

Development Management Sub Committee

Wednesday 6 June 2018

Application for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions 17/05120/AMC

At Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road, Edinburgh
Application for approval of matters conditioned regarding
the erection of buildings containing 18 houses and 144 flats;
formation of road access, parking, private and public open
space (as amended).

| | |
|----------------------|-------------|
| Item number | 4.3 |
| Report number | |
| Wards | B04 - Forth |

Summary

The proposed residential use on the site is acceptable and would contribute to meeting housing need and regeneration at Granton Waterfront. There are positive aspects of the development and a number of issues have been adequately dealt with.

However, the design of the flatted blocks contains an over dominant protruding roof that is an inappropriate design feature contrary to Local Development Plan (LDP) Policy Des 1 Design Quality and Context.

Although the general layout does follow that set out in the masterplan, the siting of Block C and location of car parking, combined with the awkward site boundary result in a proposed layout that would compromise the regeneration and development potential of the adjacent sites resulting in poorly planned left over areas of space. This is contrary to LDP Policies Des 2 Co-ordinated Development, Des 7 Layout Design and Del 3 Edinburgh Waterfront.

A lack of information has been provided for the safeguarded footpath/cyclepath that runs along the western edge of the development. It appears that the delivery of the walkway conflicts with the proposed road layout impacting on its delivery. This is contrary to LDP Policy Tra 9 Cycle and Footpath Network.

The level of car parking proposed is excessive and is contrary to Policy Tra 2 Private Car Parking.

There is a lack of information provided in relation to landscaping and therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy Des 8 Public Realm and Landscape Design.

Links

[Policies and guidance for this application](#)

LDPP, LDEL01, LDEL03, LDES01, LDES02, LDES03, LDES04, LDES05, LDES06, LDES07, LDES08, LDES10, LDES11, LEN08, LEN09, LEN13, LEN14, LEN15, LEN16, LEN20, LEN21, LEN22, LHOU01, LHOU02, LHOU03, LHOU04, LHOU06, LTRA02, LTRA03, LTRA04, LTRA09, NSG, NSGD02,

Report

Application for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions 17/05120/AMC

**At Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road, Edinburgh
Application for approval of matters conditioned regarding the erection of buildings containing 18 houses and 144 flats; formation of road access, parking, private and public open space (as amended).**

Recommendations

1.1 It is recommended that this application be Refused for the reasons below.

Background

2.1 Site description

The site is irregular in shape, covering approximately 2.46 hectares. It stretches from West Harbour Road to the south and Hesperus Crossway to the north. The northern part of the site is currently vacant land. The southern part of the site contains various industrial style buildings and the land is occupied by plant/scaffolding hire companies.

It has a zigzag eastern boundary with a number of business/industrial uses and buildings on land immediately to the east. The western boundary of the site is formed by the western breakwater.

A flatted residential scheme is currently under construction to the north of the site, with an existing residential development rising up to seven storeys adjacent to this. To the south are more business/industrial uses.

Access is currently from the south west corner from West Harbour Road. The site can also be accessed from Hesperus Crossway, but fencing is currently in place to prohibit this.

2.2 Site History

Relevant history to the site:

20 June 2003 - Outline planning permission granted for the Granton Harbour Village, mixed use development comprising residential units, hotel and serviced apartments, shops and retail /services, restaurants /cafes, public houses, general business, leisure facilities and marina. This permission includes a legal agreement to secure contributions towards education and transportation infrastructure, 15% affordable housing, restrictions on future tenancies within Granton Industrial Estate and the long term maintenance and upkeep of the Western Breakwater (application number: 01/00802/OUT).

31 January 2014 - Application approved for matters specified in condition 2 as attached to outline permission 01/00802/OUT: covering siting and height of development; design and configuration of public and open spaces; access, road layouts; footpaths and cycle routes. This was subject to a number of conditions (application number: 13/04320/AMC).

2 February 2017 - Approval of matters specified in condition 2 of outline application 01/00802/OUT covering siting and height of development, design and configuration of public and open spaces, access, road layouts, footpaths and cycle routes (Scheme 2) approved. However, the matters applied for in relation to plots 8C, 12,14, 15, 15A, 16, 17, S1, S2 and 35 are not approved (application number: 16/05618/AMC). This is the most up to date masterplan for the Granton Harbour area.

31 May 2017 - Application submitted for approval of matters specified in condition 2 of outline application 01/00802/OUT covering siting and height of development, design, and configuration of public and open spaces, access, road layouts, footpaths and cycle routes at Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road (application number: 17/02484/AMC). Not yet determined.

Other recent applications within Granton Harbour plots:

15 November 2017 - Application submitted for approval of matters specified in condition 2 of outline application 01/00802/OUT for the erection of buildings containing residential flats, hotel and serviced apartments; formation of road access, parking, and open space on plots 29 and 35 located at the north of Granton Harbour (application number: 17/05306/AMC). Not yet determined.

16 November 2017 - Application submitted for approval of matters specified in condition 2 of outline application 01/00802/OUT for the erection of buildings containing residential flats and houses; formation of road access, parking, and open space on plots 7B and 8C within a central location with Granton Harbour (application number: 17/05332/AMC), Not yet determined.

15 December 2017 - Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions on outline application 01/00802/OUT regarding the erection of a healthcare superhub and five units in Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 use submitted on Plot 19B to the east of the site refused (application number 17/02865/AMC).

13 March 2018 - Application granted for the change of use of building and land from Class 6 to Class 5 to include building operations and siting of plant to permit use of existing warehouse building as a micro distillery at 29 Sealcarr Street to the east of the site (application number: 17/03297/FUL).

Main report

3.1 Description Of The Proposal

The proposal seeks to primarily deal with the matters specified in condition 2 of the outline planning permission 01/00802/OUT. The condition states that:

Before any work on each phase of the site is commenced, details of the undernoted reserved matters being submitted to, and approved in writing by the planning authority, in the form of a detailed layout of that phase of the site (including landscaping and car parking) and detailed plans, sections and elevations of the buildings and all other structures.

Reserved Matters:

- Siting, design and height of development, including design of all external features and glazing specifications, design and configuration of public and open spaces, external lighting, all external materials and finishes, including their colour.*
- Car and cycle parking, access, road layouts and alignments, servicing areas.*
- Hours of operation and servicing.*
- Footpaths and cycle routes.*
- Boundary treatments.*
- Floor levels (including the submission of all calculations to support the levels, and including a report on sea levels, with climate change, storm surge and wave action).*
- Quay edge retention design.*
- Hard and soft landscaping details, which shall include layout plans to provide full details of ground preparation, and:
 - (i) Existing and finished ground levels in relation to Ordnance Datum.*
 - (ii) Layout and design, including walls, fences and gates.*
 - (iii) Existing and proposed services.*
 - (iv) Any structures in addition to any buildings, such as street furniture (including lighting columns and fittings), play equipment.*
 - (v) Programme of completion and subsequent maintenance for the creation of high quality open space including details of the canal and water features.*
 - (vi) The location of new trees, shrubs, and hedges.*
 - (vii) A schedule of plants to comprise species, plant size and proposed number/density.**

(NOTE:- Landscaping for each phase of development shall be completed within the planting season following the completion of each phase of development, to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning and Strategy. Landscaping shall be designed to minimise the risk of birdstrike).

