listed building. We consider that it is of equal importance to its architectural interest.

3.20 Although late in the Greek Revival compared to England, the building was an inspiration to others at home and abroad, including Alexander 'Greek' Thompson in Scotland and proponents of the Greek revival in American civic architecture.

3.21 Historical associations are not close. Although there are well-recorded connections with and to significant figures in the political life of the city, none as far as we can see are of significance to the desirability of preserving the building and would not justify a listing on their own. They do, however, colour the architectural and historical understanding of the building and must therefore add some weight to its significance overall.

3.22 The architect is undoubtedly of renown and of significant historic interest for his part in the development of Edinburgh. The fabric of the building is his doing and therefore reflects his standing as an architect. Whilst the building fabric is the principal legacy, the close historical association with the architect and his other works is also of some weight in the assessment of significance of the listed building.

3.23 As a magnificent edifice set purposefully on a prominent site in the nation's capital, Hamilton's intentions, as demonstrated by his watercolours and drawings, have been reproduced in historic painting and photography. Examples of these were presented to the

inquiry. Whilst these have been useful in our assessment of setting, we consider that they and their artists have more to say about the development of their own art forms and do not form part of the significance of the listed building itself.

3.24 The former school is more recently remembered in the context of the movement in support of Scottish Independence. It was chosen as the new assembly building and adapted in anticipation of the outcome of the devolution referendum in 1979. Although this later proved unsuitable for the parliament, the works have left their mark upon the fabric of the building, internally at least. Nevertheless, this has been at the expense of some of the original fabric and arrangement of the building. On balance, therefore, we consider that this use is not an historical association of great significance to the special interest of this listed building.

3.25 The main gates were for a time the scene of a vigil, lasting until devolution was eventually achieved in 1997 after a further referendum. This, however, is not reflected in the fabric of the building and is of little significance to the special interest in our view.

Authenticity

3.26 The building has been altered over time. As a school, new additions and alterations were made to adapt to the school's needs. These arose from the inflexibility of the building and the need to expand to meet the needs of a wider curriculum.

3.27 Since the school relocated in 1968, the building has had a number of short-term uses and other proposals for re-use. The main elements of the school and its principal elevations remain largely intact. This must partly be due to the inflexibility of the original design, itself reflecting the purity of purpose in that design.

3.28 The works of alteration in the 1970s were useful in helping to maintain the fabric of the building against the elements, but detrimental in terms of the loss of original fabric and alteration of original layouts. Alterations to the main hall to create a debating chamber are generally agreed to be unsympathetic to the character and special interest of the listed building. The works to create a new space in the undercroft to the main portico have also damaged the special interest of the interior of the building.

3.29 The school was designed with east and west playgrounds, resulting no doubt from the central position of the symmetrical main building. The original walls and railings were supplemented by planting on the slopes towards Regent Road, which would both frame the central building and mask the playgrounds behind. Later landscaping of the west playground and the profusion of street furniture have diluted the dramatic impact of the listed building to some extent.

Features of special architectural or historic interest

3.30 Since 1897, the school building has had a built-in armorial panel from an earlier school, dated 1578. This is a feature of special interest unrelated to the modern design of the building. Its retention or safe re-location is also of negligible significance to the cases before us. Apart from the undoubted qualities of the principal building set out above, we note no other features of special interest.

Summary of special interest

3.31 In summary, we find that the most significant elements are the principal building together with those elements of the boundary walls, belvedere and railings included when it was first built. Of equal importance, in our view, is the setting of these elements on the site and in the townscape of Edinburgh and surrounding landscape. We deal with this aspect of special interest in Chapter 4 below.

3.32 We note that there are other buildings of merit on the site, notably the Gate Lodge. Nevertheless, we consider that the historic fabric, the purity of the original design and the significance of the building in the history of Scotland suggest that these most significant features would be in an enhanced setting if the others were removed. In effect, we say that the principal building is of such significance to override the special interest in the building's later evolution.

3.33 We do not find that the elevations should be ranked in importance. All are of merit in their own context. Rather the transient views of the building in its three-dimensional form are key to its appreciation and its setting. The south elevation is the most visible across the landscape and represents the Greek influence in its purest form. Thus, we say that the oblique views of the south-west and south-east corners of the principal building are of greatest significance and the north-west and north-east views of only slightly lesser significance.

CHAPTER 4 Setting of the listed building

4.1 We devote a separate chapter to this aspect of the special interest of the listed building. It is the subject of much of the evidence before us, is a concern to the majority of those who submitted representations, and was subject to lengthy cross-examination at the inquiry sessions, both in terms of its landscape setting and the visual impacts of the proposed extensions.

4.2 The former Royal High School is set deliberately and boldly on a prominent site in the capital city. Edinburgh city centre is a celebrated architectural, urban and historical place of international repute. It is recognised locally, nationally and internationally for its special cityscape. The following sections set out some of the designations which recognise the characteristics which define the setting of the building.

4.3 Of equal significance to the principal building, in our view, is its setting on the site and in the townscape of Edinburgh and its surrounding landscape. Eighteenth and nineteenth century evolution in landscape design and the concept of *rus-in-urbe* (the countryside in the town) are key to understanding the setting of the former Royal High School. The Picturesque movement broadly relies on designing landscape beauty from landscape painting. The sublime, a feeling of awe from the supremacy of nature, is an aspect of this. In general terms, the dramatic setting is used to advantage by the designer. We listened with great interest to the evidence on these matters. There can be no doubt that the setting of the building as accepted and modified by Hamilton was significantly influenced by the prevailing ideas of landscape design.

4.4 The embracing of Calton Hill by the city came about during the 18th century, seemingly encouraged by the laying-out of the first New Town and the North Bridge. It became at first a place of leisure with circular walkways for health and recreation of citizens as well as the admirable views of the city afforded to visitors. Buildings followed: the observatory; then the Bridewell jail, both in the late 18th century. The Bridewell stood where St Andrew's house now stands. The Nelson Monument followed in 1816, just off-axis from Princes Street, but nevertheless terminating the vista from the New Town. Thereafter a series of classically inspired buildings were erected. The new observatory was started in 1818, the National Monument around 1827 and the monuments to Burns and Dugald Stewart around 1830. These structures and their setting on the hill were inspired by the early 19th century fervour for classical antiquity as experienced in the archaeological books and the classical paintings of those who visited Greece at the time. Landscape paintings increased interest of the Picturesque and Sublime at the time of the Enlightenment in Edinburgh.

4.5 Edinburgh bestowed upon itself the title of the Athens of the North in a spirit of romanticism which found expression in the Neo-Classical and Neo-Gothic architecture, and their Picturesque and Sublime landscape settings. This expression on and around Calton Hill is largely down to the vision of William Stark and his ideas on the Picturesque principles of planning and his pioneering use of the Greek Revival style. He advocated studying the topography to ensure that the proposed design would work naturally with the contours and for retaining trees as a foil to the architecture.

4.6 In turn, Stark's proposals for extending the New Town were taken up by his former pupil, William H Playfair, not least in his layouts for Regent Terrace and Royal Terrace. Regent Terrace was begun at the time the plans for the Royal High School were being drawn up.

4.7 The approach to Calton Hill from the New Town was built as an extension of Princes Street rising up through Waterloo Place over the Regent Bridge. From there a serpentine road connected the head of Waterloo Place to Regent Road, the new London road.

4.8 The Royal High School was built around 1829. The building is designed with its most detailed and purist Greek revival architecture facing south. This is where it is most exposed to view, particularly in views from Salisbury Crags and other viewpoints in the wider landscape and townscape. It is clear to us, however, that the three-dimensional form has been beautifully conceived, such that the grandeur of the building is most appreciated in oblique views from near and far. Thus, the significance of the setting also includes views along Waterloo Place as it turns and becomes Regent Road. The hierarchy of architectural detail, with its subtle shift from the austere temple to the windowed wings and pavilions, is important to the setting of the building. It affords a clear understanding of the functional concept of the school's design. It also exalts the three-dimensional beauty of the building. This relies on the deliberate setting of the building so that the oblique views can be appreciated.

4.9 Calton Hill is its principal setting. Here sit some of the most important and visible monuments of the city. By setting a neo-classical temple on the side of this hill, Hamilton has matched his design to this prominent, monumental setting. The setting of the building must also include the city centre as a whole because of the significance and visibility of Calton Hill. It also extends further into the landscape at Holyrood, Arthur's Seat and Salisbury Crags, where the intervisibility of monument and rugged landscape relates directly to the choice of site and the design of the building. These factors raise the special interest of the setting to a highly significant part of the special interest of the listed building as a whole. In our view, the setting of the listed building is as significant as the building itself.

CHAPTER 5 The New Town Conservation Area

5.1 The New Town Conservation Area covers an area almost four kilometres by two kilometres. It is centred on James Craig's original New Town layout of the late eighteenth century and extends to encompass successive developments up to the late nineteenth century. It is an outstanding concentration of planned ensembles of ashlar-faced, neo-classical buildings associated with internationally renowned architects. It is of great significance for its architectural, urban planning and historic interest. We consider that this is essentially the character and appearance of the conservation area, both of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. We note that the conservation area includes sites and buildings which do not form part of its special interest, including some incongruous modern insertions. These are not part of the special character which should be preserved or enhanced.

5.2 The council's conservation area character appraisal of 2017 says that its purpose is to help manage change and that it provides an agreed basis of understanding of what makes the area special. It draws attention to Planning Advice Note PAN 71, which includes that physical change in conservation areas does not necessarily need to replicate its surroundings, but should ensure that all new development respects, enhances and has a positive impact on the area.

5.3 Of particular relevance in this case is the appraisal of Calton Hill, the most prominent natural landmark within the area, and which forms a dramatic punctuation to the east of the area. This recognises the impact of the bridge over Calton Valley and Waterloo Place, which provided a grand entrance to the city and an opportunity to develop the hill. As part of a Picturesque plan for the area, the hilltop was retained as public open space. With informal planting and new streets, the hillsides gave opportunity for sweeping panoramas and important point vistas. Into this commanding setting, Hamilton introduced the Royal High School, which sits on the hill with the monuments constructed around the same time. This distinguished collection embellishes the Calton skyline and is a major contributor to the architectural and historic interest of the conservation area and Edinburgh's World heritage Site. The hill is surrounded by neo-classical terraces to the north and south, with Regent Gardens between them, and by Leith Street to the north-west. Other significant features are St Andrew's House, constructed in 1936 in a monumental Art Deco style, and the Old Calton burial ground, somewhat older.

5.4 The area immediately around the appeal site is not attributed any significant vistas or panoramas in the appraisal, but the hilltop is noted as a focal point. Monuments make a significant contribution to the historic and architectural character of the area.

5.5 The conservation area appraisal of 2017 gives a great deal of advice in relation to the streets and buildings of the bulk of the New Town, but little in relation to the appeal site and the monuments around Calton Hill. In general terms, it supports good, contemporary design that is sympathetic to the context and expects extensions to be sensitive to the existing building and in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. It adds that extensions should be subservient to the building, of an appropriate scale, use appropriate materials and should normally be located on the rear elevations of a property.

CHAPTER 6 Other considerations

6.1 The Old Town Conservation Area is centred on the spine of the hill which tails down from the steep outcrop of rock at Edinburgh Castle in the west to the Palace of Holyrood to the east. It borders the New Town Conservation Area to the north and is also a large part of the World Heritage Site.

6.2 Edinburgh's old and new towns are well known for their clear topographical distinction, which accentuates a significant period of expansion of the city and a dramatic change in urban planning. This is recognised in the two conservation areas which cover the city centre. The proposed development is not within the Old Town and we have no duty to consider whether the character or appearance of that area would be preserved or enhanced by the proposed development.

6.3 Nevertheless, the proposed development would be clearly visible from parts of the Old Town and in key views which contribute to and enhance its special interest. The character appraisal for the Old Town Conservation Area recognises its setting and views in and out of the area. These include views from Arthur's Seat and Salisbury Crags across the Old Town to Calton Hill. We therefore consider that the impact of the proposals on other parts of the city is a consideration of some significance, consistent with SPP. The council's character appraisal for the area includes that proposals outside of the area should not erode the character and appearance of the Old Town. We therefore consider that the character and appearance of the Old Town is a consideration of some weight.

The council's efforts to find use for the building

6.4 The appellants' scheme derives from a competitive bidding process. The appellants would not expect that a successful bid to be the preferred developer for the site would necessarily lead to listed building consent being granted.

6.5 Furthermore, the appellants have contracted with the council as a result of that successful bid and now have an exclusive right to develop the site. We have assessed the proposals on their merits having regard to the requirements of the listed building Act and have given no weight to the appellants' relationship to the City of Edinburgh Council.

Alternative proposals

6.6 In December 2015, between refusal of the appellants' first scheme and their second scheme, the Royal High School Preservation Trust applied for planning permission and listed building consent to redevelop the listed building and its site as a music school. The Trust is unable to implement its proposals because the appellants have effective control of the site. The appellants therefore submit that with no prospect of the Trust's scheme going forward at this time, it is not relevant for the determination of the appeals.

6.7 The appellants also cast doubt on the funding and commitment of the RHSPT and refer to unresolved issues with the permission and consent for their proposal. We consider that these are concerns that do not fundamentally affect an assessment of the merits of the appellants' scheme.

6.8 The recommended test at paragraph 15 of the HES interim guidance asks whether there are other options which would ensure a continuing beneficial use of the building with less impact on its special interest. The use of the conditional 'would' indicates a consequence of a changed situation. Put simply, an option which would have less impact if it were developed instead. If the advice had intended that it is only an option if the owner of the site chose it, that could circumvent the intention of the advice. In effect, an owner could

refuse to entertain other proposals because of personal or commercial preference. We therefore consider that the test should be read more broadly. An alternative proposal can be considered an option if it is shown to be viable, technically feasible and has (or would be likely to get) consent.

6.9 The stewardship of a listed building carries with it the likelihood of restrictions as to the works that may be carried out and a responsibility towards the preservation of the building, its setting and special features. The justification for demolishing or altering a listed building which would result in harm to special interest or setting must be compelling. Policy advice contemplates that all possibilities are considered to minimise the harm. That would be consistent with other HES interim guidance, particularly the Managing Change guidance on use and adaptation, which says that demolition is a last resort when every other option has been explored and the Managing Change guidance on demolition, which includes that marketing the building is necessary to demonstrate that every effort has been made to secure a buyer who would retain the building. These contemplate the possibility of another owner restoring the building.

6.10 The Act further allows that a building in need of repair can be compulsorily purchased following service of a repairs notice. Although these examples are not directly applicable in the cases before us, listed building law and policy clearly suggest to us that if there would be harm, the authority must consider whether an alternative proposal would cause less harm, irrespective of ownership and control of the listed building.

Other examples

6.11 The appellants give several examples of new building within an historic context and in particular within the setting of listed buildings. We were also shown examples of historic buildings where new work had been inserted into the old. We note here that none of these examples can so closely be compared that they amount to a precedent for what is proposed in this case. However, the examples show that there can be no objection to the principle of modern architecture, either as an extension to a listed building or as a new building in an historic context. They also show that dramatic interventions into the structure and fabric of listed buildings can be a successful way to bring a listed building back to life or to keep it in use.

6.12 Further examples of new design in an historic context were provided in the HES publications we have referred to already. These reinforce the ability of new design to complement the character and setting of listed buildings and historic areas. They also reflect the thrust of HES policy that change in the historic environment needs to be managed rather than prevented.

PART 2 LBA-230-2076 – Scheme 1

CHAPTER 7 Introduction and background

Proposed Use

7.1 The proposed use would be an hotel. This would involve alterations to the existing building and its grounds and two large extensions. The proposed works are shown on the application drawings, which show a site plan, building plans at each level, and elevations of the site and buildings. These are shown as existing and as proposed. Photographs of the existing buildings were also submitted as plans. A set of demolition plans was submitted. These show the proposed demolition of outbuildings and the removal of parts of the existing building to make way for the proposed conversion and extensions. Proposed sections and visualisations were submitted to illustrate the proposals in their context. The proposed alterations and extensions to the listed building were shown in a set of detailed plans, sections, elevations and visualisations. Landscape proposals were shown on a further set of plans. A schedule of the application plans is attached at Appendix 9.

Summary of proposed works

7.2 Total demolition of some of the buildings within the overall site is proposed. The former lodge, gymnasium block, classroom block and luncheon hall would be entirely removed, together with the entrance gates and piers. The remaining listed structures would be repaired and brought into good condition.

7.3 There would be substantial alterations to the remaining buildings, the retaining walls, boundary walls, gateposts and railings. The main building on the site would be altered internally and externally. Two extensions would be built, one on each side of the main building, largely over the east and west playgrounds of the former school.

7.4 The proposed extensions would be positioned to ensure a clear separation from the original building. The new hotel floors would be stepped back from the principal building, on plan and in elevation. They would be higher than the existing. The architects' intention is to mimic geological strata and rock outcrops as a reference to the Picturesque setting. The structure would be clad with a faceted, dark brown, pre-patinated copper cladding and plain glass windows.

7.5 Symmetry would be maintained by having broadly similar wings, although they would be different in response to their location. The east wing would be aligned with, but step back from the building line of Regent Terrace. The west wing would be larger and form a round corner at the sweeping bends of Regent Road. The architects' intention here is to have a bold curve; at once to open views and to avoid being overwhelmed by the hill and by St Andrew's House.

