

Item 3.1 - Minutes

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee – Additional Meeting

9.00 am Wednesday 29 June 2018

Present:

Councillors Gardiner (Convener), Child (Vice-Convener), Booth, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Mitchell, Mowat, Frank Ross (substituting for Councillor Dixon) and Neil Ross (substituting for Councillor Hal Osler).

1. 139 London Road, Edinburgh – Application for Hearing

The Sub-Committee had agreed to hold a hearing under the procedures set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedures) (Scotland) Regulations 2008 for consideration of the application for the proposed redevelopment of existing Sports Centre site to provide new Sports Centre facilities and redevelopment of surplus land for mixed uses including residential, student accommodation, hotel and commercial uses, together with car parking, landscaping, drainage and ancillary works at 139 London Road, Edinburgh, be dealt with by means of a hearing - application no 18/00154/PPP).

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The proposal was for planning permission in principle for new sports centre facilities and redevelopment of surplus land for mixed uses including residential, student accommodation, hotel and commercial uses, together with car parking, landscaping, drainage and ancillary works.

No details would be approved at this stage as the layout, scale and design would be matters for subsequent applications and would require to comply with the Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) design policies and the Edinburgh Design Guidance. There were no issues raised with regards to flooding, drainage, or air quality, subject to mitigation. Subject to appropriate contributions being made, there were no issues with transport or education infrastructure. The provision of the affordable housing would be secured by a legal agreement (or memorandum of understanding, as appropriate).

The proposed land uses were acceptable in principle, subject to further community consultation regarding the quantum and location of the uses. Any loss of trees would be assessed in further applications, if permission was granted and would require to be justified in terms of LDP policies.

The proposals were therefore acceptable at this stage. There were no other material considerations that outweighed this conclusion.

There was no requirement to notify Scottish Ministers with regards to this proposal as the proposal was not a significant departure from the Local Development Plan.

The full presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(b) Presentation by Craigentenny and Meadowbank Community Council

Nick Leech gave a presentation on behalf of Craigentenny and Meadowbank Community Council.

The Community Council's response was intended to be neutral because some members of the community and sporting organisations were happy for the stadium to be rebuilt. However, they had since identified areas which required further clarification, therefore, they could not fully support the application. It was recognised that there was a need for a new sporting facility to benefit both local residents and the people of Edinburgh and that the Council had attempted to consult some sporting organisations and local residents, but a more comprehensive consultation was required.

The two community councils had tried to rectify the lack of consultation by organising their own events to attract a wide range of people, setting out the issues. The community was nervous about the future of Meadowbank, which seemed to be in limbo. The Council needed to have more engagement and more transparency about any proposed modifications.

The presentation from the Chief Planning Officer had provided some clarity about the stage of the proposed development. The Community Council wanted to thank such groups as the "Save Meadowbank Campaign" for helping to raise awareness and provide clarity. The support from residents should encourage the Council to provide greater clarity of what the plan should be.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(c) Presentation by Northfield and Willowbrae Community Council

John Peacock gave a presentation on behalf of Northfield and Willowbrae Community Council.

Mr Peacock stated that the Community Council objected to the proposed change of use for the Meadowbank site, indicating that there were three strong reasons why the proposal should be rejected - (1) The proposed new configuration of the site breached Edinburgh's planning policies, (2) There had been a lack of meaningful consultation on the proposals with the people affected by them, and (3) the proposed downgraded sports centre was unsatisfactory in size and scope.

Mr Peacock pointed out that the Sub-Committee might be told that such issues should simply be ignored. Consent could be granted in principle, and all the minor details

sorted out afterwards. However, this would be totally irresponsible. The answer was to pause the process until the problems were sorted out.

Meadowbank was covered by policy ENV18, in respect of open space. However, all of the criteria were violated in this case, in particular, (1) There would be a major impact on the local environment, (2) there was not over-provision of local open space, (3) there would not be a local benefit from “improvement” of the space and (4) The development was not for a community purpose. In respect of the consultation, it should be remembered that Meadowbank was a resource for all citizens of Edinburgh. The consultation was unsatisfactory as people would not have had time to absorb the mass of documents on the planning website.

In conclusion, Mr Peacock understood that the Council had to live in the real world and there was strong pressure to provide new housing. However, it was not necessary to sacrifice Meadowbank in order to meet this need. Meadowbank was a rare and precious open space that should be preserved for future inhabitants of the city. Granting even outline change of use would make its destruction inevitable.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(d) Presentation by Beverley Klein

Ms Klein have a presentation to the Sub-Committee as an objector to the application and as a resident of Meadowbank.