(viii) Nature of all material to be utilised for land infill or reclamation purposes, whether imported into the site or obtained from within the site; such material shall be clean and inert.

Information has also been submitted to deal with other conditions the more general conditions on the outline permission. In summary, these are:

- 3a) Noise assessment;*
- 3b) Site survey and measures relating to landfill gases and any required protective measures;*
- 3c) Site survey relating to contamination and any required remedial/protective measures;*
- 6) Surface Water disposal arrangements; and*

14) Drainage.

The proposal is for a total of 162 residential units. This is a mixture of 144 flatted properties and 18 terraced units. The units are split into:

- 53 x one bedroom flats.
- 75 x two bedroom flats.
- 16 x three bedroom flats.
- 18 x three bedroom houses.

It should be noted that the submitted accommodation schedule does not match the floor plans. The above figures are taken from the drawings.

Block A and B are both six storeys high and contain 66 units each. These two blocks mirror each other and are located in the northwest and southwest sections of the site. Both blocks are L-shaped with return sections and provide frontage onto the proposed crescent and adjacent area of open space (3,200 sqm). An area of open space covering 2,850 sqm is located within the centre of the site and separates the blocks.

Block C fronts onto the proposed Ross Kestrel Drive and is located adjacent to the Block B. This is six storeys high and contains 12 flats.

The proposed flats have large windows and ordered fenestration. Stone cladding is the prevalent material. Large triple height, bronze metal cladding is proposed to frame the entrance areas. The top storey is recessed to provide balconies on the principal elevations. A large profiled bronze coloured metal roof is proposed. Bronze coloured aluminium windows and rainwater goods are also proposed.

At the north of the site, fronting onto Hesperus Crossway is a series of two storey terraced houses. There are a total of 18 houses split into Blocks D, E, F and G. These have small front gardens and larger rear gardens. To the east of the terrace of houses is a further area of open space covering approximately 670 sqm.

The houses have pitched roofs and are traditional in style. The lower storey incorporates stone cladding and the white render panels are used for the upper storey. On the protruding gables coloured render panels are to be utilised. Grey windows, doors and rainwater goods are proposed. Fibre cement tiles are to be used for the roofing material.

A series of streets are proposed, but due to the awkward site, many are only taken up to the boundary with the adjacent land, where a 1.8 metre high timber fence is proposed. Boundaries elsewhere are a mixture of stone walls and railings.

A total of 193 car parking spaces have been proposed. Basement car parking is proposed for Blocks A and B accessed via a ramp to the rear of the blocks from the 'mews streets'. Block A contains 66 spaces and Block B contains 78 spaces (12 spaces for Block C are also provided here). The car parking for the terraced houses is located in a courtyard to the rear of Block D and E and on spaces taken off the road between Block F and G. One space is provided for each house.

In addition to the 162 spaces provided for the 162 units, there are also 31 road side parking bays located through the proposed development. There are sixteen accessible spaces proposed within the development. The applicant has indicated that all car parking spaces associated with the flatted blocks will be equipped with electrical vehicle charging points.

The houses have garden space to accommodate cycle parking. A total of 296 cycle parking spaces are proposed for the 144 flatted units.

Scheme 1

The original scheme contained the same number of units, but the mix was:

- 32 x one bedroom flats.
- 112 x two bedroom flats.
- 18 x three bedroom houses.

A total of 211 parking spaces were proposed. The layout was broadly the same, however, it contained more surface car parking in courtyard areas and external bin stores. Cycle parking was not clearly identified.

Supporting Statements

The following documents have been submitted in support of the application:

- Design and Access Statement;
- Daylight and Sunlight Report;
- Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Management Plan;
- Energy Statement;
- Sustainability Form;
- Noise Assessment; and
- Environmental Risk Assessment.

These documents are available to view on the Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

3.2 Determining Issues

Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 states - Where, in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Do the proposals comply with the development plan?

If the proposals do comply with the development plan, are there any compelling reasons for not approving them?

If the proposals do not comply with the development plan, are there any compelling reasons for approving them?

3.3 Assessment

To address these determining issues, the Committee needs to consider whether:

- a) the development complies with the planning permission in principle;
- b) the details of the development are acceptable;
- c) there are any other material considerations;
- d) there are any equalities or human rights impacts; and
- e) the representations have been addressed.

a) Principle

The outline planning permission for Granton Harbour (01/00802/OUT) supports residential use on the site as part of a wider mixed use development. This application for 162 residential units accords with the outline permission in terms of land use.

The site is located within the Granton Harbour Area at Granton Waterfront, as identified in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP). It is covered by Proposal EW2c for housing led mixed use development across Granton Harbour. LDP Policy Del 3 supports proposals which meet a number of requirements including the provision of a series of mixed use sustainable neighbourhoods that connect with the waterfront and proposals for a mix of house types, sizes and affordability.

The most recent approved masterplan (application number 16/05618/AMC) and previous iterations show residential development on the site.

The legal agreement attached to the outline permission requires 15% affordable housing provision across Granton Harbour. The most recently approved master plan proposes 2,235 residential units in total. Fifteen percent of this is 335. This has already been secured on other sites with Granton Harbour and therefore no affordable housing is required in this proposal.

The principle of development is acceptable.

b) Acceptability of the Details

Design, Scale and Layout

LDP Policies Des 1 - Des 8 set a requirement for proposals to be based on an overall design concept which draws on the positive characteristics of the surrounding area with the need for a high quality of design which is appropriate in terms of height, scale and form, layout, and materials.

Design and Materials:

The design of the flats is modern and contains well-ordered elevations that utilise large windows in a standardised pattern. Interest is added through the use of recessed areas in the frontages and large metal cladded areas that highlight the entrance points to the flats. The use of sandstone as the main material is acceptable in this location where a number of other materials have been proposed or delivered on site. The simple material palette also avoids a patchwork effect utilised elsewhere in the harbour area.

The flatted blocks do contain an over-dominant profiled metal roof. This distracts from the otherwise well-ordered elevations and represents an intrusion into the public realm. The 3D renderings submitted in support of the application show an awkward roof that does not enhance the development. This is contrary to Policy Des 1 Development Design which states that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate design.

The two-storey terraced houses are of a simple design and include a protruding gable element to provide interest. The use of sandstone cladding for the ground floor ties the development in with the other proposed flatted blocks. A white render and a series of coloured renders on feature panels have been proposed. The design and use of coloured render is described in the Design and Access Statement as providing a form and colour that references beach huts. If executed well, they would be a distinct addition to the harbour area.

More recent approvals in the Granton Harbour area have contained brick as the primary facing material rather than render. The render on the existing older flatted buildings has not weathered well. However, the proposed houses will be at a lower level and a condition would be required for sample panels to demonstrate the quality of the materials proposed.

In terms of housing mix, the proposal contains a range of house/flat types and sizes. The Edinburgh Design Guidance (EDG) expects that 20% of units should be homes for growing families with at least three bedrooms. The proposals contains 34 units (21%) with three or more bedrooms. The internal floor areas comply with the recommended minimum sizes in the design guidance. The mix and size of house types are acceptable in the context of Policy Hou 2 Housing Mix.