7.6 The west wing would be set away from the retaining wall and, with the lodge demolished, views would be opened to the central temple of the principal building.

7.7 The roofscapes of the new wings would be visible from certain viewpoints on the hill behind. They have been designed to be planted to complement the existing setting.

7.8 The hotel entrance door, where vehicular drop-off of guests would take place, would be at the rear of the principal building, with glazed corridors between the central temple and the extensions. There would then be a secondary vehicular drop-off point on Regent Road adjacent to the new west wing of the hotel. This location would allow the lower ground floor

ballroom and conference facilities to be accessed discretely from the main hotel entrance, allowing flexibility and the opportunity for the whole lower level of the west wing to be used for public and private events without impacting on the daily workings of the hotel. The lobby area serving the ballroom affords access onto one of the south-facing front terraces and it is this terrace that is also served by Hamilton's original Regent Road entrance stair sequence.

7.9 Proposed refurbishment and re-lighting of the gates and stairs themselves would allow guests and visitors to access the front terraces of the hotel from Regent Road and then enter the hotel itself via original Hamilton doorways under the imposing central portico. The lower-level lobby of the hotel accessed off the terraces would be provided with a lift and stair up to the central reception hall above. Visitors could continue on their way up Calton Hill via a new external staircase accessing the hill's approach road to the rear of the hotel.

7.10 Service vehicle and staff access to the building would be in the south-east corner of the site onto Regent Road, leading to new basement service and delivery areas excavated under the east playground.

Condition

7.11 The building is in a relatively stable condition. Roof voids are dry and with little sign of rot although dry rot has been found and addressed in the stairwell at the east wing. The façade is in good condition, although some remedial work is required to pointing and some walls are disfigured by evidence of graffiti-cleaning. There is some plant growth which could lead to damage. There are structural cracks around the lower levels towards Regent Road on the front boundary walls. Repointing is required to the retaining wall adjacent to the north boundary.

7.12 The building is on the HES register of buildings at risk but is currently graded as low risk overall. Although not in much use, the listed building is being maintained by the City of Edinburgh Council.

7.13 Efforts to find an alternative new use have been made over several decades, with little long-term success.

CHAPTER 8 The cases for the parties

Main points for the appellants

The proposed design

8.1 The proposed development has been designed with extreme care to respect the siting and design of the principal building on the site. The form and appearance of what will be placed on the site in relation to the listed building has been carefully considered whilst at the same time providing the accommodation required to secure a viable new use for the listed building. The new design is informed by the careful study and analysis of the nature, form and history of the listed building in its specific location. The hotel bedroom wings are designed to be seen and to provide a new strong backdrop to the principal listed building on the site. They would appear as inhabited 'knowes', chiming with Hamilton's own depiction and acceptance of the rugged setting of his design as a craggy (sublime) contrast to his perfect classical forms. The colour and texture of the materials are chosen so that the new extensions would be recessive and blend in with the surroundings. They would not replicate the principal building, but keep it as the focus, allowing itself to dominate. The ability to appreciate the original building and its design concept in its setting would not be diminished.

8.2 The listed building would be diminished by sandstone additions, but that does not mean that no new building is acceptable. In this proposal, the architects have provided a carefully considered, sophisticated architectural response where the proposed extensions have been set away from the main building and provide additional context to the setting. The design is intended to be visually recessive and subservient, which would integrate skilfully with the existing topography of the area and mature well. The extensions would reflect the topographical context, the rugged hillside, where Hamilton set his masterpiece.

8.3 The guidance published by HES, Architecture + Design Scotland and Scottish Government: 'New design in historic places', seeks to ensure that the quality of new design matches that of its surroundings. It sets out how good design by talented architects can enhance sensitive heritage buildings and settings. The appellants have followed this guidance and responded directly to the principles set out in this document. The appellants' assessment concludes that the setting of the building would be enhanced by the high quality and innovative design of the proposed.

8.4 The proposed works would provide for the complete restoration of the principal building.

8.5 The principal building is already compromised in its setting by St Andrew's House, while the extended gymnasium block appears to coalesce with Regent Terrace to the east. The symmetry and clarity of the original design has become somewhat lost by the clutter of additional buildings of differing scale and lesser quality. These have had a detrimental impact on the setting of the principal building. The proposed works would remove these. In their place would be carefully considered new buildings in a confident, contemporary architectural language which would reinstate the Hamilton building as the focus within the site. Notionally symmetrical, they would respond to the site in a balanced way.

8.6 The appellants say that the impacts of the proposed scheme would not be significantly adverse and that the works therefore would comply with HES policy and guidance. The imaginative design minimises the potential harm to the special interest of the building and its setting.

8.7 In particular, the proposal has been designed to minimise the impacts on the fabric of the original Hamilton building. The profile of the extensions and their impacts on the setting of the principal school building in its playgrounds are greater as a consequence. The impact on setting is then mitigated by the high quality of the architecture of the extensions. The architects have designed an honest and confident modern architectural response to development within the setting of the former Royal High School. The extensive research and analysis carried out by the appellants' team has informed the design of the new proposals. This was not recognised by the council in assessing the applications.

8.8 The loss of the outbuildings would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposed works.

8.9 The innovative and sustainable design would reinvigorate this long-neglected site by night and day. It would become a positive destination at the threshold between city and country and a memorable place once again.

Setting

8.10 The value of the setting is what, and to what degree, it contributes to the special interest of the listed building. This will not be fixed for all time because the surroundings will change over time and because new information may alter what might previously have been understood to comprise the setting and its significance to the listed building.

8.11 The relationship between the principal building on the site and the monuments on Calton Hill, the National Monument in particular, is of great importance to appreciation of the building in its setting. This would not be adversely affected. This is a landmark building on the southern slope of Calton Hill.

8.12 The appellants say that the conservation and setting of the principal building would be enhanced by the demolition of other buildings within the site. Through their in-depth studies and robust assessments, they find no impacts to be significantly adverse in respect of either the setting or the special interest of the principal listed building. Some are of no special interest. The special interest of the gate lodge has been consistently overstated.

8.13 The setting includes the monuments on Calton Hill and St Andrew's House, which is recognised in the Calton Hill Conservation Plan (CD481) as a distinguished addition, where the sublime manner in which it responds to the magnificent site adds greatly to the importance of the composition of the hill. If the appeal scheme is regarded as distinguished and the setting can be enhanced by removal of less important and detrimental buildings, then it too may enhance the sublime experience.

8.14 The proposed development would equally have no adverse impact on the setting of other listed buildings or the ability to understand and appreciate them or their relationship to each other.

At risk

8.15 The appellants say that the building has had no long-term occupier since 1968 when the high school left. It is on the register of Buildings at Risk where the entry covers all five buildings on the site. The appellants say that is wholly inappropriate and a national embarrassment or disgrace. They say that this should add considerable weight to granting consent.

8.16 The appellants say that consent should be granted along with the planning permissions to bring an end to the vacancy and increasing dereliction of one of Scotland's most important buildings. Hotel use would make good use of the existing fabric and is a good use of a listed building where some compromise is essential to allow a viable scheme

to secure a long-term future for the building, whilst providing public access and re-integrating the building into the daily life of the city.

Conservation Area

8.17 The appellants have evaluated impacts on the conservation area. Viewpoint analysis shows that no harm would be caused to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Outstanding universal value of the WHS

8.18 The appellants have carried out a proper assessment of the impacts on the WHS based on good practice and using skilled professionals. A Heritage Impact Assessment was undertaken in accordance with recommended practice for major developments. None of the views considered was deemed to be in the category of major adverse and on balance, the impact on the World Heritage Site was predicted to be of minor negligible benefit in respect of the most important views. No lasting damage would be caused to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site. Where an adverse effect is noted, it falls short of the magnitude that would threaten the World Heritage status.

8.19 The appellants point to the challenge of an evolving city where so much must be preserved. According to the current [management plan for the WHS](#): 'Balancing the needs of the city to maintain its economic vibrancy and the need to protect the heritage is essential to both. The relationship between OUV and economic success needs to be protected, developed and celebrated.'

8.20 The appellants' Heritage Impact Assessment [Part 1 – Understanding the Site](#); [Part 2 – Evaluation of Legislation and Policy Guidance](#); [Part 3 – Heritage Impact Assessment](#); and in the Heritage Statement [Addendum to Part 3](#) identifies the direct impacts on the setting and special interest of the listed building. It demonstrates a range of impacts from moderate/ minor adverse to moderate beneficial, and with an overall impact of beneficial. The methodology derived from ICOMOS guidelines objectively considers the impact on the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site from every important viewpoint. The analysis of this supports the conclusion of beneficial impact.

Alternative schemes

8.21 Listed building consent and planning permission has been granted for an alternative scheme, as submitted by the RHSPT and with the intended occupation by St Mary's Music School. In the view of the appellants, this does not provide an option with less harm to the listed building. The appellants recognise that not developing the playground to the west would meet the objectives of the council and Historic Environment Scotland. However, greater harm would be caused in several respects.

8.22 Firstly, the introduction of a main entrance into the main portico facing Regent Road would be a travesty of the original design intentions and would fail to appreciate what is significant about the site. It would be visible in important views of the building. The upper set of railings and gates are essential components of the design, emphasising its horizontality. These would be lost.

8.23 Secondly, little survives of the original internal fabric due to extensive alterations in the 1970s. Despite this, the area below the portico is a series of spaces where original fabric can be experienced. This is unique on the site. The extensive work to hollow out an entrance foyer so deep into the plan would add to the risks to the historic fabric which the appeal scheme seeks to avoid.

8.24 Thirdly, the positioning of accommodation to the north is a flawed concept. Although this had been considered in an earlier schemes for the site and is where additional accommodation has been provided in the past, Hamilton's concept was to have a clear and rational access from the west end of the site and the access on the northern side. He deliberately resisted an imposing new access on Regent Road. Introducing one now would confuse the clarity of the layout. Hamilton set his 'temple' at the highest point of the site, as far forward from the rear retaining wall as the site allowed. Further, the rear elevation is the main entrance to the Hamilton building. It should not be sacrificed to a location for new development.

8.25 Lastly, the new accommodation required for that scheme is considerable and would require greater alteration to the principal building than the appeal scheme. Although intended to be recessive, it would be readily apparent, particularly in close views, detracting from Hamilton's masterpiece. The design also derives its architectural language from the Hamilton building: octagonal pavilions from the octagonal rooms laid out asymmetrically and expressed with simplified classical details and modern materials, and a natural stone that would weather differently from the original Craigleith sandstone.

8.26 The appellants recognise that the Gate Lodge of 1885 is part of the listed building and of some architectural and historic merit. The RHSPT scheme would preserve it. However, that would not be a major conservation benefit. Its special interest has been overstated by objectors to the appeal proposal and a case for its removal was considered in the [conservation plan of 2004](#). Further, the removal of original structure within the principal building as a result of the RHSPT scheme would be greater than the loss of fabric at the Gate Lodge.

8.27 The appellants also say that the Preservation Trust scheme would expose the upper parts of the rear retaining wall and belvedere where they are currently obscured and mainly in long and elevated views. However, these would be crowded at the base by new accommodation and obscured by mature trees for much of the time. The visual separation of the rear wall and belvedere from the principal building would be an adverse impact.

8.28 Overall, the appellants do not consider that the RHSPT scheme would have less impact on the special interest of the listed building.

8.29 The appellants say that the RHSPT scheme does not meet the requirements of the HESPS test at paragraph 3.47(c). The Trust has no legal control over the site, nor any certainty that they ever could have. There is no certainty to their funding or that the proposed school would provide a continuing beneficial use. The proposal would leave no room for further expansion. The Scottish Government may not grant consent to relocate the school under the St Mary's Music School (Aided Places) (Scotland) Regulations 2015.

8.30 In summary, the Music School scheme is not an option; it would not ensure a continuing beneficial use of the building; and it would not have less impact on the special interest of the listed building.

8.31 The alternative scheme proposed by the appellants (Scheme 2) is also an option for the site which could as readily be developed. The appellants say that this scheme has responded to the reasons for refusal at Scheme 1 and its reduced physical form would have a less harmful impact on the listed building. However, scheme 1 has greater architectural ambition at the point of arrival at the site, which would enhance the potential to animate the spaces that are created around the building and more effectively enhance the public realm.

The competitive bidding process and its effect on design

8.32 The developer competition in 2009 required a commercially sustainable proposal for the property. The appellants say that the design stems from the competitive bid for the site. The competition-winning design envisaged wings as extensions to the principal building.

Other examples

8.33 The appellants note the examples of new design in historic places found in the [guidance of HES](#) and others. They also refer to two buildings which they say are high quality, innovative designs that are based on similar general principles and are pertinent to understanding the potential of the appeal scheme. They demonstrate the exceptional architectural quality and great design vision of the architects in this case. Both are set within sensitive heritage and urban contexts and are unashamedly modern and confident.

8.34 The first example is the award-winning Blavatnik School of Government at Oxford, which has a stepped curvilinear form placed into a conservation area and has two listed neo-classical buildings for neighbours. To one side is the former church of St Paul, built in 1936 with a portico in the classical Ionic order. Opposite is the University Printing House which has two wings joined by a screen with a central monumental entrance in the classical Corinthian order. This building is contemporary with the former Royal High School. The relevance to this appeal case is that a considered design response to a specific site can be a successful addition to a highly sensitive heritage site.

8.35 The second example is the Bloomberg European HQ in the City of London, which demonstrates the use of bronze pre-patinated sculptural fins. These allow the otherwise large expanses of glass to fit into the historic context. That context includes the listed church of St Stephen Walbrook by Sir Christopher Wren – the Bank of England and a conservation area.

8.36 In both these cases, the buildings have left their historic settings unharmed. Arguably they have enhanced them. The appeal scheme has likewise responded to the special topography and the effects on views. It would have a minimal effect on the listed building. It would preserve its setting and potentially enhance its context.

In summary

8.37 The appellants say that a luxury hotel is needed and beneficial to the economy; the building would be restored with minimal intervention and brought back into use; the rear retaining wall and belvedere would be exposed and celebrated; the setting would be improved because the new building would reinforce how Hamilton intended his building to be seen. This approach says that the restoration is so desirable and the design so exemplary, that the impact overall would be beneficial.

Main points for the council

8.38 The appeal scheme would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area, thereby conflicting with sections 14(2) and 64(1) of the listed building Act. There is no exceptional case which would justify overriding that presumption on the basis that the hotel would be desirable on the ground of the economic benefit it would bring or the lack of other options to bring the building back into use with less harm.

Other options

8.39 Scheme 1 is clearly preferable from an operational point of view because there would be a link at lower ground floor between the bedroom wings, which would also give

access to the lower ground terrace areas. Scheme 1 may also be more economically sustainable.

8.40 Scheme 2 is clearly preferable in that the impact on the physical form and setting of the principal listed building would be less.

8.41 The Trust's scheme has the benefit of planning permission and listed building consent. It cannot proceed because of the contractual relationship between the council and a third party. The long stop date for obtaining permission and consent for the appeal proposal in that agreement could be as late as 31 December 2021. That would have passed before the expiry of the consent for the Trust's music school proposal, which would be seven years after 27 February 2017, that is in 2024.

8.42 Funding for the music school scheme is secured and not subject to macroeconomic factors; it is privately funded and with a clearly defined user. The Trust's scheme is therefore an 'other option' for the purposes of HES interim guidance. Given that HES did not object to that proposal, it is not difficult to conclude that it would also have less impact on the listed building.

8.43 Scheme 2 for the hotel would have less impact than Scheme 1.

Main points for Historic Environment Scotland

8.44 The former Royal High School is one of the most important listed buildings in Scotland and of international significance for its architecture and setting. This is not in dispute. It includes the outbuildings by Hamilton and others, which contribute to our understanding of the site.

Special interest

8.45 The building represents an expression of Picturesque ideals as understood at the time of its construction, a deliberate neo-classical, monumental composition in a setting described as 'rus in urbe' – the country within the town. It also represents the aspirations of Scottish identity at the time it was built by comparison with Greek civilisation as then understood and as exemplified by the Acropolis in Athens. The Hamilton building serves as a symbolic Propylaea to the National Monument as Parthenon atop Calton Hill. There is no physical gateway, but a threshold to higher elevations can be imagined. This increases the sensitivity and significance of the site and the potential for adverse effects from large bedroom extension wings on the listed building and the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site.

8.46 The building is intended to be seen in the round. The evidence of Hamilton's perspective watercolour illustrates his appropriation of the view espoused by Stark, that 'public buildings break upon the eye at the most favourable point of view, showing at once a flank and a front'. The main approach to the building is from the west and the school main entrance was always to the north. The building was intended to be seen from the west, even accepting a proposal by Hamilton to site a Burns monument on Miller's Knowe. In any event, the monument was placed elsewhere and the knowe has been removed. Even when the jail existed on the site of St Andrew's House, the north-west of the principal Hamilton building would have been experienced on the journey eastwards towards the school. Later Hamilton buildings did not obscure the west elevation. The views from the west to the rear elevation are of lesser importance and are partly obscured by the historic Gate Lodge.

8.47 The building has a strong sense of monumentality. This comes from the prominent positioning on an artificial ledge with built sub-substructure; classically derived architecture;

juxtaposition with the rugged setting of Calton Hill; relationship with the monuments on the hill; the absence of large buildings which would compete for prominence on the site; and the incorporation of delicate pavilions to frame the main building, emphasising its relative scale and mass.