Ms Klein understood that Councils had Local Plans for a reason, but this was not achieved by this proposal. The Plan was very clear in specifying that Meadowbank was Open Space. The Site History stated that the Proposal of Application was made in November 2016, which was the same month the plan was published although it did not mention this proposal.

Concerns were raised regarding changes to the character, height, the number of units, infrastructure and the impact on local services. There would be a significant departure from the plan and there was no guarantee that there would be a proper consultation. Additionally, there were plenty other options for housing, rather than Meadowbank. The proposals had largely failed to meet the criteria for ENV 18/19, provided for 50% of current parking, the quality of open space was of low amenity and this was not a community purpose. The Committee’s decision to refuse the application for Pinkhill on the grounds of Des 4 was highlighted, which was similar to the Meadowbank proposal in terms of height.

Ms Klein thought that the Committee could help address the issues she had highlighted by starting from the beginning to get the right result for the community, rather than a rushed result. Therefore, she urged the Committee to refuse the application.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(e) Presentation by John Peacock on behalf of Linda Furley

Mr Peacock provided a presentation on behalf of Linda Furley, a local resident. Mr Peacock advised that that the majority of the local community were strongly opposed to the change of use. These views were echoed by the wider Edinburgh community: 83% of responses were objections and a petition with over 3000 signatures was given to the Committee. They did not support a change of use based on alleged improvements to the local community, for many reasons: (1) Over-development of the local area and substantial loss of facilities and open space, (2) Loss of heritage, (3) Environmental impacts on wildlife, trees, greenspace and local residents, (4) Poor communication and consultation, and (5) Concerns over costing and funding.

The majority of the community did not support a change of use. These plans were very much not an improvement for the community. The Committee must reject the application until there was a site Masterplan that had been properly agreed by all parties, not forced through without proper consultation.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(f) Presentation by Sheila Hobbs on behalf of the Edinburgh Athletics Club

Sheila Hobbs spoke on behalf of Edinburgh Athletics and outlined the work of the Edinburgh Athletics Club and the very positive sporting outcomes that had been achieved.

Since Meadowbank closed at the end of last year there were few suitable alternative facilities for the club to train and compete, which meant travelling to other venues. Meadowbank's closure would deprive many people within Edinburgh access to sport and exercise unless and until a replacement was built. Other sports clubs faced similar problems. Ms Hobbs fully supported the recommendations of the Chief Planning Officer to grant planning permission for the PPP and FUL applications because it was a brownfield site, its location was appropriate for high mixed density usage and would have a wider city region benefit. The planner had demonstrated the compliance with the development plan.

The proposal was fit for purpose and would give a sense of presence, would bring benefits to local residents and would allow the Council control over the site. The concerns of the local residents were recognised, such as changes to the local environment and intensifying development, but the benefits more than outweighed any negative impacts.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(g) Presentation by Councillor John McLellan, Ward Member

Councillor John McLellan acknowledged that this had been a difficult process, however, he had had helpful discussions with officers. The detailed application for the stadium

and the outline application for the rest of the site were entirely separate in planning developmental terms. The Craigentiny and Duddingston Ward was a conglomeration of small communities, however, Meadowbank Stadium gave it a sense of identity. The stadium had been popular for a number of years, but the rest of the site had fallen into some disrepair. There had been much attention given to the loss of open space, but this had not existed for some time.

Emphasis was placed on the loss of opportunity to create something special for the use of the community. The community had made it clear that the proposed use of this site was not in its interests. There were already difficulties with parking and to add housing would only exacerbate the problem. There were already housing developments in the near vicinity which would add to housing density and granting planning permission in principle would add to this. There was a great alternative opportunity of turning the rest of the site into community parkland. The Fort Development was an excellent development with good public realm, but members of the public only went there for a specific purpose. This development could be somewhere for local residents go in all weathers, rather than just another development. It was necessary to establish how to create a better sense of community in this part of the city. If the Sub-Committee granted planning permission in principle today, this would not be the case, therefore, they should refuse it.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(h) Presentation by Councillor Iain Campbell, Ward Member

Councillor Iain Campbell advised that he had been involved in the closing of Meadowbank in December. It was difficult finding accommodation for all of the sports clubs, many of whom were now in temporary accommodation. However, he was appalled at the condition of Meadowbank, the old stadium had outlived its purpose and there were also safety issues. Therefore, something had to be done by the Council. The proposed new stadium was a much improved facility which would be family friendly and would serve the community. Some of the open space was used to reduce car parking, but it was Council policy to reduce car parking. The new Veleldrome would be an improvement and more people would be able to use it. By having a full public consultation, it would be possible to restore public confidence in the proposals. There should be open space provided and at present, the area was not serving the local residents. It was not possible to fund the present proposals without selling some of the land and other land would be used for low-cost housing. The sale of this land would provide a better facility than there was at present, which would serve the community and the city.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(I) Presentation by Applicant – Elaine Scott (City of Edinburgh Council)

Elaine Scott, Housing Services Manager at the City of Edinburgh Council with responsibility for taking forward the delivery of the Council's housing strategy and Jude Barber from Collective Architecture presented to the Sub-Committee.