In summary, although there are positive elements in general design of the proposed buildings, the roofline of the flatted blocks represents an awkward and dominant feature contrary to LDP Des 1 Design Quality and Context.

Height and Scale:

There is a mixture of six storey flats and two storey houses. The two storey houses front onto Hesperus Crossway and provide lower scale family housing in an area where predominately flatted blocks are proposed. Lower density housing next to higher flatted development is not uncommon within Edinburgh.

The Granton Harbour area contains a mixture of heights. These are either delivered on site or at various stages within the planning process. To the north there is an existing flatted development that rises up to seven storeys, with a similar sized building adjacent to this currently under construction. Further east of the site, approval has been given for residential flats also up to seven storeys in places and retirement flats up to six storeys.

The height of the proposed blocks is not out of context within the area. Representations have pointed out that previous masterplans have shown this as two and three storey developments, but earlier masterplans have also been approved for up to 9 storeys in this area. The proposed heights are appropriate in the context of the wider Granton Harbour site.

The density of the proposal is 90 dwellings per hectare (dph). This is calculated on a 1.788 ha site once the larger areas of public open space (0.672 ha) are subtracted. For comparison purposes, Marchmont tenements have a density of 99 dph as referenced in the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

Recent approval has been given for Plots S1 and S2 within Granton Harbour and this has a density of 151 dph. Consequently, the density proposed is not overdevelopment of the area as suggested in objections to the proposal.

The general height, scale and density of the development are acceptable.

Layout:

LDP Policies Des 4 Development Design - Impact on Setting and Des 7 Layout Design set out that developments should have regard to the position of buildings on the site and should include a comprehensive and integrated approach to the layout of buildings, streets, footpaths, cycle paths and open spaces.

Policy Des 2 Co-ordinated Development states that planning permission will be granted for development which will not compromise: a) the effective development of adjacent land; or b) the comprehensive development and regeneration of a wider area as provided for in a master plan, strategy or development brief approved by the Council.

The layout of the streets follows the general masterplan layout. However, the applicant has submitted several iterations of the masterplan, including a current pending AMC masterplan application that has had a number of revisions. The configuration of this application site is based on land ownership and therefore results in a challenging boundary that carves up the wider site, roads and linkages of the overall masterplan.

Blocks A and B alongside the two storey terraced housing are in fixed locations and do not alter from the previous iterations of the masterplan general layout.

Block C sits adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The LDP Development Principles for EW 2c Granton Harbour states that proposals will be expected to complete the approved street layout and perimeter block urban form.

The masterplan and the Design and Access statement show the relationship of this block with the adjacent site. The development of the proposed block would result in a left over area of space on the adjacent site.

The location and alignment of the proposed road (Hesperus Mews North) on the site to the east means this land would be difficult to develop out, resulting in an awkward relationship of Block C and the proposed road. It would not fulfil the aim of creating a comprehensive perimeter block form in this part of the site.

The proposals for this part of the site also show an unclear plan for the infill area between the proposed Ross Kestrel Mews and Hesperus Mews North.

This will impact on adjacent sites and is not in line with the requirements of Policy Des 7 as it does not have full regard to providing a comprehensive and integrated approach to the layout of buildings.

This is not only contrary to Policy Des 2 in relation to compromising adjacent land, but also Policy Del 3 Edinburgh Waterfront, which expects comprehensively designed proposals which maximise the development potential of the area.

A triangular area adjacent to Block A is also shown as left over open space with surface car parking. This also begins to impede on the ability to satisfactorily develop this part of the site and the adjacent parcel of land.

In summary, the layout of the proposal generally follows that of the established masterplan. The issue lies in the co-ordination with the adjacent plots. The proposed development begins to impact on the potential successful implementation of the wider area. It does not provide for comprehensive development and leaves poorly planned left over areas of space. The proposal is contrary to LDP Policies Des 2, Des 7 and Del 3.

Details of the external lighting have not been provided as part of the reserved matter. This would need to be conditioned if committee is minded to approve the application.

The submitted drawings (such as the layout and landscape plans) do not align. If the proposals were to be approved, an enforceable set of matching drawings would be required.

Open Space:

LDP Policy Hou 3 Private Green Space sets out that for flatted developments there should be 10 sqm of open space provision per flat except where private space is provided. The terraced housing all have private gardens.

In terms of numbers, Block A has access to 1,300 sqm of open space, Block B 1,200 sqm and Block C 300 sqm, which is above the 10 sqm requirement for the blocks. Further to this, 19 ground floor flatted units have access to small garden spaces and 24 units have access to a balcony.

The general location of the larger central areas of public open space meets that shown in previous iterations of the masterplan. More than 20% of the site is made up of open space. The design of the open space is considered further in the landscaping section.

Privacy, Daylighting and Sunlighting:

The orientation of the blocks results in no immediate privacy or overlooking issues within the proposed development.

In terms of daylighting, the proposals will not impact on the proposed development to the north. The submitted daylighting information is based on out of date information that states that detailed permission has not been granted for plots 26, 27 and 28. Plot 28 is completed and Plot 27 is under construction. The proposed development of mainly two storey houses on this part of the application site is unlikely to impact on this.

The daylight report does indicate that the design of the houses with the protruding gable will have some impact on daylighting on the ground floor houses themselves in the northwest elevation. However, there is an additional window in the southwest elevation that will limit any impact.

Five windows in the ground floor of Block B in corner elevation, where the building returns on itself will not meet the Vertical Sky Component recommended values. The windows relate to one bedroom and associated bathroom and two bedroom windows (of the same room) and the associated en suite bathroom. These do not fail by a significant amount. The infringement also relates to a proposed building and are not being imposed on an existing property.

Analysis has been provided to show that the open space areas will receive enough sunlight in line with the Edinburgh Design Guidance recommendation.

The proposal does not raise any overriding concerns in relation to privacy, daylighting and sunlighting.

Transport Matters

Access, road layouts and alignments and servicing:

The accesses to the proposed development from Hesperus Crossway and West Harbour Road Street are acceptable in principle. The part road layout proposed due to the application sites boundary matches that anticipated in earlier masterplan iterations for this part of the site.

Waste Services has provided some general advice to the applicant in relation to waste collection measures required. Refuse points are internalised within the flatted blocks. Swept path analysis has been provided for the incorrect size of refuse vehicle and this would need to be addressed to ensure the viability of the road layout. The reserved matter in relation to servicing hours does not apply to this application.

Footpaths and cycle routes:

The site is adjacent to the existing foot/cycle path that runs east/west along Hesperus Crossway and north/south along Hesperus Broadway and Chestnut Street. Further part pedestrian routes are available through the site. The layout will result in some truncated footpaths and pockets of development.

Along the western boundary of the site is the Edinburgh Waterfront Promenade cycleway/footpath. This is safeguarded in the LDP. The proposals are not clear in relation to the detail of this path in this area. There also appears to be a conflict with the north-western corner of the site where the path is 'pinched' where it meets the proposed Ross Kestrel Crescent road. The applicant has not clarified this matter through the submitted revised drawings. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to LDP Policy Tra 9 Cycle and Footpath Network as details of the promenade walkway have not been provided and the drawings indicate a potential conflict which could prevent the implementation of the footpath as shown on the proposals map.