Demolition of outbuildings

8.48 The canteen and classroom blocks are agreed to form no part of the special interest of the listed building and their removal would benefit the setting of the remainder. The Gate Lodge is of special interest in its own right. The Gymnasium is also of some special interest.

8.49 Without an acceptable scheme for the re-use of the former Royal High School, demolition of the Gate Lodge and Gymnasium building is not justified.

Setting

8.50 Setting in this case is a critical factor in the special interest of the listed building. The principal relationship is with Calton Hill. The surroundings and context of the setting contribute significantly to our ability to appreciate and understand the Hamilton building, not least due to the minimal change that has occurred over two centuries.

8.51 The principal building is a prominent and dominant feature within the landscape, set spectacularly on an elevated position against the backdrop of Calton Hill, the most conspicuous feature of the New Town. It contributes to its surroundings as a nationally important architectural feature and as a component of a landscape-inspired addition to the first New Town.

8.52 The building was set to be prominent in views from the Old Town to the south and west, as well as from close by on Regent Road. It should be viewed in the round. Any interventions should not harm the immediate setting. The careful accumulation of architectural elements when viewed on the approach from Waterloo Place rely on the open setting of the Hamilton building. This open setting also ensures adequate light and views from the building, particularly the classrooms in the east and west façades and in views from the playgrounds. The notion of framing views with the new extension has no benefit. Hamilton's temple is already framed by the original wings and pavilions.

8.53 The proposed would form an urbanised wall of development between Regent Terrace and St Andrew's House, reducing the sense of rus-in-urbe of the existing. That would reduce the internationally renowned standalone masterpiece to a structure within a wider whole, encapsulated as a piece of streetscape.

8.54 The scale, size and height of the proposed bedroom wings would dominate the building to such an extent that they would fundamentally change our current understanding and appreciation of the Hamilton building on its carefully composed site. They would build over the majority of the original playgrounds, each with a footprint larger than the principal building. The open backdrop separating the Hamilton building from development to the east and west would be infilled. The buildings would be taller than the original and dominate it by their size, prominence and height, reducing the monumental classical building to a secondary element confined within a new composition. Too much development is proposed for this sensitive site.

8.55 The setting necessarily includes the later additions by others, and these contribute to our understanding of the site and listed building. Their loss may be balanced against the increased understanding and appreciation of the principal building.

8.56 The belvedere and rear retaining wall would be further exposed by the proposed works. This would be a benefit in that they are a part of the original building and designed by Hamilton as elements of the architectural conception for the site. Some weight should be attached to this as an improvement on the setting of the principal building. However, that would not begin to compare with the adverse effects of the proposed extensions on other aspects of the setting of the listed building.

The proposed extensions

8.57 Such is the importance of Hamilton's masterpiece that redevelopment should ideally not include any new substantive buildings that might compete with it. HES accepts that high quality contemporary architecture can be appropriate in historic settings, but, in this case, the scale, height, massing and siting would be unacceptable, regardless of style or material.

8.58 The scale of the proposed extensions is justified by the appellants on the grounds that it would be the level of accommodation required to deliver a functionally and financially stable hotel. The architectural response may have been considered and sophisticated but that does not necessarily make it successful.

8.59 There would be a discordant contrast between the materials of the existing building and those of the extension. That would be exacerbated by floor to ceiling glazing, with the potential for reflection of light by day and internal illumination at night.

8.60 The impact of the proposed works on the setting of the listed building would be permanent and irreversible.

8.61 In terms of the HES guidance on extensions to listed buildings, the proposed extensions would not protect the character and appearance of the listed building; they would not be subordinate in height, scale or form; they would read as a continuation of the front façade; and the materials used would inevitably 'signpost' the extensions, drawing the eye from the Hamilton building, which would lose its primacy on the carefully designed and assembled site. This does not support a case for departing from the presumption against the works set out in paragraph 3.38 of the HES policy statement.

The music school scheme

8.62 HES considers that the music school scheme would have far less impact than the appeal proposals. It would involve greater interventions in the fabric of the building, particularly opening up the screening wall below the portico and internal works to create a new public entrance and foyer. However, the appeal scheme would involve interventions into the building, radical changes to the interior and significant works at basement level, including substantial excavation within the former playgrounds.

8.63 In terms of setting, the music school scheme would retain the gate lodge, would not involve building on the western playground and would be set at a much lower elevation on the eastern playground. It would thus have a much lesser impact. Each of the important side elevations would remain visible from within and without the site.

Other listed buildings

8.64 There are several important listed buildings within the setting of the former Royal High School, whose settings would also be affected by the proposed development. These are St Andrew's House, Regent Terrace, the National Monument and Nelson's Monument. Each is category A listed. In particular the extensions would impinge on the setting and views of Nelson's Monument in short views such as Regent Road and middle-distance views such as Canongate Kirkyard. The settled pattern of 19th century architecture would

be disrupted by the contemporary appearance of the extension wings – by turns dark and brooding in subdued light conditions and assertive and contrasting in bright light. Either way, the effect would be to draw the eye away from the National Monument and diminish the special relationship it has with the former Royal High School.

8.65 The relationship with the listed buildings on either side would be harmed, the setting of each would not be preserved.

Main points for The New Town and Broughton Community Council

8.66 The community council supports a new, sustainable use for the listed building, given its deteriorating condition. It also accepts that change will be required to support that. The issue here is whether the quantum of development can be accommodated without detrimental impact on the building, its setting and the wider conservation area and the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site. The community council has a clear preference for aesthetic, educational and intellectual use. The apparent offer of a more sympathetic and less intrusive development by the RHSPT is relevant to the consideration of the proposals here.

8.67 The community council accepts that some of the later buildings on the site could be demolished to support the sustainable re-use. That would allow some new development within the site. Demolition of the Gate Lodge is not supported because it makes a significant contribution to the vista at the foot of the access road to Calton Hill. At the extreme west of the site, it could be retained whilst allowing some redevelopment of the site as a whole.

8.68 The proposed hotel extensions would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building. The integrity of the listed building, which includes its associated pavilions, screen walls, gateways and railings, would be adversely impacted. The proposed extensions, by their height, scale and massing would dominate and overwhelm the listed building, challenging its primacy on the site and diminishing significantly its status. They would block key views of the listed buildings and other monuments and their landscape setting. The relationship of the building to the surrounding landscape is fundamental to its setting and architectural philosophy.

8.69 The community council accepts that alterations will be needed for any new use. However, such uses should be sensitive, sympathetic and necessary. In this case many are necessary, and they have been reduced to a minimum. However, the interruption of the plinth for service access from Regent Road is not supported.

8.70 The scale of development for commercial viability is above the capacity of the site. No arrangement can achieve this without harm to the setting of the listed building, irrespective of the architectural style proposed. Unfortunately, the stepping back of the bedroom storeys leads to an overhang at the west end which ruins the views on approach from the city centre. The community council considers that the western playground should remain undeveloped.

8.71 The prevention of further deterioration is a key benefit of the proposals. However, the same aim can be achieved with a less intrusive scheme. The proposed relocation of St Mary's Music School, backed by Dunard Fund, is a credible alternative to re-use the building for teaching and to allow public access.

Main points for the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland

8.72 The Royal High School is one of the relatively few Scottish buildings that are recognised as being of international standing by the wider architectural community. It is one of the most important Greek revival buildings anywhere and a key monument to the nineteenth century. In the context of Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment Edinburgh, and its much-vaunted claim to be the Athens of the North, it is more important than any other single building in the city. It is also part of a major urban design and embodies modern and specifically urban ideas about the Picturesque movement in landscape design.

8.73 The Picturesque deals principally with how a building or landscape is seen. Uvedale Price in particular argued that the Picturesque landscape should be modelled on landscape painting. Humphrey Repton argued to the contrary that what we see in a painting is decidedly not what we see in reality. The greatest impact of the proposed extensions would be seen when approaching rather than in any particular view selected by the architects' renderings, historic paintings or photographs.

8.74 The building was designed in the spirit of the Picturesque, as it was emerging in the early 19th century, and with a distinctly urban character. At the time of the building of the Royal High School, the understanding of how buildings are seen in the landscape had begun to move on from the literal and static conception of a painting. The idea that landscape design should learn from painters and model their landscapes on the painting itself was countered by the idea that what is shown on a painting (or photograph) is not what we actually see. Our field of vision is generally wider and we turn our heads and move along. The notion of a static, Picturesque view was being challenged before the end of the 18th century.

8.75 William Stark had been a profound influence on the development of Edinburgh in the late 18th century. In his unfinished report to the city in respect of the competition to extend the New Town to Leith, he talked of much beauty and perhaps the most striking effects being in the 'bending alignment of the street'. He noted that public buildings break upon the eye at the most favourable points of view, 'shewing at once a front and a flank'. His support for a careful contextual approach is evident in the disposition of the former Royal High School, and is appreciated on approach from the east and the west. The Royal High School is part of a grander urban design for the expansion of the New Town. Stark's approach was taken up by his pupil William Playfair, who was also influenced by the work of John Nash, particularly at Regent's Park, London. This Picturesque in motion is how the setting of the Royal High School should be understood. From the west, the building takes advantage of a long and gradual approach consistent with the most advanced thinking at the time.

8.76 The proposed western extension would cut across and dominate the oblique views of the Hamilton building from the west. It would severely impinge upon the gap between the former school and St Andrew's House and the sense of separation created by setting the principal school building within open playgrounds to the east and west.

8.77 The setting of the building was conceived with the emerging symbolism of Calton Hill as a place of commemoration and identity. This landscape setting is connected with national identity, politics, commemoration, education, criminality, enlightenment, science and art. It includes themes related to aspects of the visual; astronomy, photography, the invention of the panorama, and the Picturesque. It is a powerful and precious cultural landscape. Thomas Hamilton carefully inserted his building into it in a way that mediates between and negotiates some of those themes and in particular its role in helping to establish the idea of Edinburgh as Athens.

8.78 The proposed wings would not retain the sense of separation and individuality of Hamilton's building. They would be read together and the hotel wings would undermine the delicate balance of actual size, scale and monumentality achieved by Hamilton. The original building would appear as a small precious object in a reticulated glass box.

8.79 The AHSS notes that the existing building makes a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the New Town Conservation Area, as well as to the setting of the Old Town Conservation Area.

8.80 The AHSS supports appropriate, sympathetic, high quality modern architecture and initiatives to bring historic buildings back into economic and social use. However, they say that the proposed scheme would result in over-development of the site. The balance of open and developed space would be harmed. The design and materials of the proposal would not be appropriate to the special interest of the listed building. The design elements would not reflect or respond to the essential principles of neo-classicism found in the existing buildings and surrounding area.

Main points for The Edinburgh World Heritage Trust

8.81 The EWHT recognises that the appeal site can accept a degree of development in support of the restoration and re-use of the main building. However, it is abundantly clear that the proposals for a hotel of this size could not be built on the site without having a major impact on the building and its setting and therefore the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site. The proposals would diminish the building and remove its setting. The principal building on the site would be turned into an object rather than an integrated part of an historic urban landscape. The failure of the proposed hotel wings to work with the topography would have a negative impact on outstanding universal value. There would be no discernible relationship to the role of Calton Hill in the cityscape. The visual connection of the building to the Picturesque movement would be broken.

Main points for the Cockburn Association

8.82 The association objects strongly to the proposed works. The dynamic composition of Calton Hill and the Royal High School would be compromised with the addition of the wing buildings either side, effectively linking it into a staggered terrace. The height of the wings would be higher than the central school building but also the adjacent Regent Terrace. There is a fundamental discord in the adaptation of a building with no windows to the view into an hotel. The proposals would undermine the building's important relationship with its context. The volume of accommodation said to be needed would not be appropriate.

8.83 The association is disappointed to see that the entrance lodge would be demolished. It works well within the set-piece design and ties into the wall and railings. It could be put to beneficial use.

8.84 The proposed wings are too high in relation to the principal building. This would be exacerbated by the extensive use of glass and inevitable illumination at night. The increase in scale over the principal building would be apparent despite some disguise by the elevation treatment.

8.85 Development of the western terrace would obscure important side views of the principal building. The spatial arrangement between buildings including the relationship with St Andrew's House would be weakened.

8.86 Adding further pavilions to the central building would unbalance the composition. The problem with a set-piece design so perfectly conceived is that it doesn't lend itself to any extension.

Main points for the Regent, Royal and Carlton Terraces and Mews Association

8.87 Of principal concern to the association is the impact of the proposed development on the special interest and significance of Calton Hill and the two listed terraces to the east. The unique combination of landscape and buildings was no accident and is recognised by the World Heritage Site inscription.

8.88 The elegant Regents Terrace would be debased by becoming the only service entrance for the development.

Main points for the Royal High School Preservation Trust

8.89 The Trust objects to the proposed works because of the impact they would have on the listed building and its setting.

8.90 The trust also objects to the proposed works on the basis on which the appellants' carried out their economic assessment. They say the appellants have consistently overstated the benefits and have not used the correct methodology, that is the HM Treasury Green Book, to derive the net economic benefit. The key issue is whether there would be new business to Scotland as opposed to diverting trade from existing hotels.

Main points for others/ written representations

8.91 We also heard from three individual objectors: Ruth MacDonald, Neil Harrison, and Rosemary Addison. About 55 written representations were also received following receipt of the appeal.

8.92 That evidence, and much of the additional representations, object to the proposed works on the basis of the unacceptable impacts on the character, appearance and setting of the listed building. No other relevant issues were raised that we have not already dealt with in this report.

CHAPTER 9 Reporters' findings

The main issues

9.1 The main issues in this appeal are the impacts of the proposed works, including demolition, on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building; on its setting; and on the setting of other listed buildings.

9.2 In the event that the Scottish Ministers find harm, we must also consider whether there are other options which might secure a beneficial future with less harm and any wider benefits that might stem from consent.

9.3 Other relevant issues include the impact of the proposed works on the New Town Conservation Area and on the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site.

Impacts on the special interest of the listed building

9.4 None of the parties to the inquiry and no other representations to the appeals dispute the importance and significance of the principal building on the site. It is clearly a building of national and even international importance. This includes the remaining original elements such as the retaining and boundary walls, gates and railings and the belvedere tower in the north-east corner of the site. We have assessed the relative importance of all elements of the listed building in Part 1, Chapter 3 of this report.

9.5 The basis for assessing impacts on a listed building is the building as it existed on the date of listing. At that time, the school had added buildings to the yards and in front of the rear retaining walls and belvedere. We note that these buildings and the historical development of the school are of some special interest but also note that they detract from the understanding and appreciation of the significance of the principal building. Were this understanding and appreciation to be enhanced or left unharmed by any particular scheme, we might consider that demolition of historic outbuildings would be justified.

9.6 More recent additions such as the canteen block and classroom block are not regarded by any party to be significant to the special interest of the listed building and their loss would be acceptable in our view, whatever the impact of the proposals before us.

9.7 The interior has been considerably altered since the school left the site and after it had become listed. Many of the alterations also show progression of the use of the principal building, but in so doing detract from its special interest overall.

9.8 The grounds of the building were altered by the newer buildings and by landscape alterations to the playground areas. These changes, along with the later buildings which clutter the outside space, also detract from the special interest of the listed building.

9.9 We recognise that the rear retaining wall and the belvedere are elements of the original design for the site and that they were carefully considered as part of the setting of the whole against Calton Hill. We therefore understand the merit in restoring these to view and the benefit of improving the understanding of the design from important viewpoints. However, we note that this experience has been lost for some time and was not possible at the time of listing.

9.10 The proposed development would help to preserve the listed building by a sympathetic repair and restoration of the fabric of the building. The outside of the principal building together with the majority of the boundary walls and railings would be brought into good condition. The proposed use would involve substantial alterations to some of the internal fabric but would reuse the main spaces for public areas. Proposed internal

alterations would be sensitively done to protect adjacent fabric and minimise loss of the original. These impacts alone would amount to preservation by repair, protection and beneficial re-use of the listed building. This must carry substantial weight in favour of the proposed new uses.

9.11 The recommendation of HES in their interim guidance, at paragraph 15, applies consideration of four specific criteria. Failure to meet any one of the criteria could be grounds to conclude that the presumption against works which adversely affect the special interest of the listed building or its setting should not be departed from.

9.12 The general approach of the appellants is to minimise the interventions in Hamilton's original work and design the necessary accommodation to add to the quality of that building in its setting. This is a valid conservation approach and one that responds well to a hotel design. Public rooms can be arranged in the larger spaces of the original school whilst the bedrooms and other requirements are best suited to new build. We consider the impacts of this further in our findings on setting.

9.13 The appellants accept the primacy of the southern elevation and the importance of the oblique views in the understanding and appreciation of the principal listed building. We consider that these would inevitably be significantly compromised by the addition of large scale wings to each side, however they are cloaked.

9.14 Impacts on the setting of the listed building would be considerable. The prominence and dominance of the building in certain views would be spoiled by the overwhelming scale of the extensions proposed.

9.15 Having said that, we note that the extensions to and interventions in the principal building have been designed to minimise their impact. A great deal of careful consideration has arrived at a multifaceted framework of subdued framing, together with green roofs. The extensions would be behind the line of the main elevation and their elevations would be curved and stepped. The intentional mimicry of the rocky, verdant setting is skilfully handled by the architects. They would rationalise what has become a cluttered site.