In terms of background to the development of the site, in 2008 the Council agreed that the existing facilities at Meadowbank were not suitable for the long term and agreed to build a new sports centre. In March 2016, the Council agreed the strategy for the redevelopment, including a commitment to provide a new sports centre and associated facilities and the release of the surplus site for development. Rather than dispose of sites to the highest bidder, the Council agreed that the sites identified for housing development could transfer to the Housing Service for Council led housing development through the 21st Century Homes programme. This programme had already successfully delivered new affordable homes in Gracemount, Pennywell, Greendykes and most recently at Leith Fort.

Development of affordable housing at Meadowbank would support key Council objectives as set out in the Council's business plan for the next 5 years, including delivery of new social and affordable homes to help meet the target of 20,000 new affordable homes in the next 10 years. It would also support the delivery of better health and social care outcomes; through provision of accessible housing; including homes that will be suitable for wheelchair users.

During 2016, a housing capacity study and other technical studies were carried out to assess development potential of the surplus sites. Community consultation took place over a three month period and included an on-line consultation portal, two drop-in events and a presentation to Craighentiny/ Meadowbank community council in January 2017. Additionally, in February 2018 the Council was invited to two meetings organised by the local Community Councils to answer questions on the proposals. These meetings and recent meetings with Save Meadowbank campaign had proved invaluable in helping to understand the concerns of local stakeholders.

As the consultation progressed and the application for outline planning consent was submitted it became apparent that the statutory consultation process that had been followed for the PPP application had fallen short of what was needed to allow meaningful comment and engagement on the mixed use proposals.

The masterplan application had attracted a lot of comments and objections and had been criticised for being confusing and unclear, creating concern and upset. This was unintentional and regrettable and they were now looking to address those concerns. Approval was not sought of a masterplan for the site today, only approval of the principle of mixed use development with details on housing numbers, heights, massing, layout to be agreed as part of subsequent applications and following extensive community consultation.

Jude Barber outlined the approach of Collective Architecture to design and development, detailing their background, their ethos and shared set of values within the practice, such as participation and communication. Communication was at the heart of the practice with an obligation to consult with the community. The consultation process would run through the whole development journey. They were looking to create a high quality mixed tenure housing development which should enhance such aspects as open space and active travel links. Various examples were given of projects that Collective Architecture had been involved in.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

Decision

To **GRANT** planning permission in principle subject to:

- 1) Conditions, informatives and a legal agreement or memorandum of understanding as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) The addition to condition one that the Masterplan should include evidence that it has been prepared:
 - (a) With substantive consultation from the local community and the relevant stakeholders.
 - (b) With the input from a working group comprising of representatives from the local community and other relevant stakeholders and chaired by a local ward Councillor or alternative party, as agreed by the Planning Authority.
- 3) To note that Committee had requested the removal of the following text on page 19 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer in relation to Education Infrastructure: “The assessment is based on: West of site (Drummond Education Contribution Zone) – 134 Flats. East of site (Sub-Area LT-1 of the Leith Trintiy Education Contribution Zone) – 313 Flats and five houses.”

(Reference – report by the Chief Planning Officer, submitted)

3. 139 London Road, Edinburgh – Application for Hearing

The Sub-Committee had agreed to hold a hearing under the procedures set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedures) (Scotland) Regulations 2008 for consideration of the application for the proposed redevelopment of Meadowbank Sports Centre. The detailed proposals included the development of a new sports centre facility, including a new sports centre building with offices for Edinburgh Leisure, the retained athletics track, new spectator stand, sports pitches and floodlighting, with associated access, roads, car parking, landscaping and ancillary works at 139 London Road, Edinburgh be dealt with by means of a hearing – application no 18/00181/FUL.

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The proposal was for a sports centre on the site of the existing stadium. In policy and land use terms, this was acceptable. The existing buildings and grandstand were no longer fit for purpose, and so the new sports centre would provide modern facilities. The design of the building was simple but contemporary and appropriate in its context. The design compromises were outweighed by the fact that the proposal would provide modern sporting facilities for the wider community. The loss of the trees was not justifiable for arboricultural reasons, however the new landscaping provided suitable and robust replacement planting.