The site is shown as being in an area with good public transport accessibility in the EDG. Bus stops are located approximately 400m from the site on Chestnut Street and on Hesperus Crossway. There are also bus stops to the south of the site on Waterfront Avenue. There are a number of Lothian Bus Services (numbers 24 and 47) that provide links to and throughout the city. Further buses are also available from Granton Square (numbers 16, 19 and 32). A tram safeguard along West Harbour Road and Waterfront Avenue, with a tram stop at Granton Square and on Waterfront Avenue indicatively identified. The proposed development will not interfere with the tram line safeguard.

Car and cycle parking:

Policy Tra 2 Private Car Parking states planning permission will be granted for development where proposed car parking provision complies with and does not exceed the parking levels set out in Council guidance. The supporting text to Policy Tra 2 sets out that a purpose of the policy is to generally fulfil the wider strategy of encouraging sustainable, non-car modes.

Parking is a reserved matter and a wider parking strategy has not been agreed.

The 2017 EDG parking standards permit a maximum of 162 car parking spaces (one space per unit) in this location. The proposals contain 193 car parking spaces. No reasoned justification for the level of parking has been submitted with the application.

The Roads Authority recommend that the application should be refused. The proposed level of car parking is contrary to the EDG and consequently LDP Policy Tra 2.

Cycle parking locations have been shown within the basement areas. There is a slight infringement in the quantity provided (296 instead of 304). There is no detail design of the cycle parking and it appears there will be difficulty in accessing the cycle parking due to lack of manoeuvrable space.

In summary, issues in relation to the Edinburgh Promenade and the ability for and adequately sized refuse vehicle to access the site remain unresolved. The proposed level of car parking is contrary to LDP Policy Tra 2 Private Car Parking and the Council's Non-statutory Edinburgh Design Guidance.

Landscaping

Landscape Design:

The first part of condition 2 of 01/00802/OUT expects detailed layouts and plans to come forward with detailed layout landscaping plans. The condition provides specific matters that should be covered.

LDP Policy Des 8 Public Realm and Landscape Design indicates that all external spaces, including a number of component parts, should be designed as an integral part of the scheme as a whole.

The location of the main open space areas match those as shown in the masterplan. However, these are bereft of any detail. The applicant was asked to provide further information to deal with the reserved matter in relation to hard and soft landscaping details. The information provided is wholly inadequate and does not demonstrate a high quality, well designed public space.

No information on the design of the open space areas, save for a few sporadic areas of tree planting and some meadow grassland for the main large areas of public open space has been provided. No further type of soft landscape is indicated. Furthermore, there is no detail to show any pedestrian access, location of seating, street furniture, additional structures or play areas within an area that combines to be one of the largest areas of open space in the Granton Harbour development. No information has been provided in relation to other matters such as a programme of completion or subsequent maintenance.

Boundary Treatments:

There are some positive elements proposed for the boundary treatment, with stone walls and railings utilised to differentiate the private garden areas.

It is acknowledged that other areas of the masterplan area may not come forward in the immediate future, which has resulted in the awkward site boundary. The proposal contains a 1.8 metre timber fence along the length of the site boundary. As it is not known when development will come forward on the adjacent sites, the edge condition of the boundaries need to be suitable for the long term. This has not been provided.

The design of the open spaces are contrary to Policy Des 8 as the public space has not been well designed and there is a lack of detail to satisfy the requirements of the policy.

Flooding and Drainage

The reserved matter relates to floor levels and associated information to support the levels. Condition 6 on the outline permission relates to surface water disposal arrangements and condition 14 relates to sustainable urban drainage.

The applicant has provided the relevant flood risk assessment and surface water management information for the site as part of the self-certification (with third party verification) process. The proposals meet the Council's requirements.

SEPA support the proposed finished floor levels which are set at a minimum of 6.0m which is above SEPA's previously recommended level of 5.07 AOD and above that recommended in the submitted flood risk assessment. Further information has also been provided to deal with SEPA's original objection in relation to foul drainage.

The information submitted satisfactorily deals with this reserved matter and conditions 6 and 14 for the application site.

c) Other Material Considerations

Noise:

A Noise Impact Assessment has been provided as required by condition 3a) of 01/00802/OUT. Environmental Protection has considered the assessment and do not object to the application on noise grounds. A condition in relation to acoustic glazing is requested to be added to any approval. As glazing is a reserved matter, this information should be dealt with upfront. However, a condition could be used in this instance if committee were minded to approve the application.

Site investigation:

Site investigation information has been submitted in support of the application as required under condition 3b) and c) of the outline permission. This is being assessed by Environmental Protection. This condition could be discharged for the site once Environmental Protection has assessed its acceptability.

Sustainability:

The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Statement and an Energy Statement in support of the application. Part A of the standards is met through the provision CHP generators and photovoltaic systems.

The proposal is a major development and has been assessed against Part B of the standards. The points achieved against the essential criteria are set out in the table below:

| Essential Criteria | Available | Achieved |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Section 1: Energy Needs | 20 | 20 |
| Section 2: Water conservation | 10 | 10 |
| Section 3: Surface water run off | 10 | 10 |
| Section 4: Recycling | 10 | 10 |
| Section 5: Materials | 30 | 30 |
| Total points | 80 | 80 |

The proposal meets the essential criteria. In addition, the applicant has provided a commitment to further sustainability measures as set out in the desirable elements sections. Additional measures include the use of electric vehicle charging points, rainwater harvesting and a commitment not to use tropical hardwood.

Archaeology:

The Archaeology Officer has requested that a programme of work is undertaken prior to any development commencing on this site and has recommended a condition. The applicant has disputed this given that much of the land has been reclaimed. However, the site boundary of this application covers the southwest corner of Granton Harbour where historic maps show an early 19th century shipyard.

Condition 5 on the original outline permission related to the implementation of archaeological work. Some work has been undertaken up to 2008 in the wider harbour area, but no work has been undertaken within this application site. As there is an existing condition, if approval is given, an informative should be added to advise the applicant that further archaeological work is required.

d) Equalities

This application raises no adverse impacts in terms of equalities and human rights.

e) Public Comments

Material representations - objection

Design:

- Increased height and density from previous proposals. This should be considered in conjunction with other submitted applications (17/05306/AMC and 17/05332/AMC) - addressed in section 3.3b).
- Visual impact to and from the site - addressed in section 3.3b).
- Wind tunnelling effects - the spaces between the flatted blocks are wide and no issues have been raised by Environmental Protection.

Transport:

- Impact on general traffic, buses and parking - addressed in section 3.3b).
- Unclear how the pedestrian/cycle walkway can be accommodated - considered in section 3.3b).
- Unclear how proposed tramline will be integrated - the proposed development does not impact on the tram safeguard.

Amenity:

- Residential amenity - addressed in section 3.3b).
- Lack of open space proposed - addressed in section 3.3b).
- Noise impact from existing adjacent business on proposed residential amenity - addressed in section 3.3c).

Infrastructure:

- General impacts on infrastructure - there is an existing legal agreement in relation to transport and education contributions, as such further contributions cannot be sought from this proposals.

Community Council

The community council did not comment on the application.

Conclusion

The proposed residential use on the site is acceptable and would contribute to meeting housing need and regeneration at Granton Waterfront. There are positive aspects of the development and a number of issues have been adequately dealt with.