9.16 Nevertheless, the large amount of glass would inevitably sparkle in the daylight, drawing attention to the mass of the new wings. The scale of the extensions would mask a large part of the background setting to the sides of the principal listed building. At night, the light reflecting from the surfaces and activity in the rooms would be potentially more prominent still. We do not consider that this would be mitigated sufficiently by the technical specification of the proposed lighting, where surfaces, furniture and activity would be likely to reflect the light outwards. We therefore say that these extensions would not blend with the hillside nor disappear into the background. They would appear overbearing, urbanising and out of context. They would be a distraction in significant views of the principal building and harmful to its setting.

9.17 The proposed works would be permanent development. They would attach to the existing building to a relatively limited extent, sufficient only to provide links between them. Although in theory the works could be reversed, we attach little weight to that in our assessment. Firstly, the successful re-use of the building would assume a sustained use. Secondly, the impact on setting would be immediate. Thirdly, the outbuildings could not reasonably be restored without loss of authenticity. Our considered view that the proposed extensions would be detrimental to the setting of the listed building would not be affected to any significant degree by whether the works could be reversed at some time in the future.

The RHSPT scheme

9.18 This proposal has planning permission and listed building consent, although some details remain to be resolved. It has the financial backing of Dunard Fund, a charity established to promote the arts. The music school proposal is designed by architects and engineers of equal renown to those responsible for the appeal scheme. In our view, there is no reason why the RHSPT scheme would not be a viable and achievable alternative to the appeal proposals.

9.19 It is not our role here to revisit the merits of the RHSPT scheme except to assess whether it would cause less harm to the listed building. We have therefore assessed the impacts on the listed building and its setting in a similar way to our assessment of the appeal scheme, but only to compare with it for the purposes of applying the HES guidance.

9.20 The fact that the music school option has listed building consent does not mean that the proposed hotel is acceptable even if it would cause less harm. That is only one consideration. Conversely, the fact that the music school scheme has listed building consent does not mean that it would necessarily cause less harm.

9.21 The immediately obvious benefit of this proposal is that it is a school use, where the existing spaces could be re-used and where the intended occupier, like the RHS, has a distinguished reputation. Also, the visibility of the scheme (and its impact on setting) has been kept low by burying much of the school accommodation around internal top-lit courtyards, and it has been designed to accommodate the north and eastern parts of the site, leaving the west side as designed landscape.

9.22 That said, the proposal includes extensive new building, major excavation and radical intervention into the existing fabric.

9.23 In assessing the overall balance of impacts on the special interest of the listed building, we rely on our findings in regard to hierarchy of importance and significance set out in Part 1 of this report.

9.24 We consider that whichever option were to be established the original pattern of use would be further lost to the new arrangement. We therefore attribute less significance to the internal alterations. We note, however, that the appeal proposal would involve considerably less removal of original fabric of the principal building. In terms of the preservation of the listed building itself, the appeal proposal would better preserve the building. Set against this is the much greater visual impact of the proposed hotel wings on the setting of the listed building. In our consideration of the special interest in Part 1 we have found that the preservation of the magnificence of the principal building in its setting is what is most significant to the special interest. It is what survives best from the original intention and conception of the building and what lifts it beyond the architecture to an icon of the cultural development of Edinburgh in Scotland and the world.

9.25 It is not for us to consider, or for Ministers to decide, whether the music school scheme would preserve the listed building or its setting or its features of special architectural or historic interest. We do, however, conclude that it is an option that would cause less harm to these attributes of the listed building than the appeal scheme, because of its lesser impact on setting.

Other options

9.26 Of course, Scheme 2 prepared by the appellants is another option for the listed building in this case, in terms of consideration of the HES guidance. It could, we heard, be as readily developed. It would certainly have reduced levels of impact and this was

recognised in the review of the scheme design carried out during the workshop process in 2016.

9.27 The appellants say that this scheme has responded to the reasons for refusal at Scheme 1 and its reduced physical form would have a less harmful impact on the listed building and its setting. Although the economic balance would shift, there is no suggestion that the reduced scheme would not be viable. Scheme 2 is an option which would ensure a continuing beneficial use for the building with less impact on its special interest. On that basis too, Scheme 1 would fail to meet the criteria at recommendation 15 of the HES guidance.

Whether there would be significant benefits

9.28 The appellants seek to build a world-class hotel. Their view is that this will add to the offer in this world-class city and create wealth and jobs. They base the economic argument on the quality of the hotel. We have found in the parallel planning appeals that the economic and tourism benefits of the appeal proposal would be at least regionally significant.

9.29 However, any benefits that might result from the proposals would rely on the quality of the hotel being secured indefinitely. In general terms, planning regulates the use of land in the public interest and permissions run with the land. Restricting a permission to a specific class of occupier is generally undesirable and should only be used when there are special grounds and where the alternative would be refusal. Any attempt to control the level of service and the price of a room would be fraught with difficulty and an interference in the market. The operating model of the hotel would be vulnerable to change to maintain the business. We therefore place limited weight on the proposal to define the particular quality or level of service at the hotel and the proposed conditions to restrict it. The benefit of the proposed hotel to the economy should not therefore, be determined on the ambitions for a world-class hotel.

9.30 The appellants also say that the Scheme 1 proposal would have an improved urban design at the western end where it engages with Waterloo Place/ Regent Road and the foreground to St Andrew's House. The impact of that is discussed in our report on the planning applications. For the purposes of the listed building consent applications, we do not consider that any benefit to that part of the public realm would be of such significance to conclude overall that there would be no harm to the special interest of the listed building or its setting, nor to overcome the policy presumption against the harm we have found.

9.31 It has long been a tenet of historic building conservation that 'if you don't use it you may well lose it'. If successfully completed, the proposed scheme would remove the building from the at-risk register. That would reflect a significant change in fortunes for the building. However, we consider that the consented scheme for the RHS Preservation Trust indicates that there could be other ways in which the former Royal High School could be converted and altered to a viable use, thereby significantly reducing the risk to its preservation.

The conservation area

9.32 The proposed works would be a radical intervention in a sensitive part of the New Town Conservation Area. As set out in our analysis of the impact on the listed building and its setting, these works would appear as two major extensions out of keeping with the character of the principal school building and its prominent setting. For that reason, the character and appearance of the conservation area would be neither preserved nor enhanced by what is proposed.

World Heritage Site

9.33 The current management plan says that balancing the needs of the city to maintain its economic vibrancy and the need to protect the heritage is essential to both. It seems to us that this implies that the economic vibrancy must not be at the expense of protection of the heritage. Indeed, the outstanding universal value is a key driver of the economic success of the city and must be protected, developed and celebrated. We consider that this supports the statutory approach to protection of the listed building and to the preservation or enhancement of the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore, we say, the proposed works would to some degree harm the outstanding universal values of the World Heritage Site.

9.34 Beyond that, we heard argument that the proposed development may lead to the loss of World Heritage Site status. It seems to us that such a likelihood would be at best uncertain and not for us to conclude on within the confines of this appeal.

Other matters

9.35 We acknowledge the efforts made better to understand the building and its setting and to explain the proposed works in that context. There is no doubt that this has led to increased understanding of the importance of the building.

9.36 However, we note that the mitigation proposed is predicated on the need for an amount of new development, rather than an assessment of the amount that could be developed without harm to the building, its setting and the character or appearance of the conservation area. This is not outweighed by the improved understanding of the building and its setting provided in evidence to the inquiry.

CHAPTER 10 Conditions

10.1 Although our recommendation in this case is that the Scottish Ministers should dismiss the appeal and refuse to grant listed building consent for the proposed works, we acknowledge that they may come to a different view. We have therefore considered the conditions proposed by the parties that might be attached if listed building consent were to be granted in this case.

10.2 A single condition was agreed between the council and the appellants. It would require that no part of the existing structures shall be demolished until a contract including the refurbishment of the main Hamilton building is in place. We agree that this condition would be necessary to ensure that no historic fabric would be lost without some assurance that the benefits of the scheme would be realised. A similar condition was proposed by HES but would not be required in addition.

10.3 Several other conditions were proposed by CEC and HES and these were discussed at our hearing session.

10.4 A condition requiring details of the new railings around the portico was suggested. We consider that there is insufficient detail to be sure that the quality of these would match the existing standard of material and detail. We also consider that the means of fixing to the existing building could have an impact on its special interest. To preserve the quality of the original building we consider that these matters should be subject to further detail, subject to a condition requiring submission for approval. The council suggested that consultation with HES should be included in the condition. This would not be necessary because it is a matter for the council who they consult.

10.5 The council proposed a condition seeking a programme of archaeological works based on a scheme of investigation. It is our view that such a condition relates to archaeology rather than listed building legislation and should properly be attached to any planning permission for the development of the site. Duplication through the listed building consent is not necessary.

10.6 The existing building has a carved stone armorial plaque built into its wall. It dates from an earlier school and was moved to the site when the school relocated. It is somewhat weathered. The proposed works would include removing this plaque. HES suggested a condition to ensure that it is preserved. This too is a matter covered by the suggested conditions in the linked planning appeals and repetition here would be unnecessary.

10.7 HES suggest a condition to require more detail of the connections between the main Hamilton building and the proposed hotel wings. A similar condition is proposed to consider how the glazed access corridors at the rear of the main building would be built. Another would require details of the reinstatement of features in the main hall. In our view, these matters are covered in detail in the drawings submitted with the application. Careful consideration has been given to the way in which the work at these junctions of old and new would be done. Any variation from the proposed solutions would require a fresh listed building consent if they would be likely to affect the special interest of the building. We recommend that these conditions are not attached to any consent.

10.8 HES further suggest a condition to ensure that the gate piers and gates be re-used or sent to salvage so that they are not lost. They referred to a similar exercise at another listed building in Edinburgh where the applicant was able to use some gates elsewhere on their estate. The appellant and the council agree that putting removed items into storage with no notion of their future use is likely to be onerous and unproductive. It is our

considered opinion that, with no scheme for their re-use or retention on site as a part of the development, these features would effectively be lost to the listed building. Use elsewhere would not prevent that loss. A condition to find some other use would be unenforceable and imprecise. We therefore do not recommend such a condition.

10.9 Further suggested conditions relating to rock extraction are intended to protect the site of special scientific interest at Arthurs Seat and to ensure that railway infrastructure is protected. These matters do not relate to the preservation of the listed building and would be adequately covered by conditions on the associated planning permissions (if granted). without which the proposed works could not be carried out.

10.10 We therefore set out at Appendix 8 the two conditions that we recommend should be attached to any consent, together with the reasons for them.

CHAPTER 11 Conclusions and recommendations for Scheme 1

11.1 The beauty and harmony of central Edinburgh rests on the historical development of a dramatic landscape. Key buildings and spaces survive to connect with the past and to preserve what constitutes the distinction of the city in its landscape – its *genius loci*. The scale of the topography has accommodated change over centuries, which has allowed the city to reinvent and adapt to maintain a vigorous and healthy society.

11.2 The listed building regime and the world heritage designation exist to ensure that the most important buildings and townscape are preserved and that current demands and fashions do not deform the beauty and harmony deriving from the special interest of its buildings and universal value of its townscapes. At the same time, these special values contribute to the vitality and economic benefit brought by visitors to the city.

11.3 There is no requirement in national policy or HES guidance that an extension to an old building should look old. The architecture of the proposed development has been approached with honesty and confidence. The solutions are reasonable and well-considered modern interventions.

11.4 In our view, the restoration of the building and part clearance of later additions to expose and enhance the original setting are desirable outcomes. We also note that the architects' approach to the proposed extensions is exemplary and would produce high-quality contextual modern architecture.

11.5 However, this does not add up to an acceptable or beneficial solution where the impact of the scale of the extensions is so harmful to the integrity and setting of this nationally and internationally important listed building in its highly valued setting.

11.6 We conclude that the extent of the works proposed is so great that the setting of the listed building would be dramatically and irreparably harmed. That would not preserve the setting of the listed building, which we consider to be one of the most significant aspects of the listed building.

11.7 We note that the proposed hotel would ensure repair, reinstatement and protection for the principal listed building, Hamilton's masterpiece of Greek revival architecture for the Athens of the North. It would also contribute to the economy of the city and the region.

11.8 However, our examination of the appeal proposal concludes overall that the proposed works would not preserve the listed building or its setting and that the character and appearance of the Edinburgh New Town Conservation Area would be neither preserved nor enhanced. That would be contrary to Sections 14 and 64 respectively of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.

11.9 We therefore recommend that the appeal be refused.

Dannie Onn
Reporter

Scott M Ferrie
Assistant Chief Reporter

PART 3 LBA-230-2118 – Scheme 2

CHAPTER 12 Introduction

Proposed Use

12.1 The proposed use would be an hotel. This would involve alterations to the existing building and its grounds together with the construction of two extensions.

12.2 The proposed works are shown on the application drawings, which show a site plan, building plans at each level, and elevations of the site and buildings. These are shown as existing and as proposed. Photographs of the existing buildings were also submitted as plans. A set of demolition plans was submitted. These show the proposed demolition of outbuildings and the removal of parts of the existing building to make way for the proposed conversion and extensions. Proposed sections and visualisations were submitted to illustrate the proposals in their context. The proposed alterations and extensions to the listed building were shown in a set of detailed plans, sections, elevations and visualisations. Landscape proposals were shown on a further set of plans. A schedule of the application drawings is attached at Appendix 9.

Summary of proposed works

12.3 Total demolition of some of the buildings within the overall site is proposed. The former lodge, gymnasium block, classroom block and luncheon hall would be entirely removed. The remaining listed structures would be repaired and brought into good condition.

12.4 There would be substantial alterations to the remaining buildings, the retaining walls, boundary walls, gateposts and railings. The main building on the site would be altered internally and externally. Two extensions would be built, one on each side of the main building, largely over the east and west playgrounds of the former school.

12.5 The proposed extensions would be positioned to ensure a clear separation from the original building. The new hotel floors would be stepped back from the principal building, on plan and in elevation. They would be higher than the existing building. The architects' intention is to mimic geological strata and rock outcrops as a reference to the Picturesque setting. The structure would be clad with a faceted, dark brown, pre-patinated copper cladding and plain glass windows.

12.6 Symmetry would be maintained by having broadly similar wings, although they would be different in response to their location. The east wing would be aligned with, but step back from the building line of Regent Terrace. The west wing would be larger and form a round corner at the sweeping bends of Regent Road. The architects' intention here is to have a bold curve: at once to open views and to avoid being overwhelmed by the hill and by St Andrew's House.

12.7 The west wing would be set away from the retaining wall and, with the lodge demolished, views would be opened to the central temple of the principal building.

12.8 The roofscapes of the new wings would be visible from certain viewpoints on the hill behind. They have been designed to be planted to complement the existing setting.

12.9 The hotel entrance door, where vehicular drop-off of guests would take place, would be at the rear of the principal building, with glazed corridors between the central temple and the extensions. There would then be a secondary vehicular drop-off point on Regent Road

adjacent to the new west wing of the hotel. This location would allow the lower ground floor ballroom and conference facilities to be accessed discretely from the main hotel entrance, allowing flexibility and the opportunity for the whole lower level of the west wing to be used for public and private events without impacting on the daily workings of the hotel. The lobby area serving the ballroom would afford access onto one of the south-facing front terraces and it is this terrace that is also served by Hamilton's original Regent Road entrance stair sequence.

12.10 Proposed refurbishment and re-lighting of the gates and stairs themselves would allow guests and visitors to access the front terraces of the hotel from Regent Road and then enter the hotel itself via original Hamilton doorways under the imposing central portico. The lower level lobby of the hotel accessed off the terraces would be provided with a lift and stair up to the central reception hall above. Visitors could continue on their way up Calton Hill via a new external staircase, accessing the hill's approach road to the rear of the hotel.

12.11 Service and staff access to the building would be in the south-east corner of the site onto Regent Road, leading to new basement service areas excavated under the east playground.

Condition

12.12 The building is in a relatively stable condition. Roof voids are dry and with little sign of rot, although dry rot has been found and addressed in the stairwell at the east wing. The façade is in good condition, although some remedial work is required to pointing and some walls are disfigured by evidence of graffiti cleaning. There is some plant growth which could lead to damage. There are structural cracks around the lower levels towards Regent Road on the front boundary walls. Repointing is required to the retaining wall adjacent to the north boundary.

12.13 The building is on the HES register of buildings at risk but is currently graded as low risk overall. Although not in much use, the listed building is being maintained by the City of Edinburgh Council.

12.14 Efforts to find an alternative new use have been made over several decades, with little long-term success.

CHAPTER 13 The cases for the parties

Main points for the appellants

The proposed design

13.1 The proposed development has been designed with extreme care to respect the siting and design of the principal building on the site. The form and appearance of what would be placed on the site in relation to the listed building has been carefully considered, whilst at the same time providing the accommodation required to secure a viable new use for the listed building.

13.2 The new design is informed by the careful study and analysis of the nature, form and history of the listed building in its specific location. The hotel bedroom wings are designed to be seen and to provide a new strong backdrop to the principal listed building on the site. They would appear as inhabited 'knowes', chiming with Hamilton's own depiction and acceptance of the rugged setting of his design as a craggy (sublime) contrast to his perfect classical forms. The colour and texture of the materials are chosen so that the new extensions would be recessive and blend in with the surroundings. They would not replicate the principal building, but keep it as the focus, allowing itself to dominate. The ability to appreciate the original building and its design concept in its setting would not be diminished.

13.3 The listed building would be diminished by sandstone additions, but that does not mean that no new building is acceptable. In this proposal, the architects have provided a carefully considered, sophisticated architectural response where the proposed extensions have been set away from the main building and provide additional context to the setting. The design is intended to be visually recessive and subservient, which would integrate skilfully with the existing topography of the area and would mature well. The extensions would reflect the topographical context, the rugged hillside, where Hamilton set his masterpiece.

13.4 The guidance published by HES, Architecture + Design Scotland and Scottish Government: '[New design in historic settings](#)', seeks to ensure that the quality of new design matches that of its surroundings. It sets out how good design by talented architects can enhance sensitive heritage buildings and settings. The appellants have followed this guidance and responded directly to the principles in this document. The appellants' assessment concludes that the setting of the building would be enhanced by the high quality and innovative design of the proposed.

13.5 The proposed works would provide for the complete restoration of the principal building.

13.6 The principal building is already compromised in its setting by St Andrew's House, while the extended gymnasium block appears to coalesce with Regent Terrace to the east. The symmetry and clarity of the original design has become somewhat lost by the clutter of additional buildings of differing scale and lesser quality. These have had a detrimental impact on the setting of the principal building. The proposed works would remove these. In their place would be carefully considered new buildings in a confident, contemporary architectural language which would reinstate the Hamilton building as the focus within the site. Notionally symmetrical, they would respond to the site in a balanced way.

13.7 The appellants say that the impacts of the proposed scheme would not be significantly adverse and that the works therefore would comply with the guidance set out in

HES guidance and recommendations. The imaginative design minimises the potential harm to the special interest of the building and its setting.

13.8 In particular, the proposal has been designed to minimise the impacts on the fabric of the original Hamilton building. The profile of the extensions and their impacts on the setting of the principal school building in its playgrounds are greater as a consequence. The impact on setting is then mitigated by the high quality of the architecture of the extensions. The architects have designed an honest and confident modern architectural response to development within the setting of the former Royal High School. The extensive research and analysis carried out by the appellants' team has informed the design of the new proposals. This was not recognised by the council in assessing the applications.

13.9 The loss of the outbuildings would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposed works.

13.10 The innovative and sustainable design would reinvigorate this long-neglected site by night and day. It would become a positive destination at the threshold between city and country and a memorable place once again.

Setting

13.11 The value of the setting is what, and to what degree, it contributes to the special interest of the listed building. This will not be fixed for all time because the surroundings will change over time and because new information may alter what might previously have been understood to comprise the setting and its significance to the listed building.

13.12 The relationship between the principal building on the site and the monuments on Calton Hill, the National Monument in particular, is of great importance to appreciation of the building in its setting. This would not be adversely affected. This is a landmark building on the southern slope of Calton Hill

13.13 The appellants say that the conservation and setting of the principal building would be enhanced by the demolition of other buildings within the site. Through their in-depth studies and robust assessments, they find no impacts to be significantly adverse in respect of either the setting or the special interest of the principal listed building. Some are of no special interest. The special interest of the gate lodge has been consistently overstated.

13.14 The setting includes the monuments on Calton Hill and St Andrew's House, which is recognised in the [Calton Hill Conservation Plan](#) as a distinguished addition, where the sublime manner in which it responds to the magnificent site adds greatly to the importance of the composition of the hill. If the appeal scheme is regarded as distinguished and the setting can be enhanced by removal of less important and detrimental buildings, then it too may enhance the sublime experience.

13.15 The proposed development would equally have no adverse impact on the setting of other listed buildings or the ability to understand and appreciate them or their relationship to each other.

At risk

13.16 The appellants say that the building has had no long-term occupier since 1968 when the high school left. It is on the register of Buildings at Risk where the entry covers all five buildings on the site. That it is wholly inappropriate and a national embarrassment or disgrace. They say that this should add considerable weight to granting consent.

13.17 The appellants say that consent should be granted along with the planning permissions to bring an end to the vacancy and increasing dereliction of one of Scotland's most important buildings. Hotel use would make good use of the existing fabric and is a

good use of a listed building where some compromise is essential to allow a viable scheme to secure a long-term future for the building, whilst providing public access and re-integrating the building into the daily life of the city.

Conservation Area

13.18 The appellants have evaluated impacts on the conservation area. Viewpoint analysis shows that no harm would be caused to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

OUV of the WHS

13.19 The appellants have carried out a proper assessment of the impacts on the WHS based on good practice and using skilled professionals. A Heritage Impact Assessment was undertaken in accordance with recommended practice for major developments. None of the views considered was deemed to be in the category of major adverse and on balance, the impact on the World Heritage Site was predicted to be of minor negligible benefit in respect of the most important views. No lasting damage would be caused to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site. Where an adverse effect is noted, it falls short of the magnitude that would threaten the World Heritage status.

13.20 The appellants point to the challenge of an evolving city where so much must be preserved. According to the current [management plan for the WHS](#): 'Balancing the needs of the city to maintain its economic vibrancy and the need to protect the heritage is essential to both. The relationship between OUV and economic success needs to be protected, developed and celebrated.'

13.21 The appellants' Heritage Impact Assessment: [Part 1 – Understanding the Site](#); [Part 2 – Evaluation of Legislation and Policy Guidance](#); and [Part 3 – Heritage Impact Assessment](#), identifies the direct impacts on the setting and special interest of the listed building. It demonstrates a range of impacts from moderate/minor adverse to moderate beneficial, and with an overall impact of beneficial. The methodology derived from ICOMOS guidelines objectively considers the impact on the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site from every important viewpoint. The analysis of this supports the conclusion of beneficial impact.

Alternative schemes

13.22 Listed building consent and planning permission has been granted for an alternative scheme, as submitted by the RHSPT and with the intended occupation by St Mary's Music School. In the view of the appellants, this does not provide an option with less harm to the listed building. The appellants recognise that not developing the playground to the west would meet the objectives of the council and Historic Environment Scotland. However, greater harm would be caused in several respects.

13.23 Firstly, the introduction of a main entrance into the main portico facing Regent Road would be a travesty of the original design intentions and would fail to appreciate what is significant about the site. It would be visible in important views of the building. The upper set of railings and gates are essential components of the design, emphasising its horizontality. These would be lost.

13.24 Secondly, little survives of the original internal fabric due to extensive alterations in the 1970s. Despite this, the area below the portico is a series of spaces where original fabric can be experienced. This is unique on the site. The extensive work to hollow out an entrance foyer so deep into the plan would add to the risks to the historic fabric which the appeal scheme seeks to avoid.

13.25 Thirdly, the positioning of accommodation to the north is a flawed concept. Although this had been considered in earlier schemes for the site and is where additional accommodation has been provided in the past, Hamilton's concept was to have a clear and rational access from the west end of the site and the access on the northern side. He deliberately resisted an imposing new access on Regent Road. Introducing one now would confuse the clarity of the layout. Hamilton set his 'temple' at the highest point of the site, as far forward from the rear retaining wall as the site allowed. Further, the rear elevation is the main entrance to the Hamilton building. It should not be sacrificed to a location for new development.

13.26 Lastly, the new accommodation required for that scheme is considerable and would require greater alteration to the principal building than the appeal scheme. Although intended to be recessive, it would be readily apparent, particularly in close views, detracting from Hamilton's masterpiece. The design also derives its architectural language from the Hamilton building: octagonal pavilions from the octagonal rooms laid out asymmetrically and expressed with simplified classical details and modern materials, and a natural stone that would weather differently from the original Craigleith sandstone.

13.27 The appellants recognise that the Gate Lodge of 1885 is part of the listed building and of some architectural and historic merit. The RHSPT scheme would preserve it. However, that would not be a major conservation benefit. Its special interest has been overstated by objectors to the appeal proposal and a case for its removal was considered in the [conservation plan of 2004](#). Further, the removal of original structure within the principal building as a result of the RHSPT scheme would be greater than the loss of fabric at the Gate Lodge.

13.28 The appellants also say that the Preservation Trust scheme would expose the upper parts of the rear retaining wall and belvedere where they are currently obscured, mainly in long and elevated views. However these would be crowded at the base by new accommodation and obscured by mature trees for much of the time. The visual separation of the rear wall and belvedere from the principal building would be an adverse impact.

13.29 Overall, the appellants do not consider that the RHSPT scheme would have less impact on the special interest of the listed building.

13.30 The appellants say that the RHSPT scheme does not meet the requirements of the HESPS test at paragraph 3.47(c). The Trust has no legal control over the site, nor any certainty that they ever could have. There is no certainty to their funding or that the proposed school would provide a continuing beneficial use. The proposal would leave no room for further expansion. The Scottish Government may not grant consent to relocate the school under the St Mary's Music School (Aided Places) (Scotland) Regulations 2015.

13.31 In summary, then, the Music School scheme is not an option: it would not ensure a continuing beneficial use of the building; and it would not have less impact on the special interest of the listed building.

13.32 The alternative scheme proposed by the appellants (Scheme 1) is also an option for the site which could as readily be developed. Scheme 1 has greater architectural ambition at the point of arrival at the site, which would enhance the potential to animate the spaces that are created around the building and more effectively enhance the public realm.

The competitive bidding process and its effect on design

13.33 The developer competition in 2009 required a commercially sustainable proposal for the property. The appellants say that the design stems from the competitive bid for the

site. The competition-winning design envisaged wings as extensions to the principal building.

Other examples

13.34 The appellants notes the examples of new design in historic places found in the [guidance of HES](#) and others. They also offer two buildings which they say are of high quality, innovative designs that are based on the similar general principles and are pertinent to understanding the potential of the appeal scheme. They demonstrate the exceptional architectural quality and great design vision of the architects in this case. Both are set within sensitive heritage and urban contexts and are unashamedly modern and confident.

13.35 The first example is the award-winning Blavatnik School of Government at Oxford, which has a stepped curvilinear form placed into a conservation area and has two listed neo-classical buildings for neighbours. To one side is the former church of St Paul, built in 1936 with a portico in the classical Ionic order. Opposite is the University Printing House which has two wings joined by a screen with a central monumental entrance in the classical Corinthian order. This building is contemporary with the former Royal High School. The relevance to this appeal case is that a considered design response to a specific site can be a successful addition to a highly sensitive heritage site.

13.36 The second example is the Bloomberg European HQ in the City of London, which demonstrates the use of bronze pre-patinated sculptural fins. These allow the otherwise large expanses of glass to fit into the historic context. That context includes the listed church of St Stephen Walbrook by Sir Christopher Wren – the Bank of England and a conservation area.

13.37 In both these cases, the buildings have left their historic settings unharmed. Arguably they have enhanced them. The appeal scheme has likewise responded to the special topography and the effects on views. It would have a minimal effect on the listed building. It would preserve its setting and potentially enhance its context.

In summary

13.38 The appellants say that a luxury hotel is needed and beneficial to the economy; the building would be restored with minimal intervention and brought back into use; the rear retaining wall and belvedere would be exposed and celebrated; the setting would be improved because the new building would reinforce how Hamilton intended his building to be seen. This approach says that the restoration is so desirable and the design so exemplary, that the impact overall would be beneficial.

Main points for the council

13.39 The appeal scheme would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area, thereby conflicting with sections 14(2) and 64(1) of the listed building Act. There is no exceptional case which would justify overriding that presumption on the basis that the hotel would be desirable on the ground of the economic benefit it would bring or the lack of other options to bring the building back into use with less harm.

Other options

13.40 Scheme 1 is clearly preferable from an operational point of view because there would be a link at lower ground floor between the bedroom wings, which would also give access to the lower ground terrace areas. Scheme 1 may also be more economically sustainable.

13.41 Scheme 2 is clearly preferable in that the impact on the physical form and setting of the principal listed building would be less.

13.42 The RHS Preservation Trust's scheme has the benefit of planning permission and listed building consent. It cannot proceed because of the contractual relationship between the council and a third party. The long stop date for obtaining permission and consent for the appeal proposal in that agreement could be as late as 31 December 2021. That would have passed before the expiry of the consent for the Trust's music school proposal, which would be seven years after 27 February 2017, that is in 2024.

13.43 Funding for the music school scheme is secured and not subject to macroeconomic factors; it is privately funded and with a clearly defined user. The Trust's scheme is therefore an 'other option' for the purposes of HES interim guidance. Given that HES did not object to the scheme, it is not difficult to conclude that it would also have less impact on the listed building.

13.44 Scheme 2 for the hotel would have less impact than Scheme 1.

Main points for Historic Environment Scotland

13.45 The former Royal High School is one of the most important listed buildings in Scotland and of international significance for its architecture and setting. This is not in dispute. It includes the outbuildings by Hamilton and others, which contribute to our understanding of the site.

Special interest

13.46 The building represents an expression of Picturesque ideals as understood at the time of its construction, a deliberate neo-classical, monumental composition in a setting described as 'rus in urbe' – the country within the town. It also represents the aspirations of Scottish identity at the time it was built by comparison with Greek civilisation as then understood and as exemplified by the Acropolis in Athens. The Hamilton building serves as a symbolic Propylaea to the National Monument as Parthenon atop Calton Hill. There is no physical gateway, but a threshold to higher elevations can be imagined. This increases the sensitivity and significance of the site and the potential for adverse effects from large bedroom extension wings on the listed building and the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site.

13.47 The building is intended to be seen in the round. The evidence of Hamilton's perspective watercolour illustrates his appropriation of the view espoused by Stark, that 'public buildings break upon the eye at the most favourable point of view, showing at once a flank and a front'. The main approach to the building is from the west and the school main entrance was always to the north. The building was intended to be seen from the west, even accepting a proposal by Hamilton to site a Burns monument on Miller's Knowe. In any event, the monument was placed elsewhere and the knowe has been removed. Even when the jail existed on the site of St Andrew's House, the north-west of the principal Hamilton building would have been experienced on the journey eastwards towards the school. Later Hamilton buildings did not obscure the west elevation. The views from the west to the rear elevation are of lesser importance and are partly obscured by the historic Gate Lodge.

13.48 The building has a strong sense of monumentality. This comes from the prominent positioning on an artificial ledge with built sub-structure; classically derived architecture; juxtaposition with the rugged setting of Calton Hill; relationship with the monuments on the hill; the absence of large building which would compete for prominence on the site; and the

incorporation of delicate pavilions to frame the main building, emphasising its relative scale and mass.

Demolition of outbuildings

13.49 The canteen and classroom blocks are agreed to form no part of the special interest of the listed building and their removal would benefit the setting of the remainder. The Gate Lodge is of special interest in its own right. The Gymnasium is also of some special interest.

13.50 Without an acceptable scheme for the re-use of the former Royal High School, demolition of the Gate Lodge and Gymnasium building is not justified.

Setting

13.51 Setting in this case is a critical factor in the special interest of the listed building. The principal relationship is with Calton Hill. The surroundings and context of the setting contribute significantly to our ability to appreciate and understand the Hamilton building, not least due to the minimal change that has occurred over two centuries.

13.52 The principal building is a prominent and dominant feature within the landscape, set spectacularly on an elevated position against the backdrop of Calton Hill, the most conspicuous feature of the New Town. It contributes to its surroundings as a nationally important architectural feature and as a component of a landscape-inspired addition to the first New Town.

13.53 The building was set to be prominent in views from the Old Town to the south and west, as well as from close by on Regent Road. It should be viewed in the round. Any interventions should not harm the immediate setting. The careful accumulation of architectural elements when viewed on approach from Waterloo Place rely on the open setting of the Hamilton building. This open setting also ensures adequate light and views from the building, particularly the classrooms in the east and west façades and in views from the playgrounds. The notion of framing views with the new extension has no benefit. Hamilton's temple is already framed by the original wings and pavilions.

13.54 The proposal would form an urbanised wall of development between Regent Terrace and St Andrew's House, reducing the sense of rus-in-urbe of the existing. That would reduce the internationally renowned standalone masterpiece to a structure within a wider whole, encapsulated as a piece of streetscape.

13.55 The scale, size and height of the proposed bedroom wings would dominate the building to such an extent that they would fundamentally change our current understanding and appreciation of the Hamilton building on its carefully composed site. They would build over the majority of the original playgrounds, each with a footprint larger than the principal building. The open backdrop separating the Hamilton building from development to the east and west would be infilled. The buildings would be taller than the original and dominate it by their size, prominence and height, reducing the monumental classical building to a secondary element confined within a new composition. Too much development is proposed for this sensitive site.

13.56 The setting necessarily includes the later additions by others, and these contribute to our understanding of the site and the listed building. Their loss may be balanced against the increased understanding and appreciation of the principal building.

13.57 The belvedere and rear retaining wall would be further exposed by the proposed works. This would be a benefit in that they are a part of the original building and designed

by Hamilton as elements of the architectural conception for the site. Some weight should be attached to this as an improvement on the setting of the principal building. However, that would not begin to compare with the adverse effects of the proposed extensions on other aspects of the setting of the listed building.

The proposed extensions

13.58 Such is the importance of Hamilton's masterpiece that redevelopment should ideally not include any new substantive buildings that might compete with it. HES accepts that high-quality contemporary architecture can be appropriate in historic settings, but in this case, the scale, height, massing and siting would be unacceptable, regardless of style or material.