However, the design of the flatted blocks contains an over dominant protruding roof that is an inappropriate design feature contrary to LDP Policy Des 1 Design Quality and Context.

Although the general layout does follow that set out in the masterplan, the siting of Block C and location of car parking, combined with the awkward site boundary result in a proposed layout that would compromise the regeneration and development potential of the adjacent sites resulting in poorly planned left over areas of space. This is contrary to LDP Policies Des 2 Co-ordinated Development, Des 7 Layout Design and Del 3 Edinburgh Waterfront.

A lack of information has been provided for the safeguarded footpath/cyclepath that runs along the western edge of the development. It appears that the delivery of the walkway conflicts with the proposed road layout impacting on its delivery. This is contrary to LDP Policy Tra 9 Cycle and Footpath Network.

The level of car parking proposed is excessive and is contrary to Policy Tra 2 Private Car Parking.

There is a lack of information provided in relation to landscaping and therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy Des 8 Public Realm and Landscape Design.

There are no material considerations that outweigh this recommendation.

It is recommended that this application be Refused for the reasons below.

3.4 Conditions/reasons/informatives

Reason for Refusal:-

1. The proposal is contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Des 1 Design Quality and Context as the protruding roofline of the flatted blocks creates an awkward and dominant feature that is of an inappropriate design.

2. The proposal is contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Des 2 Co-ordinated Development, Des 7 Layout Design and Policy Del 3 Edinburgh Waterfront as the proposed layout compromises the regeneration and development potential of the adjacent site. It will result in poorly planned left over areas of space.
3. The proposal is contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Des 8 Public Realm and Landscape Design, as the proposal does not provide high-quality landscape proposals that have been designed as an integral part of the scheme and lacks sufficient detailed information.
4. The proposal is contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Tra 2 Private Car Parking, as the proposed parking exceeds the parking standards set out in the non-statutory Edinburgh Design Guidance.
5. The proposal is contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Tra 9 Cycle and Footpath Network as it would prejudice the implementation of the proposed cyclepath/footpath along the western/north-western part of the site as identified on the LDP Proposals Map by providing insufficient detail and showing a conflict with the proposed road layout.

Financial impact

4.1 The financial impact has been assessed as follows:

An existing legal agreement is in place for 01/00802/OUT to which this proposal relates to. The agreement required contributions towards transport and education infrastructure. The required transport contributions have already been paid by the previous owner of the site and this part of the legal agreement has been discharged. The relevant education clause requires payment of £1,366 per residential unit (index linked).

Risk, Policy, compliance and governance impact

5.1 Provided planning applications are determined in accordance with statutory legislation, the level of risk is low.

Equalities impact

6.1 The equalities impact has been assessed as follows:

The application has been assessed and has no impact in terms of equalities or human rights.

Sustainability impact

7.1 The sustainability impact has been assessed as follows:

This application meets the sustainability requirements of the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

Consultation and engagement

8.1 Pre-Application Process

There is no pre-application process history.

8.2 Publicity summary of representations and Community Council comments

The application was advertised on 1 December 2017 and attracted 30 letters of objection and one representation.

The representations are addressed in the Assessment Section of the report.

Background reading/external references

- To view details of the application go to
- [Planning and Building Standards online services](#)
- [Planning guidelines](#)
- [Conservation Area Character Appraisals](#)
- [Edinburgh Local Development Plan](#)
- [Scottish Planning Policy](#)

**Statutory Development
Plan Provision**

The site is located within the Urban Area as shown on the Local Development Plan proposals map. The land is identified as being within Edinburgh Waterfront. Proposal EW 2c (Granton Harbour) states that the area is for a housing-led mixed use development. It sets out a number of Development Principles. These include that proposals will be expected to:

- Complete the approved street layout and perimeter block urban form.
- Provide a housing mix that is appropriate in terms of place-making and would maximise completions within this urban regeneration proposal within the plan period.

Date registered

3 November 2017

Drawing numbers/Scheme

01, 02A - 09A, 10-15, 16A-23A, 24, 25A, 26A, 28A-30A, 31- 33,

Scheme 2

David R. Leslie
Chief Planning Officer
PLACE
The City of Edinburgh Council

Contact: Kenneth Bowes, Senior Planning Officer
E-mail:kenneth.bowes@edinburgh.gov.uk Tel:0131 529 6724

Links - Policies

Relevant Policies:

Relevant policies of the Local Development Plan.

LDP Policy Del 1 (Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery) identifies the circumstances in which developer contributions will be required.

LDP Policy Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront) sets criteria for assessing development in Granton Waterfront and Leith Waterfront.

LDP Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context) sets general criteria for assessing design quality and requires an overall design concept to be demonstrated.

LDP Policy Des 2 (Co-ordinated Development) establishes a presumption against proposals which might compromise the effect development of adjacent land or the wider area.

LDP Policy Des 3 (Development Design - Incorporating and Enhancing Existing and Potential Features) supports development where it is demonstrated that existing and potential features have been incorporated into the design.

LDP Policy Des 4 (Development Design - Impact on Setting) sets criteria for assessing the impact of development design against its setting.

LDP Policy Des 5 (Development Design - Amenity) sets criteria for assessing amenity.

LDP Policy Des 6 (Sustainable Buildings) sets criteria for assessing the sustainability of new development.

LDP Policy Des 7 (Layout design) sets criteria for assessing layout design.

LDP Policy Des 8 (Public Realm and Landscape Design) sets criteria for assessing public realm and landscape design.

LDP Policy Des 10 (Waterside Development) sets criteria for assessing development on sites on the coastal edge or adjoining a watercourse, including the Union Canal.

LDP Policy Des 11 (Tall Buildings - Skyline and Key Views) sets out criteria for assessing proposals for tall buildings.

LDP Policy Env 8 (Protection of Important Remains) establishes a presumption against development that would adversely affect the site or setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument or archaeological remains of national importance.

LDP Policy Env 9 (Development of Sites of Archaeological Significance) sets out the circumstances in which development affecting sites of known or suspected archaeological significance will be permitted.

LDP Policy Env 13 (Sites of International Importance) identifies the circumstances in which development likely to affect Sites of International Importance will be permitted.

LDP Policy Env 14 (Sites of National Importance) identifies the circumstances in which development likely to affect Sites of National Importance will be permitted.

LDP Policy Env 15 (Sites of Local Importance) identifies the circumstances in which development likely to affect Sites of Local Importance will be permitted.

LDP Policy Env 16 (Species Protection) sets out species protection requirements for new development.

LDP Policy Env 20 (Open Space in New Development) sets out requirements for the provision of open space in new development.

LDP Policy Env 21 (Flood Protection) sets criteria for assessing the impact of development on flood protection.

LDP Policy Env 22 (Pollution and Air, Water and Soil Quality) sets criteria for assessing the impact of development on air, water and soil quality.

LDP Policy Hou 1 (Housing Development) sets criteria for assessing the principle of housing proposals.

LDP Policy Hou 2 (Housing Mix) requires provision of a mix of house types and sizes in new housing developments to meet a range of housing needs.

LDP Policy Hou 3 (Private Green Space in Housing Development) sets out the requirements for the provision of private green space in housing development.

LDP Policy Hou 4 (Housing Density) sets out the factors to be taken into account in assessing density levels in new development.