13.59 The scale of the proposed extensions is justified by the appellants on the grounds that it would be the level of accommodation required to deliver a functionally and financially stable hotel. The architectural response may have been considered and sophisticated but that does not necessarily make them successful.

13.60 There would be a discordant contrast between the materials of the existing building and those for the extension. That would be exacerbated by floor to ceiling glazing, with the potential for reflection of light by day and internal illumination at night.

13.61 The impact of the proposed works on the setting of the listed building would be permanent and irreversible.

13.62 In terms of the HES guidance on extensions to listed buildings, the proposed would not protect the character and appearance of the listed building; they would not be subordinate in height, scale or form; they would read as a continuation of the front façade; and the materials used would inevitably 'signpost' the extensions, drawing the eye from the Hamilton building, which would lose its primacy on the carefully designed and assembled site. This does not support a case for departing from the presumption against the works set out in paragraph 3.38 of the HES policy statement.

The music school scheme

13.63 HES considers that the music school scheme would have far less impact than the appeal proposals. It would involve greater interventions in the fabric of the building, particularly opening up the screening wall below the portico and internal works to create a new public entrance and foyer. However, the appeal scheme would involve interventions into the building, radical changes to the interior and significant works at basement level, including substantial excavation within the former playgrounds.

13.64 In terms of setting, the music school scheme would retain the gate lodge, would not involve building on the western playground and would be set at a much lower elevation on the eastern playground. It would thus have a much lesser impact. Each of the important side elevations would remain visible from within and without the site.

Other listed buildings

13.65 There are several important listed buildings within the setting of the former Royal High School, whose settings would also be affected by the proposed development. These are St Andrew's House, Regent Terrace, the National Monument and Nelson's Monument. Each is category A listed. In particular the extensions would impinge on the setting and views of Nelson's Monument in short views such as Regent Road and middle-distance views such as Canongate Kirkyard. The settled pattern of 19th century architecture would be disrupted by the contemporary appearance of the extension wings – by turns dark and brooding in subdued light conditions and assertive and contrasting in bright light. Either

way, the effect would be to draw the eye away from the National Monument and diminish the special relationship it has with the former Royal High School.

13.66 The relationship with the listed buildings on either side would be harmed, the setting of each would not be preserved.

Main points for The New Town and Broughton Community Council

13.67 The community council supports a new, sustainable use for the listed building, given its deteriorating condition. It also accepts that change will be required to support that. The issue here is whether the quantum of development can be accommodated without detrimental impact on the building, its setting and the wider conservation area, and on the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site. The community council has a clear preference for aesthetic, educational and intellectual use. The apparent offer of a more sympathetic and less intrusive development by the RHSPT is relevant to the consideration of the proposals here.

13.68 The community council accepts that some of the later buildings on the site could be demolished to support the sustainable re-use. That would allow some new development within the site. Demolition of the Gate Lodge is not supported because it makes a significant contribution to the vista at the foot of the access road to Calton Hill. At the extreme west of the site, it could be retained whilst allowing some redevelopment of the site as a whole.

13.69 The proposed hotel extensions would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building. The integrity of the listed building, which includes its associated pavilions, screen walls, gateways and railings, would be adversely impacted. The proposed extensions, by their height, scale and massing would dominate and overwhelm the listed building, challenging its primacy on the site and diminishing significantly its status. They would block key views of the listed buildings and other monuments and their landscape setting. The relationship of the building to the surrounding landscape is fundamental to its setting and architectural philosophy.

13.70 The community council accepts that alterations will be needed for any new use. However, such uses should be sensitive, sympathetic and necessary. In this case many are necessary and they have been reduced to a minimum. However, the interruption of the plinth for service access from Regent Road is not supported.

13.71 The scale of development for commercial viability is above the capacity of the site. No arrangement can achieve this without harm to the setting of the listed building, irrespective of the architectural style proposed. Unfortunately, the stepping back of the bedroom storeys leads to an overhang at the west end which ruins the views on approach from the city centre. The community council considers that the western playground should remain undeveloped.

13.72 The prevention of further deterioration is a key benefit of the proposals. However, the same aim can be achieved with a less intrusive scheme. The proposed relocation of St Mary's Music School, backed by Dunard Fund, is a credible alternative to re-use the building for teaching and to allow public access.

Main points for the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland

13.73 The Royal High School is one of the relatively few Scottish buildings that are recognised as of international standing by the wider architectural community. It is one of the most important Greek revival buildings anywhere and a key monument to the nineteenth century. In the context of Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment Edinburgh, and its much-vaunted claim to be the Athens of the North, it is more important than any other single building in the city. It is also part of a major urban design and embodies modern and specifically urban ideas about the Picturesque movement in landscape design.

13.74 The Picturesque deals principally with how a building or landscape is seen. Uvedale Price in particular argued that the Picturesque landscape should be modelled on landscape painting. Humphrey Repton argued to the contrary that what we see in a painting is decidedly not what we see in reality. The greatest impact of the proposed extensions would be seen when approaching rather than in any particular view selected by the architects' renderings, historic paintings or photographs.

13.75 The building was designed in the spirit of the Picturesque, as it was emerging in the early 19th century, and with a distinctly urban character. At the time of the building of the Royal High School, the understanding of how buildings are seen in the landscape had begun to move on from the literal and static conception of a painting. The idea that landscape design should learn from painters and model their landscapes on the painting itself was countered by the idea that what is shown on a painting (or photograph) is not what we actually see. Our field of vision is generally wider, and we turn our heads and move along. The notion of a static, Picturesque view was being challenged before the end of the 18th century.

13.76 William Stark had been a profound influence on the development of Edinburgh in the late 18th century. In his unfinished report to the city in respect of the competition to extend the New Town to Leith, he talked of much beauty and perhaps the most striking effects being in the 'bending alignment of the street'. He noted that public buildings break upon the eye at the most favourable points of view, 'shewing at once a front and a flank'. His support for a careful contextual approach is evident in the disposition of the former Royal High School and is appreciated on approach from the east and the west. The Royal High School is part of a grander urban design for the expansion of the New Town. Stark's approach was taken up by his pupil William Playfair, who was also influenced by the work of John Nash, particularly at Regent's Park, London. This Picturesque in motion is how the setting of the Royal High School should be understood. From the west, the building takes advantage of a long and gradual approach consistent with the most advanced thinking at the time.

13.77 The proposed western extension would cut across and dominate the oblique views of the Hamilton building from the west. It would severely impinge upon the gap between the former school and St Andrew's House and the sense of separation created by setting the principal school building within open playgrounds to the east and west.

13.78 The setting of the building was conceived with the emerging symbolism of Calton Hill as a place of commemoration and identity. This landscape setting is connected with national identity, politics, commemoration, education, criminality, enlightenment, science and art. It includes themes related to aspects of the visual, astronomy, photography, the invention of the panorama, and the Picturesque. It is a powerful and precious cultural landscape. Thomas Hamilton carefully inserted his building into it in a way that mediates between and negotiates some of those themes and in particular its role in helping to establish the idea of Edinburgh as Athens.

13.79 The proposed wings would not retain the sense of separation and individuality of Hamilton's building. They would be read together and the hotel wings would undermine the delicate balance of actual size, scale and monumentality achieved by Hamilton. The original building would appear as a small precious object in a reticulated glass box.

13.80 The AHSS notes that the existing building makes a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the New Town Conservation Area as well as to the setting of the Old Town Conservation Area.

13.81 The AHSS supports appropriate, sympathetic, high-quality modern architecture and initiatives to bring historic buildings back into economic and social use. However, they say that the proposed scheme would bring over-development of the site. The balance of open and developed space would be harmed. The design and materials of the proposed development would not be appropriate to the special interest of the listed building. The design elements would not reflect or respond to the essential principles of neo-classicism found in the existing buildings and surrounding area.

Main points for The Edinburgh World Heritage Trust

13.82 The EWHT recognises that the appeal site can accept a degree of development in support of the restoration and re-use of the main building. However, it is abundantly clear that the proposals for a hotel of this size could not be built on the site without having a major impact on the building and its setting and therefore the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage Site.

13.83 The proposals would diminish the building and remove its setting. The principal building on the site would be turned into an object rather than an integrated part of an historic urban landscape. The failure of the proposed hotel wings to work with the topography would have a negative impact on outstanding universal value. There would be no discernible relationship to the role of Calton Hill in the cityscape. The visual connection of the building to the Picturesque movement would be broken.

Main points for the Cockburn Association

13.84 The association objects strongly to the proposed works. The dynamic composition of Calton Hill and the Royal High School would be compromised with the addition of the wing buildings either side, effectively linking it into a staggered terrace. The height of the wings would be higher than the central school building but also the adjacent Regent Terrace. There is a fundamental discord in the adaptation of a building with no windows to the view into an hotel. The proposals would undermine the building's important relationship with its context. The volume of accommodation said to be needed would not be appropriate.

13.85 The association is disappointed to see that the entrance lodge would be demolished. It works well within the set-piece design and ties into the wall and railings. It could be put to beneficial use.

13.86 The proposed wings are too high in relation to the principal building. This would be exacerbated by the extensive use of glass and inevitable illumination at night. The increase in scale over the principal building would be apparent despite some disguise by the elevation treatment.

13.87 Development of the western terrace would obscure important side views of the principal building. The spatial arrangement between buildings including the relationship with St Andrew's House would be weakened.

13.88 Adding further pavilions to the central building would unbalance the composition. The problem with a set-piece design so perfectly conceived is that it doesn't lend itself to any extension.

Main points for the Regent, Royal and Carlton Terraces and Mews Association

13.89 Of principal concern to the association is the impact of the proposed development on the special interest and significance of Calton Hill and the two listed terraces to the east. The unique combination of landscape and buildings was no accident and is recognised by the World Heritage Site inscription.

13.90 The elegant Regents Terrace would be debased by becoming the only service entrance for the development.

Main points for the Royal High School Preservation Trust

13.91 The Trust objects to the proposed works because of the impact they would have on the listed building and its setting.

13.92 The Trust also objects to the proposed works on the basis on which the appellants' carried out their economic assessment. They say the appellants have consistently overstated the benefits and have not used the correct methodology, that is the HM Treasury Green Book, to derive the net economic benefit. The key issue is whether there would be new business to Scotland as opposed to diverting trade from existing hotels.

Main points for others/ written representations

13.93 We also heard from three individual objectors: Ruth MacDonald, Neil Harrison, and Rosemary Addison. About 15 written representations were also received following receipt of the appeal.

13.94 That evidence, and much of the additional representations, object to the proposed works on the basis of the unacceptable impacts on the character, appearance and setting of the listed building. No other relevant issues were raised that we have not already dealt with in this report.

CHAPTER 14 Reporters' findings

The main issues

14.1 The main issues in this appeal are the impacts of the proposed works, including demolition, on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building; on its setting; and on the setting of other listed buildings. In the event that the Scottish Ministers find harm, we must also consider whether there are other options which might secure a beneficial future with less harm and any wider benefits that might stem from consent. Other issues include the impact of the proposed works on the New Town Conservation Area and on the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site.

Impacts on the special interest of the listed building

14.2 None of the parties to the inquiry and no other representations to the appeals dispute the importance and significance of the principal building on the site. It is clearly a building of national and even international importance. This includes the remaining original elements such as the retaining and boundary walls, gates and railings and the belvedere tower in the north-east corner of the site. We have assessed the relative importance of all elements of the listed building in Part 1, Chapter 3 of this report.

14.3 The basis for assessing impacts on a listed building is the building as it existed on the date of listing. At that time, the school had added buildings to the yards and in front of the rear retaining walls and belvedere. We note that these buildings and the historical development of the school are of some special interest but also note that they detract from the understanding and appreciation of the significance of the principal building. Were this understanding and appreciation to be enhanced or left unharmed by any particular scheme, we might consider that demolition of historic outbuildings would be justified.

14.4 More recent additions such as the canteen block and classroom block are not regarded by any party to be significant to the special interest of the listed building and their loss would be acceptable in our view, whatever the impact of the proposals before us.

14.5 The interior had already been considerably altered since the school left the site and after it had become listed. Many of the alterations also show progression of the use of the principal building, but in so doing detract from its special interest overall.

14.6 The grounds of the building were altered by the newer buildings and by landscape alterations to the playground areas. These changes, along with the later buildings which clutter the outside space, also detract from the special interest of the listed building.

14.7 We recognise that the rear retaining wall and the belvedere are elements of the original design for the site and that they were carefully considered as part of the setting of the whole against Calton Hill. We therefore understand the merit in restoring these to view and the benefit of improving the understanding of the design from important viewpoints. However, we note that this experience has been lost for some time and was not there at the time of listing.

14.8 The proposed development would help to preserve the listed building by a sympathetic repair and restoration of the fabric of the building. The outside of the principal building together with most of the boundary walls and railings would be brought into good condition. The proposed use would involve substantial alterations to some of the internal fabric but would reuse the main spaces for public areas. Proposed internal alterations would be sensitively done to protect adjacent fabric and minimise loss of the original. These impacts alone would amount to preservation by repair, protection and beneficial re-

use of the listed building. This must carry substantial weight in favour of the proposed new uses.

14.9 The recommendation of HES in their interim guidance, at paragraph 15, applies consideration of four specific criteria. Failure to meet any one of the criteria could be grounds to conclude that the presumption against works which adversely affect the special interest of the listed building or its setting should not be departed from.

14.10 The general approach of the appellants is to minimise the interventions in Hamilton's original work and design the necessary accommodation to add to the quality of that building in its setting. This is a valid conservation approach and one that responds well to a hotel design. Public rooms can be arranged in the larger spaces of the original school whilst the bedrooms and other requirements are best suited to new build. We consider the impacts of this further in our findings on setting.

14.11 The appellants accept the primacy of the southern elevation and the importance of the oblique views in the understanding and appreciation of the principal listed building. We consider that these would inevitably be significantly compromised by the addition of large-scale wings to each side, however they are cloaked.

14.12 Impacts on the setting of the listed building would be considerable. The prominence and dominance of the building in certain views would be spoiled by the overwhelming scale of the extensions proposed.

14.13 However, we note that the extensions to and interventions in the principal building have been designed to minimise their impact. A great deal of careful consideration has arrived at multifaceted framework of subdued framing, together with green roofs. The extensions would be behind the line of the main elevation and their elevations would be curved and stepped. The intentional mimicry of the rocky, verdant setting is skilfully handled by the architects. They would rationalise what has become a cluttered site.

14.14 Nevertheless, the large amount of glass would inevitably sparkle in the daylight, drawing attention to the mass of the new wings. The scale of the extensions would mask a large part of the background setting to the sides of the principal listed building. At night, the light reflecting from the surfaces and activity in the rooms would be potentially more prominent still. This would not be sufficiently mitigated by the technical specification of the proposed lighting, where surfaces, furniture and activity would reflect the light outwards.

14.15 We therefore say that these extensions would not blend with the hillside nor disappear into the background. They would appear overbearing, urbanising and out of context. They would be a distraction in significant views of the principal building and harmful to its setting.

14.16 The proposed works would be permanent development. They would attach to the existing building to a relatively limited extent, sufficient only to provide links between them. Although in theory the works could be reversed, we attach little weight to that in our assessment. Firstly, the successful re-use of the building would assume a sustained use. Secondly, the impact on setting would be immediate. Thirdly, the outbuildings could not reasonably be restored without loss of authenticity. Our considered view that the proposed extensions would be detrimental to the setting of the listed building would not be affected to any significant degree by whether the works could be reversed at some time in the future.

14.17 We must at this point record that our assessment of the Scheme 2 proposal is that it would in some respects reduce the severity of adverse impacts on the setting of the building over those arising from Scheme 1. Our clear judgement, however, is that those

reduced impacts are insufficient to enable us to conclude that the proposal would preserve the building and its setting.

The RHSPT scheme

14.18 This proposal has planning permission and listed building consent, although some details remain to be resolved. It has the financial backing of Dunard Fund, a charity established to promote the arts. The music school proposal is designed by architects and engineers of equal renown to those responsible for the appeal scheme. In our view, there is no reason why the RHSPT scheme would not be a viable and achievable alternative to the appeal proposals.

14.19 It is not our role here to revisit the merits of the RHSPT scheme except to assess whether it would cause less harm to the listed building. We have therefore assessed the impacts on the listed building and its setting in a similar way to our assessment of the appeal scheme, but only to compare with it for the purposes of applying the HES guidance.

14.20 The fact that the music school option has listed building consent does not mean that the proposed hotel is acceptable even if it would cause less harm. That is only one consideration. Conversely, the fact that the music school scheme has listed building consent does not mean that it would necessarily cause less harm.

14.21 The immediately obvious benefit of this proposal is that it is a school use, where the existing spaces could be re-used and where the intended occupier, like the RHS, has a distinguished reputation. Also, the visibility of the scheme (and its impact on setting) has been kept low by burying much of the school accommodation around internal top-lit courtyards, and it has been designed to accommodate the northern and eastern parts of the site, leaving the west side as designed landscape.

14.22 That said, the proposal includes extensive new building, major excavation and radical intervention into the existing fabric.

14.23 In assessing the overall balance of impacts on the special interest of the listed building, we rely on our hierarchy of importance and significance set out in Part 1 above. We consider that whichever option were to be established the original pattern of use would be further lost to the new arrangement. We therefore attribute less significance to the internal alterations. We note, however, that the appeal proposals would involve considerably less removal of original fabric of the principal building. In terms of the preservation of the listed building itself, the appeal proposal would better preserve the building.

14.24 Set against this is the much greater visual impact of the proposed hotel wings on the setting of the listed building. In our consideration of the special interest in Part 1 of this report we have found that the preservation of the magnificence of the principal building in its setting is what is most significant to the special interest. It is what survives best from the original intention and conception of the building and what lifts it beyond the architecture to an icon of the cultural development of Edinburgh in Scotland and the world.

14.25 It is not for us to consider or for Ministers to decide, within the confines of this appeal, whether the music school scheme would preserve the listed building or its setting or its features of special architectural or historic interest. We do, however, conclude that it is an option that would cause less harm to these attributes of the listed building than the appeal scheme, because of its lesser impact on setting.

Other options

14.26 Of course, Scheme 1 prepared by the appellants is an option for the listed building in this case, in terms of the HES guidance. It could, we heard, be as readily developed.

14.27 The appellants say that Scheme 2, subject of this appeal, has responded to the reasons for refusal of Scheme 1, and that its reduced physical form would have a less harmful impact on the listed building and its setting. Although the economic balance would shift, on that understanding, Scheme 1 would fail to meet the criteria at recommendation 15 of the HES guidance.

Whether there would be significant benefits

14.28 The appellants seek to build a world-class hotel. Their view is that this would add to the offer in this world-class city and create wealth and jobs. They base the economic argument on the quality of the hotel. We have found in the parallel planning appeals that the economic and tourism benefits of the appeal proposal would be at least regionally significant.

14.29 However, any benefits that might result from the proposals would rely on the quality of the hotel being secured indefinitely. In general terms, planning regulates the use of land in the public interest and permissions run with the land. Restricting a permission to a specific class of occupier is generally undesirable and should only be used when there are special grounds and where the alternative would be refusal. Any attempt to control the level of service and the price of a room would be fraught with difficulty and an interference in the market. The operating model of the hotel would be vulnerable to change to maintain the business. We therefore place limited weight on the proposal to define the particular quality or level of service at the hotel and the proposed conditions to restrict it. The benefit of the proposed hotel to the economy should not therefore be determined on the ambitions for a world-class hotel.

14.30 The appellants also say that the proposal would have an improved urban design at the western end where it engages with Waterloo Place/ Regent Road and the foreground to St Andrew's House. The impact of that is discussed in our report on the planning applications. For the purposes of the listed building consent applications, we do not consider that any benefit to that part of the public realm would be of such significance to conclude overall that there would be no harm to the special interest of the listed building or its setting nor to overcome the policy presumption against the harm we have found.

14.31 It has long been a tenet of historic building conservation that 'if you don't use it you may well lose it'. If successfully completed, the proposed scheme would remove the building from the at-risk register. That would reflect a significant change in fortunes for the building. However, we consider that the consented scheme for the RHS Preservation Trust indicates that there could be other ways in which the former Royal High School could be converted and altered to a viable use, thereby significantly reducing the risk to its preservation.

The conservation area

14.32 The proposed works would be a radical intervention in a sensitive part of the New Town Conservation Area. As set out in our analysis of the impact on the listed building and its setting, these works would appear as two major extensions out of keeping with the character of the principal school building and its prominent setting. For that reason, the character and appearance of the conservation area would be neither preserved nor enhanced by what is proposed.

World Heritage

14.33 The current management plan says that balancing the needs of the city to maintain its economic vibrancy and the need to protect the heritage is essential to both. It seems to us that this implies that the economic vibrancy must not be at the expense of protection of the heritage. Indeed, the outstanding universal value is a key driver of the economic success of the city and must be protected, developed and celebrated. We consider that this supports the statutory approach to protection of the listed building and to the preservation or enhancement of the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore, we say, the proposed works would harm the outstanding universal values of the World Heritage Site.

14.34 Beyond that, we heard argument that the proposed development may lead to the loss of World Heritage Site status. It seems to us that such a likelihood would be uncertain and not for us to conclude on within the confines of this appeal.

Other matters

14.35 We acknowledge the efforts made better to understand the building and its setting and to explain the proposed works in that context. There is no doubt that this has led to increased understanding of the importance of the building.

14.36 However, we note that the mitigation proposed is predicated on the need for an amount of new development, rather than an assessment of the amount that could be developed without harm to the building, its setting and the character or appearance of the conservation area. This is not outweighed by the improved understanding of the building and its setting provided in evidence to the inquiry.

CHAPTER 15 Conditions

15.1 Although our recommendation in this case is that the Scottish Ministers should dismiss the appeal and refuse to grant listed building consent for the proposed works, we acknowledge that they may come to a different view. We have therefore considered the conditions proposed by the parties that might be attached if listed building consent were to be granted in this case.

15.2 A single condition was agreed between the council and the appellants. It would require that no part of the existing structures shall be demolished until a contract including the refurbishment of the main Hamilton building is in place. We agree that this condition would be necessary to ensure that no historic fabric would be lost without some assurance that the benefits of the scheme would be realised. A similar condition was proposed by HES but would not be required in addition.

15.3 Several other conditions were proposed by CEC and HES and these were discussed at our hearing session.

15.4 A condition requiring details of the new railings around the portico was suggested. We consider that there is insufficient detail to be sure that the quality of these would match the existing standard of material and detail. We also consider that the means of fixing to the existing building could have an impact on its special interest. To preserve the quality of the original building we consider that these matters should be subject to further detail, subject to a condition requiring submission for approval. The council suggested that consultation with HES should be included in the condition. This would not be necessary because it is a matter for the council who they consult.

15.5 The council proposed a condition seeking a programme of archaeological works based on a scheme of investigation. It is our view that such a condition relates to archaeology rather than listed building legislation and should properly be attached to any planning permission for the development of the site. Duplication through the listed building consent is not necessary.

15.6 The existing building has a carved stone armorial plaque built into its wall. It dates from an earlier school and was moved to the site when the school relocated. It is somewhat weathered. The proposed works would include removing this plaque. HES suggested a condition to ensure that it is preserved. This too is a matter covered by the suggested conditions in the linked planning appeals and repetition here would be unnecessary.

15.7 HES suggest a condition to require more detail of the connections between the main Hamilton building and the proposed hotel wings. A similar condition is proposed to consider how the glazed access corridors at the rear of the main building would be built. Another would require details of the reinstatement of features in the main hall. In our view, these matters are covered in detail in the drawings submitted with the application. Careful consideration has been given to the way in which the work at these junctions of old and new would be done. Any variation from the proposed solutions would require a fresh listed building consent if they would affect the special interest of the building. We recommend that these conditions are not attached to any consent.

15.8 Further suggested conditions relating to rock extraction are intended to protect the site of special scientific interest at Arthurs Seat and to ensure that railway infrastructure is protected. These matters do not relate to the preservation of the listed building and would be adequately covered by conditions on the associated planning permissions (if granted). without which the proposed works could not be carried out.

15.9 We therefore set out at Appendix 8 the conditions that we recommend should be attached to any consent together with the reasons for them.

CHAPTER 16 Conclusions and recommendations for Scheme 2

16.1 The beauty and harmony of central Edinburgh rests on the historical development of a dramatic landscape. Key buildings and spaces survive to connect with the past and to preserve what constitutes the particular distinction of the city in its landscape – its genius loci. The scale of the topography has accommodated change over centuries, which has allowed the city to reinvent and adapt to maintain a vigorous and healthy society.

16.2 The listed building regime and the world heritage designation exist to ensure that the most important buildings and townscape are preserved and that current demands and fashions do not deform the beauty and harmony deriving from the special interest of its buildings and universal value of its townscapes. At the same time, these special values contribute to the vitality and economic benefit brought by visitors to the city.

16.3 There is no requirement in national policy or HES guidance that an extension to an old building should look old. The architecture of the proposed development has been approached with honesty and confidence. The solutions are reasonable and well-considered modern interventions.

16.4 In our view, the restoration of the building and part clearance of later additions to expose and enhance the original setting are desirable outcomes. We also note that the architects' approach to the proposed extensions is exemplary and would produce high quality contextual modern architecture.

16.5 However, this does not add up to an acceptable or beneficial solution where the impact of the scale of the extensions is so harmful to the integrity and setting of this nationally and internationally important listed building in its highly valued setting.

16.6 We conclude that the extent of the works proposed is so great that the setting of the listed building would be dramatically and irreparably harmed. That would not preserve the setting of the listed building, which we consider to be one of the most significant aspects of the listed building.

16.7 We note that the proposed hotel would ensure repair, reinstatement and protection for the principal listed building, Hamilton's masterpiece of Greek revival architecture for the Athens of the North. It would also contribute to the economy of the city and the region.

16.8 However, our examination of the appeal proposal concludes overall that the proposed works would not preserve the listed building or its setting and that the character and appearance of the Edinburgh New Town Conservation Area would be neither preserved nor enhanced. That would be contrary to Sections 14 and 64 respectively of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.

16.9 We therefore recommend that the appeal be refused.

Dannie Onn
Reporter

Scott M Ferrie
Assistant Chief Reporter

Appendix 1: Note of pre-examination meeting

[Pre examination meeting 1](#)

[Pre-examination meeting 2](#)

Appendix 2: Schedule of documents

[Core documents](#)

[Documents for the appellants](#)

[Documents for the council](#)

[Documents for Historic Environment Scotland](#)

[Documents for Edinburgh World Heritage/ The Cockburn Association/ The New Town and Broughton Community Council](#)

[Documents for Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland](#)

[Documents for Royal High School Preservation Trust](#)

[Documents for Regent, Royal, Carlton Terraces Mews Association](#)

Appendix 3: Inquiry session 1: precognitions

Precognitions submitted by the appellants

[Andrew wright](#)

[Andrew Wright rebuttal](#)

[Roger Mascal](#)

[Hannah Tweedie](#)

[Hannah Tweedie rebuttal](#)

[Gordon Gibb](#)

[Gordon Cameron Murray](#)

[Richard Collins written submission](#)

[Marc van Grieken](#)

[Robert Tavernor](#)

[Gary Mappin](#)

[Gary Mappin rebuttal](#)

[Gary Mappin conservation areas note](#)

Precognitions submitted by the council

[David Leslie](#)

[David Leslie rebuttal](#)

[Julie Waldron](#)

[Julie Waldron rebuttal](#)

[Euan McMeeken](#)

[Euan McMeeken rebuttal](#)

[Carla Parkes](#)

[Carla Parkes rebuttal](#)

Precognitions submitted by Historic Environment Scotland

[Catherine Middleton](#)

[Catherine Middleton rebuttal](#)

[Steven Robb](#)

[Steven Robb rebuttal](#)

[Susan Denyer](#)

[Susan Denyer rebuttal](#)

Precognitions submitted by The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland

[John Lowrey](#)

[Peter Drummond](#)

Precognitions submitted by The Cockburn Association/ Edinburgh World Heritage/ The New Town and Broughton Community Council

[Kirsten Carter McKee](#)

[Adam Wilkinson](#)

[Richard Price](#)

[Terry Levinthal](#)

Precognitions submitted by the Royal High School Preservation Trust

[Colin Liddell](#)

[David Narro](#)

[James Welsh](#)

Precognitions submitted by the Regent, Royal, Carlton Terraces and Mews Association

[Carol Nimmo](#)

Precognitions submitted by other objectors

[Ruth MacDonald](#)

[Neil Harrison](#)

[Rosemary Addison](#)

Appendix 4: Inquiry session 2: precognitions

Precognitions submitted by the appellants

[Andrew Logan](#)

[Russell Kett](#)

[Mark Jones](#)

[Marc Finney](#)

[Gary Mappin](#)

Precognitions submitted by the council

[Kyle Drummond](#)

[Carla Parkes](#)

[Carla Parkes rebuttal](#)

Precognitions submitted by The Cockburn Association/ Edinburgh World Heritage

[Spiros Batas](#)

Precognitions submitted by the Royal High School Preservation Trust

[Gavan Conlon](#)

Appendix 5: Hearing session statements (conditions and planning obligation)

[Appellants' hearing statement](#)

[CEC hearing statement on conditions and planning obligations](#)

[Final schedules of suggested conditions with annotations by the parties](#)

[Final schedules annotated by AHSS](#)

Appendix 6: Closing statements

[The appellants](#)

[The council](#)

[Historic Environment Scotland](#)

[The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland](#)

[The Cockburn Association/ Edinburgh World Heritage/ The New Town and Broughton Community Council](#) and [Addendum](#)

[The Royal High School Preservation Trust](#)

[The Regent, Royal, Carlton Terraces and Mews Association](#)

Appendix 7: Representations from Mr Black

[Representation from Mr Black dated 16 November 2017](#)

[Inquiry statement from Mr Black](#)

[Representation from Mr Black dated 24 September 2018](#)

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=360980> representation dated 8 April 2016

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=391012> Exchange with Mr Black regarding procurement exercise undertaken by CEC

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=391146> Further exchange with Mr Black regarding procurement exercise undertaken by CEC

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=383508> Exchange with David Black clarifying Note of PEM

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=381853> Submission on status of appeal

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=520004> Statement (PPA-230-2213)

Attachment from PPA-230-2213 - written submission - summary of core arguments - MASTER COPY (no link as not published)

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=546860> Published version of above

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=547565> Comments on submission of oral evidence at inquiry (PPA-230-2213)

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=547943> Further comments from Mr Back (PPA-230-2213)

Attachment - RHS EU legal arguments – 1 October 2018

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=607708> Seeking update on progress of reports and further query regarding contract between GEC and appellant (PPA-230-2213)

<http://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/Document.aspx?id=361029> Representation – 8 April 2016 (LBA-230-2076)

Appendix 8: Schedule of proposed conditions

Scheme 1

1. No part of the existing structures shall be demolished until a contract including the refurbishments of the main Hamilton building is in place.

Reason: in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the Category A listed building.

2. Prior to the commencement of development a detailed scheme for the design and materials of the railings to the portico, providing public access from the main assembly hall of the listed building, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority, and those railings shall be erected in full compliance with that approved scheme prior to the first occupation of the premises.

Reason: in order to ensure that the design and materials are of a satisfactory standard so as to safeguard the character and appearance of the Category A listed building.

Scheme 2

1. No part of the existing structures shall be demolished until a contract including the refurbishments of the main Hamilton building is in place.

Reason: in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the Category A listed building.

2. Prior to the commencement of development a detailed scheme for the design and materials of the railings to the portico, providing public access from the main assembly hall of the listed building, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority, and those railings shall be erected in full compliance with that approved scheme prior to the first occupation of the premises.

Reason: in order to ensure that the design and materials are of a satisfactory standard so as to safeguard the character and appearance of the Category A listed building.