LDP Policy Hou 6 (Affordable Housing) requires 25% affordable housing provision in residential development of twelve or more units.

LDP Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking) requires private car parking provision to comply with the parking levels set out in Council guidance, and sets criteria for assessing lower provision.

LDP Policy Tra 3 (Private Cycle Parking) requires cycle parking provision in accordance with standards set out in Council guidance.

LDP Policy Tra 4 (Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking) sets criteria for assessing design of off-street car and cycle parking.

LDP Policy Tra 9 (Cycle and Footpath Network) prevents development which would prevent implementation of, prejudice or obstruct the current or potential cycle and footpath network.

Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines

Non-Statutory guidelines Edinburgh Design Guidance supports development of the highest design quality and that integrates well with the existing city. It sets out the Council's expectations for the design of new development, including buildings, parking, streets and landscape, in Edinburgh.

Appendix 1

Application for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions 17/05120/AMC

**At Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road, Edinburgh
Application for approval of matters conditioned regarding the erection of buildings containing 18 houses and 144 flats; formation of road access, parking, private and public open space (as amended).**

Consultations

Archaeology Officer response - dated 17 November 2017

Further to your consultation request I would like to make the following comments and recommendations in respect to this application for approval of matters specified in conditions regarding the erection of buildings containing 144 houses and 18 flats, formation of road access, parking, private and public open space.

I refer you to my earlier comments in response to 01/00802/OUT, 06/03636/REM, 13/01013/AMC & 13/04320/AMC & 14/05305/AMC which outlined the archaeological significance of the Granton Harbour redevelopment site. As part of this earlier work this application site has been identified as being of particular significance as it overlies the site of an early 19th century shipyard, in addition to the later sea/harbour walls. Therefore, this application must be considered under terms the Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement (HESPS) 2016, Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), PAN 02/2011 and also Edinburgh Local Development Plan (2016) policies DES 3 & ENV9.

An archaeological mitigation strategy was agreed for the redevelopment of Granton Harbour in response to the original 2001 Outline application. Although various elements have been undertaken in the intervening period, the last element of field work to the Western Harbour was undertaken in 2008, no archaeological work has been undertaken within this application site.

Accordingly, it is essential that this programme of work is undertaken prior to development commencing and that it is re-secured using the following recommended condition;

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

The work must be carried out by a professional archaeological organisation, either working to a brief prepared by CECAS or through a written scheme of investigation submitted to and agreed by CECAS for the site. Responsibility for the execution and resourcing of the programme of archaeological works and for the archiving and appropriate level of publication of the results lies with the applicant.

Please contact me if you require any further information.

Communities and Families response - dated 24 January 2018

The Council has assessed the impact of the growth set out in the LDP through an Education Appraisal (January 2018), taking account of school roll projections. To do this, an assumption has been made as to the amount of new housing development which will come forward ('housing output'). This takes account of new housing sites allocated in the LDP and other land within the urban area.

In areas where additional infrastructure will be required to accommodate the cumulative number of additional pupils, education infrastructure 'actions' have been identified. The infrastructure requirements and estimated delivery dates are set out in the Council's Action Programme (January 2018).

Residential development is required to contribute towards the cost of delivering these education infrastructure actions to ensure that the cumulative impact of development can be mitigated. In order that the total delivery cost is shared proportionally and fairly between developments, Education Contribution Zones have been identified and 'per house' and 'per flat' contribution rates established. These are set out in the draft Supplementary Guidance on 'Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery'.

Assessment and Contribution Requirements

Assessment based on:

112 Flats (32 one bedroom flats excluded)

18 Houses

This site falls within Sub-Area CB-1 of the 'Craigroyston Broughton Education Contribution Zone'.

The Council has assessed the impact of the proposed development on the identified education infrastructure actions and current delivery programme.

The education infrastructure actions that are identified are appropriate to mitigate the cumulative impact of development that would be anticipated if this proposal progressed.

The proposed development is therefore required to make a contribution towards the delivery of these actions based on the established 'per house' and 'per flat' rates for the appropriate part of the Zone.

If the appropriate infrastructure and land contribution is provided by the developer, as set out below, Communities and Families does not object to the application.

Total infrastructure contribution required:

£718,926

Note - all infrastructure contributions shall be index linked based on the increase in the BCIS Forecast All-in Tender Price Index from Q4 2017 to the date of payment.

Total land contribution required:

£3,586

Note - no indexation to be applied to land contribution.

Although the above assessment is based on the current approach to determining developer contributions, there is a legal agreement attached to the original outline consent for the Granton Harbour development (01/00802/OUT). The Planning service has advised that the terms of this agreement are applicable to this application. This requires payment of £1,366 (to be indexed from 2002) per residential unit towards education infrastructure. This equates to £2,165 when indexed to Q4 2017.

If 162 units are delivered at Granton Harbour under the terms of the original agreement, the value of the financial contributions that the Council would receive is estimated to be £350,730 (as at Q4 2017).

It is therefore likely that there will be a significant funding gap with regard to the delivery of the infrastructure that is now required to serve the new housing development expected in the Contribution Zone.

The potential for such gaps to arise has previously been identified and reported through LDP Action Programme governance arrangements, including a report to the Council's Finance and Resource Committee (24 January 2018). There is as yet no confirmed source of alternative funding to address the cumulative gap in capital funding arising. There will also be significant additional revenue costs arising from the new education infrastructure for which no revenue budget currently exists within either Communities and Families, or Corporate Property (with whom responsibility for all property related budgets now lies).

Any future capital and revenue budget pressures arising from the infrastructure requirements in this area, and the Local Development Plan as a whole, will need to be considered as part of the on-going budget consultation process. If the funding gap towards the education infrastructure actions identified in the 'Craigroyston Broughton Education Contribution Zone' and the additional revenue costs are not addressed through Council budget processes, there is a significant risk that the Council will not be able to provide local school places for pupils arising from new development in this area.

Environmental Protection response - dated 20 December 2017

As the current application is an AMC application relating to the outline planning permission, there is already consent for an acceptable quantum of development on the site. This application is for the development of three new blocks of flats comprising 144 units and 18 terraced houses. The proposals within this application include development of the total area of plots 21 & 22 and partial development of plots 19B, 20A, 20B and 23A make up the following: Plot 19B - 4 terraced houses, public open space Plots 20A & 20B - 8 terraced houses, 12 flats, public and private open space, car parking Plot 21 - 66 flats, 6 terraced houses, public and private open space, car parking Plot 22 - 66 flats, public and private open space, car parking Plot 23A - public open space. All private parking to blocks A, B, and C is provided in the below ground car park on a 1 space per apartment (Total 226) basis with all other private parking plus an additional 20% allowed for visitor parking allocated in on-street provision. Secure cycle parking is also proposed in the secure parking area.

The plots are bordered by West Harbour Road, Ross Kestral Crescent, North Breakwater road, Ross Kestral Drive and Ross Kestral Mews. The site is made up of several plots T, U K, O, P & Q. To the north west of the site is open water with some existing residential uses developed to the north (Merlin Ave). There are several commercial and industrial uses located to the south and east (Forth Industrial Estate) of the proposed development site.

Environmental Protection understands that plot-specific issues will be addressed through detailed development processes (assuming the Masterplan delivers no major shift in the content or context of the outline approval, including development phasing). This proposal follows what has been agreed in the masterplan however the density of this proposal has decreased. The indicative capacity approved in the most recent Masterplan (Y-2f) of plots 19B, 20A, 20B, 21, 22 and 23A is 192 Residential units. The present proposal is for 162 units which is not a major departure from the masterplan although it is noted that it is for partial development of some of the approved plots with the applicant advising that there may be a surplus area for future development to realise the original number in the approved masterplan with The application proposes 226 car parking spaces.

Noise

The applicant has submitted several noise impact assessments to assess the potential noise impacts on the various proposed blocks of residential buildings.

Plot T

Due to the proximity of Plot T to existing industrial and commercial activities within Forth Industrial Estate, and proposed commercial activities from Plot 19B, there is potential for industrial/commercial noise to impact upon future residents of the proposed development. It should be noted that Environmental Protection have not received any noise complaints from the existing nearby residential properties located on Merlin Avenue.

Existing and proposed industrial/commercial noise sources have been assessed. Daytime external garden noise is predicted to meet target noise criteria at the most exposed properties. Day and night-time internal noise is predicted to meet target noise criteria with open windows at the most exposed houses in Plot T.

Plot K,O,P & Q

The site is bound by West Harbour Road to the south, Plot U to the north, with existing industrial units to the east. The proposed development comprises a six-storey apartment block (Block A).

Due to the proximity of the site to West Harbour Road, there is potential for road traffic noise to impact upon future residents of the proposed development. There are existing industrial/ commercial units to the east, west, south and north-east of the proposed apartments, therefore there is also the potential for noise from these sources to impact on future residents.

The noise impact assessment for 'Block A' shows that internal road traffic noise levels during the daytime will exceed target noise criteria with standard specification closed windows.

In order to reduce the daytime internal noise to within target criteria, glazing with a sound reduction index of at least 36dB(A) is required. To allow for ventilation whilst achieving internal noise criteria, windows incorporating acoustically attenuating trickle ventilators will need to be installed to any bedroom windows on the south, east and west facing elevations of Block A. The ventilators will need to have as a minimum a sound reduction level $D_{n,e,w}$ of at least 35dB in the 500Hz octave band. If two trickle ventilators are to be installed within the same room, the $D_{n,e,w}$ should be 38dB. If further trickle ventilators are to be installed to the same room, the $D_{n,e,w}$ should be increased by 3dB per extra ventilator. Windows shall remain openable at the occupiers' choice for purge ventilation if required.

Environmental Protection shall recommend a condition is attached to ensure specific details on the required acoustic glazing is submitted when the information is available. Environmental Protection will require specific details on the proposed acoustic glazing including an elevation highlighting all the glazing units requiring upgraded glazing.

Plot U

To the south the site is bound by proposed residential development Plots K and Q. Existing industrial/commercial units are located to the south, south-east and south-west. The proposed development comprises flats and houses (Blocks B, C & D).

Existing industrial/commercial noise sources have been assessed. Daytime external garden noise is predicted to meet target noise criteria at the most exposed properties. Day and night-time internal noise is predicted to meet target noise criteria with open windows at the most exposed houses in.

Land contamination

Environmental Protection has received information regarding the outline consent for Granton Harbour (01/00802/OUT). The applicant has submitted an updated Ground Investigation Report which is currently being assessed by Environmental Protection. Until this has been completed Environmental Protection recommends that a condition is attached to ensure that contaminated land is fully addressed.

Air Quality

As detailed above the quantum of development has decreased slightly, Environmental Protection is concerned with the proposed number of car parking spaces (226). Environmental Protection recommend that this parking provision is reduced significantly.

It is highlighted in Edinburgh's Local Transport Strategy 2014-2019 that the Council seeks to support increased use of low emission vehicles and support the extension of the network of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points.

The City of Edinburgh Parking Standards for Development Management also now encourages the use of EVs. It states that the Council is likely to introduce a requirement for EV charging infrastructure which depends on how charging technology evolves this includes:

- o Dedicated parking spaces with charging facilities.*
- o Ducting and infrastructure to allow electric vehicles to be readily accommodated in the future.*

Developers should now consider the potential for EV charging as they develop their proposals. Based on currently available technology Environmental Protection recommends that a 7Kw charger is installed for each parking space provided in the parking area. The location of each charger should be included in a referenced drawing.

Grants may also be available for the installation of EV charge points for workplaces more information can be found at;

<http://www.energysavingtrust.org.uk/scotland/Organisations/Transport/Electric-vehicles/Electric-Vehicle-Charge-Point-Funding>.

The Scottish Government in the 'Government's Programme for Scotland 2017-18 has a new ambition on ultra-low emission vehicles, including electric cars and vans, with a target to phase out the need for petrol and diesel vehicles by 2032. This is underpinned by a range of actions to expand the charging network, support innovative approaches and encourage the public sector to lead the way, with developers incorporating charging points in new developments.

With regards to air quality Environmental Protection do raise concerns due to the high level of parking provision with no local air quality mitigation measures. We would normally encourage the developer to work with this department to produce a Green Travel Plan which should incorporate the following measures to help mitigate traffic related air quality impacts;

1. *Keep Car Parking levels to minimum.*
2. *Car Club facilities (electric and/or low emission vehicles).*
3. *Provision of electric vehicle charging facilities.*
4. *Public transport incentives for residents.*
5. *Improved cycle/pedestrian facilities and links.*

Environmental Protection would also advise the applicant that all energy systems must comply with the Clean Air Act 1993 and that Environmental Protection will not support the use of biomass.

On balance, Environmental Protection recommends no objection subject to the following conditions;

Noise

1. *Full details including elevational drawings and technical data on acoustic glazing required to mitigate traffic noise affecting 'Block A' shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for its approval at the detailed application stage.*

Contaminated Land

1. *Prior to the commencement of construction works on site:*

- (a) *A site survey (including initial desk study as a minimum) must be carried out to establish to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning, either that the level of risk posed to human health and the wider environment by contaminants in, on or under the land is acceptable, or that remedial and/or protective measures could be undertaken to bring the risks to an acceptable level in relation to the development; and*
- (b) *Where necessary, a detailed schedule of any remedial and/or protective measures, including their programming, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning.*

Any required remedial and/or protective measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved schedule and documentary evidence to certify those works shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning.

Local Air Quality

1. *Prior to the use being taken up, 7Kw electric vehicle charging point, shall be installed serving each space in the car park for all residential properties.*

Informative

2. *Electric vehicle charging points should be installed in accordance with Transport Scotland's Switched On Scotland Phase Two: An Action Plan For Growth (2017).*
3. *When available the applicant shall provide details of all the boilers to Environmental Assessment to ensure compliance with the Clean Air Act 1993.*

Roads Authority Issues - dated 8 February 2018

The application should be refused.