Appendix 9: Schedule of drawings

Scheme 1

Document Number	Document Description [DPEA Number and Ref]
CD 074.	Drawings – Existing Building Plans - AL(EX)002 –Rev A - Existing Site Plan [14a - AL(EX)002 - RevA - Existing Site Plan]
CD 075.	Drawings – Existing Building Plans - AL(EX)110 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan – Basement Level [14b - AL(EX)110 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan - Basement Level]
CD 076.	Drawings – Existing Building Plans - AL(EX)111 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan – Lower Ground Level [14c - AL(EX)111 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan - Lower Ground Level]
CD 077.	Drawings – Existing Building Plans - AL(EX)112 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan – Upper Ground Level [14d - AL(EX)112 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan - Upper Ground Level]
CD 078.	Drawings – Existing Building Plans - AL(EX)113 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan – Mezzanine Level [14e - AL(EX)113 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan - Mezzanine Level]
CD 079.	Drawings – Existing Building Plans - AL(EX)114 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan – Roof [14f - AL(EX)114 - Existing Hamilton Building Plan - Roof]
CD 080.	Drawings – Existing Building Plans - AL(EX)130 - Existing East & West Pavilion [14g - AL(EX)130 - Existing East & West Pavilion]
CD 081.	Drawings – Existing Building Plans - AL(EX)135 - Existing Lodge & Gymnasium [14h - AL(EX)135 - Existing Lodge and Gymnasium]
CD 082.	Drawings – Existing Building Plans - AL(EX)210 - Existing Hamilton Building Sections [14i - AL(EX)210 - Existing Hamilton Building Sections]

- CD 083. Drawings – Existing Building Plans -
AL(EX)310 - Existing Hamilton Building
Existing Elevations N+S
[14j - AL(EX)310 - Existing Hamilton
Building Existing Elevations N+S]
- CD 084. Drawings – Existing Building Plans -
AL(EX)311 - Existing Hamilton Building
Existing Elevations
[14k - AL(EX)311 - Existing Hamilton
Building Existing Elevations]
- CD 085. Drawings – Existing Building Plans -
AL(EX)325 - Existing North Site
Elevations
[14l - AL(EX)325 - Existing North Site
Elevations]
- CD 086. Drawings – Existing Building Plans -
AL(EX)326 - Existing South Site
Elevations
[14m - AL(EX)326 - Existing South Site
Elevations]
- CD 087. Drawings – Existing Building Plans -
AL(EX)327 - Existing East & West Site
Elevations
[14n - AL(EX)327 - Existing East & West
Site Elevations]
- CD 088. AL(EX)350 - Existing Photographs –
Hamilton Building
[14o - AL(EX)350 - Existing Photographs
- Hamilton Building]
- CD 089. AL(EX)351 - Existing Photographs – East
Pavilion
[14p - AL(EX)351 - Existing Photographs
- East Pavilion]
- CD 090. AL(EX)352 - Existing Photographs – West
Pavilion
[14q - AL(EX)352 - Existing Photographs
- West Pavilion]
- CD 091. AL(EX)353 - Existing Photographs –
Lodge
[14r - AL(EX)353 - Existing Photographs -
Lodge]
- CD 092. AL(EX)354 - Existing Photographs –
Gymnasium
[14s - AL(EX)354 - Existing Photographs -
Gymnasium]
- CD 093. AL(EX)355 - Existing Photographs –
Luncheon Hall
[14t - AL(EX)355 - Existing Photographs -
Luncheon Hall]
- CD 094. AL(EX)356 - Existing Photographs –
Classroom Block

- CD 095. [14v - AL(EX)356 - Existing Photographs - Classroom Block]
Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)002 - Demolition Site Plan
[15a - AL(D-)002 - Demolition Site Plan]
- CD 096. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)110 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Basement Level
[15b - AL(d-)110 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Basement Level]
- CD 097. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)111 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Lower Ground Level
[15c - AL(D-)111 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Lower Ground Level]
- CD 098. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)112 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Upper Ground Level
[15d - AL(D-)112 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Upper Ground Level]
- CD 099. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)113 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Mezzanine Level
[15e - AL(D-)113 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Mezzanine Level]
- CD 100. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)114 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Roof Level
[15f - AL(D-)114 - Hamilton Building Demolition Plan - Roof Level]
- CD 101. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)130 - East and West Pavilion Demolition Elevations
[15g - AL(D-)130 - East and West Pavilion Demolition Elevations]
- CD 102. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)210 - Hamilton Building Demolition Sections
[15h - AL(D-)210 - Hamilton Building Demolition Sections]
- CD 103. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)310 - Hamilton Building Demolition 1-2 Elevations
[15i - AL(D-)310 - Hamilton Building Demolition 1-2 Elevations]
- CD 104. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)311- Hamilton Building Demolition 1-6 Elevations
[15j - AL(D-)311 - Hamilton Building Demolition 1-6 Elevations]
- CD 105. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)325 - North Site Demolition Elevation

- CD 106. [15k - AL(D-)325 - North Site Demolition Elevation]
 Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)326 - South Site Demolition Elevation
 [15l - AL(D-)326 - South Site Demolition Elevation]
- CD 107. Drawings – Demolition Plans - AL(D-)327 -East & West Site Demolition Elevations
 [15m - AL(D-)327 - East & West Site Demolition Elevations]
- CD 108. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)001 - Location Plan
 [16a - AL(PL)001 - Location Plan]
- CD 109. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)002 - Proposed Site Plan
 [16b - AL(PL)002 - Proposed Site Plan]
- CD 110. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)110 - Proposed Plan - Basement Level
 [16c - AL(PL)110 - Proposed Plan - Basement Level]
- CD 111. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)111 - Proposed Plan - Lower Ground Level
 [16d - AL(PL)111 - Proposed Plan - Lower Ground Level]
- CD 112. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)112 - Proposed Plan - Upper Ground Level
 [16e - AL(PL)112 - Proposed Plan - Upper Ground Level]
- CD 113. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)113 - Proposed Plan - First Floor Level
 [16f - AL(PL)113 - Proposed Plan - First Floor Level]
- CD 114. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)114 - Proposed Plan - Second Floor Level
 [16g - AL(PL)114 - Proposed Plan - Second Floor Level]
- CD 115. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)115 - Proposed Plan - Third Floor Level
 [16h - AL(PL)115 - Proposed Plan - Third Floor Level]
- CD 116. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)116 - Proposed Plan - Fourth Floor Level
 [16i - AL(PL)116 - Proposed Plan - Fourth Floor Level]
- CD 117. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)210 - Rev A - Proposed Sections AA(1), AA(2)
 [16j - AL(PL)210 - Rev A - Proposed Sections AA(1), AA (2)]
- CD 118. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)211 - Rev B - Proposed Sections AA(3), BB

- CD 119. [16k - AL(PL)211 - Rev B - Proposed Sections AA (3), BB]
Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)212 - Rev A - Proposed Sections CC, DD
[16l - AL(PL)212 - Rev A - Proposed Sections CC, DD]
- CD 120. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)213 - Rev A - Proposed Sections EE, FF
[16m - AL(PL)213 - Rev A - Proposed Section EE, FF]
- CD 121. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)214 - Rev B - Proposed Sections GG, HH
[16n - AL(PL)214 - Rev B - Proposed Sections GG, HH]
- CD 122. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)215 - Rev B - Proposed Contextual Sections AA, CC
[16o - AL(PL)215 - Rev B - Proposed Contextual Sections AA, CC]
- CD 123. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)216 - Rev B - Proposed Contextual Sections FF, HH
[16p - AL(PL)216 - Rev B - Proposed Contextual Sections FF, HH]
- CD 124. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)245 - Proposed South Portico Detail Section
[16q - AL(PL)245 - Proposed South Portico Detail Section]
- CD 125. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)260 - Proposed North Elevation Main Entrance Detail Section
[16r - AL(PL)260 - Proposed North Elevation Main Entrance Detail Section]
- CD 126. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)285 - Proposed West Wing -West Pavilion (North) Detail Sections
[16s - AL(PL)285 - Proposed West Wing - West Pavilion (North) Detail Sections]
- CD 127. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)286 - Proposed West Wing - West Gallery Connection Detail Sections
[16t - AL(PL)286 - Proposed West Wing - West Gallery Connection Detail Sections]
- CD 128. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)287 - Proposed West Wing - West Pavilion (South) Detail Sections
[16u - AL(PL)287 - Proposed West Wing - West Pavilion (South) Detail Sections]
- CD 129. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)295 - Proposed East Pavilion Service Access Detail Sections

- CD 130. [16v - AL(PL)295 - Proposed East Pavilion Service Access Detail Sections]
Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)296 - Proposed East Pavilion Service Access Detail Section
- CD 131. [16w - AL(PL)296 - Proposed East Pavilion Service Access Detail Section]
Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)325 - Rev A - Proposed North Site Elevation
[16x - AL(PL)325 - Rev A - Proposed North Site Elevation]
- CD 132. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)326 - Proposed East Wing - East Elevation
[16y - AL(PL)326 - Proposed East Wing - East Elevation]
- CD 133. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)327 – Rev A - Proposed South Site Elevation
[16z - AL(PL)327 - Rev A - Proposed South Site Elevation]
- CD 134. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)328 - Proposed West Wing - West Elevation
[16aa - AL(PL)328 - Proposed West Wing - West Elevation]
- CD 135. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)329 - Proposed East Wing - West Elevation
[16bb - AL(PL)329 - Proposed East Wing - West Elevation]
- CD 136. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)330 - Proposed West Wing - East Elevation
[16cc - AL(PL)330 - Proposed West Wing - East Elevation]
- CD 137. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)350 - Proposed West Wing Detail Elevation & Section
[16dd - AL(PL)350 - Proposed West Wing Detail Elevation & Section]
- CD 138. Drawings – Proposed Plans - AL(PL)351 - Proposed East Wing Detail Elevation & Section
[16ee - AL(PL)351 - Proposed East Wing Detail Elevation & Section]
- CD 139. Drawings – Landscape Plans - 1427.L.N(91)001 - Tree Survey
[17a - 1427.L.N(91)001 - Tree Survey]
- CD 140. Drawings – Landscape Plans - 1427.L.N(91)002 - Tree Removal Plan
[17b - 1427.L.N(91)002 - Tree Removal Plan]
- CD 141. Drawings – Landscape Plans - 1427.L.N(91)003 - Rev B - Tree Protection Plan

- CD 142. [17c - 1427.L.N(91)003 - Rev B - Tree Protection Plan]
 Drawings – Landscape Plans - 1427.L.G(92)001 - Rev B - General Landscape Layout
 [17d - 1427.L.G(92)001 - Rev B - General Landscape Layout]
- CD 143. Drawings – Landscape Plans - 1427.L.G(92)002 - Proposed Site Planting Plan
 [17e - 1427.L.G(92)002 - Proposed Site Planting Plan]
- CD 144. Drawings – Landscape Plans - 1427.L.G(92)003 - West Roofs Plan
 [17f - 1427.L.G(92)003 - West Roofs Plan]
- CD 145. Drawings – Landscape Plans - 1427.L.G(92)004 - East Roofs Plan
 [17g - 1427.L.G(92)004 - East Roofs Plan]
- CD 146. Drawings – Landscape Plans - 1427.L.G(92)005 - Rev B - Proposed Public Realm Layout
 [17h - 1427.L.G(92)005 - Rev B - Proposed Public Realm Layout]

Scheme 2

- CD 211. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)002 Demolition Site Plan
 [025a - Drawing RHSv AL(D)002 Demolition Site Plan]
- CD 212. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)110 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Basement Plan
 [025b - Drawing RHSv AL(D)110 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Basement Plan]
- CD 213. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)111 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Lower Ground Plan
 [025c - Drawing RHSv AL(D)111 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Lower Ground Plan]
- CD 214. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)112 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Upper Ground Plan
 [025d - Drawing RHSv AL(D)112 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Upper Ground Plan]

- CD 215. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)113 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Mezzanine Plan
[025e - Drawing RHSv AL(D)113 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Mezzanine Plan]
- CD 216. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)114 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Roof Plan
[025f - Drawing RHSv AL(D)114 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Roof Plan]
- CD 217. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)130 Demolition - East & West Pavilions - Plans & Elevations
[025g - Drawing RHSv AL(D)130 Demolition - East & West Pavilions - Plans & Elevations]
- CD 218. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)210 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Sections
[025h - Drawing RHSv AL(D)210 Demolition - Hamilton Building – Sections]
- CD 219. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)310 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Elevations North & South
[025i - Drawing RHSv AL(D)310 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Elevations North & South]
- CD 220. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)311 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Elevations East & West
[025j - Drawing RHSv AL(D)311 Demolition - Hamilton Building - Elevations East & West]
- CD 221. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)325 Demolition - North Site Elevation
[025k - Drawing RHSv AL(D)325 Demolition - North Site Elevation]
- CD 222. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)326 Demolition - South Site Elevation
[025l - Drawing RHSv AL(D)326 Demolition - South Site Elevation]
- CD 223. Drawings – Demolition - Drawing RHSv AL(D)327 Demolition - East+West Site Elevations
[025m - Drawing RHSv AL(D)327 Demolition - East+West Site Elevations]

- CD 224. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)001 Location Plan
[026a - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)001 Location Plan]
- CD 225. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)002 Proposed - Site Plan - RevA 2017.07.21
[026b - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)002 Proposed - Site Plan - RevA 2017.07.21]
- CD 226. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)110 Proposed - Basement Level - RevA 2017.07.21
[026c - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)110 Proposed - Basement Level - RevA 2017.07.21]
- CD 227. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)111 Proposed - Lower Ground Floor Level - RevB 2017.07.21
[026d - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)111 Proposed - Lower Ground Floor Level - RevB 2017.07.21]
- CD 228. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)112 Proposed - Upper Ground Floor Plan - RevB 2017.07.21
[026e - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)112 Proposed - Upper Ground Floor Plan - RevB 2017.07.21]
- CD 229. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)113 Proposed - First Floor Plan - RevA 2017.06.21
[026f - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)113 Proposed - First Floor Plan - RevA 2017.06.21]
- CD 230. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)114 Proposed - Second Floor Plan - RevA 2017.06.21
[026g - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)114 Proposed - Second Floor Plan - RevA 2017.06.21]
- CD 231. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)115 Proposed - Third Floor Plan - RevA 2017.06.21
[026h - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)115 Proposed - Third Floor Plan - RevA 2017.06.21]
- CD 232. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)116 Proposed - Fourth Floor (Roof) Plan - RevA 2017.06.21
[026i - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)116 Proposed - Fourth Floor (Roof) Plan - RevA 2017.06.21]

- CD 233. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)119 Proposed - Hamilton Bldg Upper Ground - Acoustic Glazing 2017.06.21
[026j - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)119 Proposed - Hamilton Bldg Upper Ground - Acoustic Glazing 2017.06.21]
- CD 234. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)120 Proposed - Hamilton Bldg Mezzanine - Acoustic Glazing 2017.06.21
[026k - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)120 Proposed - Hamilton Bldg Mezzanine - Acoustic Glazing 2017.06.21]
- CD 235. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)210 Proposed - Section AA(1), AA(2) RevA
[026l - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)210 Proposed - Section AA(1), AA(2) RevA]
- CD 236. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)211 Proposed - Section AA(3), BB
[026m - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)211 Proposed - Section AA(3), BB]
- CD 237. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)212 Proposed - Section CC, DD
[026n - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)212 Proposed - Section CC, DD]
- CD 238. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)213 Proposed - Section EE FF RevA 11.05.2017
[026o - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)213 Proposed - Section EE FF RevA 11.05.2017]
- CD 239. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)214 Proposed - Section GG, HH
[026p - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)214 Proposed - Section GG, HH]
- CD 240. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)215 Proposed - Contextual Section AA, CC
[026q - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)215 Proposed - Contextual Section AA, CC]
- CD 241. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)216 Proposed - Contextual Section FF, HH
[026r - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)216 Proposed - Contextual Section FF, HH]
- CD 242. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)245 Proposed - South Portico Detail Section
[026s - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)245 Proposed - South Portico Detail Section]

- CD 243. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)260 Proposed - North Elevation Main Entrance Detail Section
[026t - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)260 Proposed - North Elevation Main Entrance Detail Section]
- CD 244. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)286 Proposed - West Rear Gallery Detail Sections
[026u - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)286 Proposed - West Rear Gallery Detail Sections]
- CD 245. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)287 Proposed - West Wing, West Pavilion - South - Detail Sections
[026v - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)287 Proposed - West Wing, West Pavilion - South - Detail Sections]
- CD 246. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)295 Proposed - Landscape Stairway
[026w - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)295 Proposed - Landscape Stairway]
- CD 247. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)325 Proposed - North Elevation
[026x - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)325 Proposed - North Elevation]
- CD 248. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)326 Proposed - East Wing East Elevation
[026y - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)326 Proposed - East Wing East Elevation]
- CD 249. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)327 Proposed - South Elevation
[026z - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)327 Proposed - South Elevation]
- CD 250. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)328 Proposed - West Wing West Elevation
[026aa - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)328 Proposed - West Wing West Elevation]
- CD 251. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)329 Proposed - East Wing West Elevation
[026bb - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)329 Proposed - East Wing West Elevation]
- CD 252. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)330 Proposed - West Wing East Elevation
[026cc - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)330 Proposed - West Wing East Elevation]

- CD 253. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)331 Proposed - East Wing East Elevation - RevC 2017.07.25
[026dd - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)331 Proposed - East Wing East Elevation - RevC 2017.07.25]
- CD 254. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)350 Proposed - West Wing South Façade Detail Elevation+Section
[026ee - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)350 Proposed - West Wing South Façade Detail Elevation+Section]
- CD 255. Drawings – Proposed - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)351 Proposed - East Wing South Façade Detail Elevation+Section - RevA 2017.05.11
[026ff - Drawing RHSv AL(PL)351 Proposed - East Wing South Façade Detail Elevation+Section - RevA 2017.05.11]
- CD 256. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)001 Landscape - General Layout - Ground Floor RevG 2017.07.17
[027a - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)001 Landscape - General Layout - Ground Floor RevG 2017.07.17]
- CD 257. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)002 Landscape - General Layout - Roof Plan 2017.05.11
[027b - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)002 Landscape - General Layout - Roof Plan 2017.05.11]
- CD 258. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)003 Landscape - Proposed Public Realm Layout RevF 2017.07.17
[027c - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)003 Landscape - Proposed Public Realm Layout RevF 2017.07.17]
- CD 259. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)004 Landscape - Site Sections AA, BB and CC 2017.05.11
[027d - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)004 Landscape - Site Sections AA, BB and CC 2017.05.11]
- CD 260. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)005 Landscape - Site Sections DD and EE 2017.05.11
[027e - Drawing 1614.L.G(92)005 Landscape - Site Sections DD and EE 2017.05.11]

- CD 261. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.G(93)001 Landscape - Proposed Site Planting Plan 2017.05.11
[027f - Drawing 1614.L.G(93)001 Landscape - Proposed Site Planting Plan 2017.05.11]
- CD 262. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.N(91)001 Landscape - Tree Survey
[027g - Drawing 1614.L.N(91)001 Landscape - Tree Survey]
- CD 263. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.N(91)002 Landscape - Tree Removal Plan
[027h - Drawing 1614.L.N(91)002 Landscape - Tree Removal Plan]
- CD 264. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.N(91)003 Landscape - Tree Protection Plan
[027i - Drawing 1614.L.N(91)003 Landscape - Tree Protection Plan]
- CD 265. Drawings – Landscape - Drawing 1614.L.S(98)001 Landscape - Planting Plan Design Intent 2017.05.12
[027j - Drawing 1614.L.S(98)001 Landscape - Planting Plan Design Intent 2017.05.12]