Reasons:

1. The proposals within this application are not considered to comply with section 2.4 Design, Integration and Quantity of Parking of the Edinburgh Design Guidance 2017 for the following reasons:

a. The level of parking provision is proposed at 211 car parking spaces, the 2017 parking standards permit a maximum of 162 car parking spaces (one space per unit) for a development of this size.

b. A minimum of 8% of the car parking provision should be designated as accessible parking. This should result in 13 accessible spaces, the details within the application propose 4 accessible spaces.

c. A minimum of 1 in 6 spaces should be equipped for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging. Resulting in 26 EV spaces, the details within the application does not show any of the car parking provision equipped for EV charging.

d. No detailed and reasoned justification for this level of car parking provision was provided with the application.

e. No detail provided within the application showing location, design and numbers of cycle parking.

f. No detail provided within the application showing location, design and numbers of motorcycle parking.

SEPA response - dated 2 February 2018

We object to this planning application on the grounds of lack of information (or clarification) on proposals for foul drainage. We will review this objection if the issues detailed in Section 1.1 and 1.2 below are adequately addressed.

1. Drainage

Foul Drainage.

1.1 More information on proposals for foul drainage are necessary.

1.2 SEPA would not support or approve a CAR licence for any private sewage plant, until the connection to the public sewer has been investigated. We note that the public sewer is approximately 140 metres from the centre of the site.

Surface Water Drainage

1.3 The proposals for surface water drainage are acceptable to SEPA.

2. Flood Risk

2.1 We have no objection to the proposed development on flood risk grounds. Notwithstanding this we expect Edinburgh Council to undertake its responsibilities as the Flood Prevention Authority.

2.2 We have provided advice on a number of planning applications in the Granton Harbour area, including the overall masterplan, reference 01/00802/OUT. We did not object to the overall masterplan. We have, however, made recommendations on finished floor levels and any development below ground.

2.3 An updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), has been completed by Fairhurst (August 2017). This updated FRA includes additional analysis to quantify wave action and overtopping rates at the site. It is for the City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) to satisfy itself that the assessment of wave action and joint probability correspond with its analysis of these factors.

2.4 We previously recommended that finished floor levels (FFLs) should be set above 5.07mAOD. The FRA recommends FFLs of 5.44mAOD and review of site elevations. FFLs of the ground floor are set at a minimum of 6.0m. We support the elevation of FFLs and the overland flow pathways shown within the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP). Where ground levels are landscaped they should direct surface water away from developments and not increase flood risk to nearby properties.

2.5 We note that an underground car park is proposed underneath the proposed developments. No further information has been provided on mitigation measures against groundwater ingress, however within the FRA it is stated that the access points or openings to the basement levels should be set to a minimum of 5.44mAOD, which we support. Given the proximity of the sites to the coast and the fact that the parking spaces will be set below the 1 in 200 year extreme still water level for the area we strongly recommend that the car park is tanked and all entrances and exits are elevated relative to the surrounding area so they will not be inundated with surface water in the event of heavy rainfall. We also strongly recommend that in addition to tanking, pumps are installed within to ensure that should water ingress occur, there is a way to remove the standing water.

Caveats & Additional Information for Applicant

2.6 The SEPA Flood Maps have been produced following a consistent, nationally-applied methodology for catchment areas equal to or greater than 3km² using a Digital Terrain Model (DTM) to define river corridors and low-lying coastal land. The maps are indicative and designed to be used as a strategic tool to assess flood risk at the community level and to support planning policy and flood risk management in Scotland. For further information please visit <http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/water/flooding/flood-maps/>.

2.7 Please note that we are reliant on the accuracy and completeness of any information supplied by the applicant in undertaking our review, and can take no responsibility for incorrect data or interpretation made by the authors.

The advice contained in this letter is supplied to you by SEPA in terms of Section 72 (1) of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 on the basis of information held by SEPA as at the date hereof. It is intended as advice solely to the City of Edinburgh Council as Planning Authority in terms of the said Section 72 (1). Our briefing note "Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009: Flood risk advice to planning authorities" outlines the transitional changes to the basis of our advice in line with the phases of this legislation and can be downloaded from <http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/land/planning/guidance-and-advice-notes/>.

Regulatory advice for the applicant

2. Regulatory requirements

Details of regulatory requirements and good practice advice for the applicant can be found on the Regulations section of our website. If you are unable to find the advice you need for a specific regulatory matter, please contact a member of the regulatory team in the local SEPA office.

SEPA further response - dated 3 April 2018

Thank you for your consultation which SEPA received on 03 April 2018.

Advice for the planning authority

On the 02 February 2018 (our reference PCS/15707) we objected to planning application 17/05120/AMC on the grounds of lack of information on proposals for foul drainage. On the basis of the information supplied by Fairhurst and on which you consulted us on 03 April we can withdraw our objection to this planning application.

Regulatory advice for the applicant

1. Regulatory requirements

1.1 Details of regulatory requirements and good practice advice for the applicant can be found on the Regulations section of our website. If you are unable to find the advice you need for a specific regulatory matter, please contact a member of the regulatory team in the local SEPA office at:

Silvan House, SEPA 3rd Floor, 231 Corstorphine Road, Edinburgh EH12 7AT

Waste Services response - dated 4 December 2017

I have provided below some general information in relation to this development, but the detailed arrangements need to be agreed with myself at later stage. The architects or developers should liaise directly with me at earliest point via email at anna.napiorkowska@edinburgh.gov.uk.

Waste Management Responsibilities

The Waste and Cleansing Services will be responsible for managing the waste from households and any Council premises only. I am assuming this would include this development.

Compliance with Waste Strategy (Domestic Waste Only)

The provision of a full recycling service is mandatory in Scotland, so that developers must make provision for the full range of bins (either individual Containers for each property, or communal bins for multiple properties). These must be stored off street at all times, except on the day of collection (in the case of individual bins).

The waste collection teams will require safe and efficient access to these from the earliest occupation, and therefore cognisance must be taken of my comments below in relation to operational viability.

For low density properties, we would recommend individual kerbside collections. This provides each property with landfill (140 litres); mixed recycling (240 litres), glass (box), food box and internal caddy. All of these must be presented on the day of collection before a specified time and removed thereafter. They must otherwise be stored off street at all times.

For high density properties, we would recommend communal waste containers, for: landfill waste, mixed recycling for paper and packaging, glass, and food.

Key points are:

- each bin store must accept the full range of materials in bins, segregated as outlined above. It is not acceptable to have some types of bin in one bin storage area, and others in a different collection point, as recycling is a fully integrated part of the service;*
- the maximum size of a food bin is 500 litres; and that of a glass bin is 660 litres, which are both smaller than other types of waste due to weight issues;*
- provision must be made for the storage and disposal of bulky wastes such as furniture produced by the residents, and indeed access to those by our collection teams.*

Developers can either source their own bins in line with our requirements, or can arrange for us to do so and recharge the cost- this will probably be most convenient for them.

Operational Viability

Developers need to ensure that services are accessible so that our collection crews can provide the service in a safe and efficient manner, taking account of turning circles, length and width of vehicles, distance bins must be pulled, surfaces, slopes and so on. Obviously sufficient capacity must also be provided to allow successful collection of each segregated waste stream.

With regards to the development at West Harbour Road I will require confirmation regarding the distance from the bin stores to the collection point as well as swept path analysis to confirm the refuse collection vehicle can safely enter and exit the site. I would strongly recommend early contact with myself to ensure adequate provision of segregated household waste bins includes all of the above and suitable access for the refuse collectors is provided.

Location Plan



© Crown Copyright and database right 2014. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey License number 100023420
END