There was no requirement to notify Scottish Ministers with regards to this proposal. This was due to the fact that the proposal was not a significant departure from the Development Plan.

The full presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(b) Presentation by Craigentiny and Meadowbank Community Council

Andrew Fournet and Nick Leech gave a presentation on behalf of Craigentiny and Meadowbank Community Council. Andrew Fournet thanked the Committee for giving them the opportunity to present their views.

While they recognized that Council had made some efforts to consult on the stadium, reaching out to sporting organisations and some local residents, they felt that the Council should have carried out a better and more continuous consultation with local residents and residents across the whole of Edinburgh as this facility was a city-wide asset.

The Community Council had attempted to bridge the gap of the lack of consultation by organising their own events in collaboration with their neighbours from the Northfield and Willowbrae Community Council. During the sessions they asked members of the community to write down the issues they could see with the development and they reproduced all these comments into a letter that was sent back to the Council.

The community was now very nervous about the future of the Meadowbank stadium. They would like to have clearer information about the next steps from the Council about any improvements or modifications which would be added to the planning application. The involvement of groups such as the "Save Meadowbank" campaign helped raise awareness and reach more people in the community. They thanked the campaign for raising awareness and trying to provide more clarity on this very large planning application, and the support which the campaign had received from various residents, which should encourage the Council to increase its efforts to reach out and explain the plans better.

The full presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(c) Presentation by David Baxter

David Baxter spoke to the Sub-Committee as an objector to the application on four grounds: it contravened policy on the loss of open space, the change of land use, a reduction in facilities of over 40%, and the consultation was inadequate. Mr Baxter felt that the application should be referred to the Scottish Ministers. Many sports had been inconvenienced by the proposal and would not meet the needs of Scotland's Capital City. The Committee should refer the application to the Scottish Ministers or reject it completely.

The full presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(d) Presentation by Vanessa Fuertes

Vanessa Fuertes addressed the Sub-Committee as an objector to the application, and advised that she had been involved in the original "Save Meadowbank" Campaign 11 years ago, but things had changed since then. The Council's plans then provided for more sports facilities, however, the land to be sold for the redevelopment had increased since then.

Proposals by the Council now tended to be driven by cost concerns and conservative solutions, but elected members should have a vision for the city. There were examples of good practice to be considered. They wanted a new sports centre soon, but speed should not override quality. There was a failure to consult adequately, but even this consultation demonstrated that most residents objected to the proposals. The Council should think of how this would be in the long term. The decision the Sub-Committee took today could have a damaging effect on sport in Scotland and upon health and wellbeing.

The full presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(e) Presentation by Simone Melanie Clark

Ms Clark presented to the Committee as an objector to the application due to the loss of trees, which she viewed as a valuable part of her neighbourhood. The "Save Meadowbank Trees" campaign had handed in a petition requesting that the Council protected the trees around Meadowbank. It had been proposed that 150 trees were to be felled at the site. The majority of these mature trees were found to be in healthy condition and included trees of a rare species. The campaign group asked that these trees were not removed and that access to the site did not require the trees to be removed. In other countries, trees were protected during development work. Replacement planting of new young trees would take 20 years or more. Mature trees provided habitat for wildlife such as nesting birds, however, trees and spaces for wildlife were being constantly reduced in Edinburgh, which had an adverse effect on wildlife. It was appreciated that some tree loss was necessary, but 97% was excessive. Retention

of trees for new developments provided a sense of maturity and the excessive removal of trees for development was contrary to Local Development Plan (LDP) Policy. The Save Meadowbank Trees Campaign asked that the main stand of trees on London Road be preserved. These trees were intrinsic to the local area and were highly valued.

The full presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(f) Presentation from Mark Munro

Mr Munro spoke on behalf of the governing body for sport in Scotland and on behalf of the clubs in Edinburgh and Athletics Scotland. Meadowbank was an iconic venue for athletics in Scotland, but it had fallen behind the times. So for athletics events and for training purposes it was essential that the proposals went ahead. The facilities would be an enhancement. The original plans were not fit for purpose, but the new proposals were modern and fit for purpose.

Some of the present facilities were not safe, and it was acknowledged that there was a lot of nostalgia for Meadowbank. Scotland would continue to host certain events, but in the near future would not have the opportunity to host certain events.

Meadowbank had a successful track history, but there was a huge risk that if Meadowbank was not developed properly, then there would be a reduction in the number of athletes being created in the city. Additionally, the physical and mental well-being of sports users in general should be catered for. There were a large number of coaches who might not continue. If there was no Meadowbank, then there was no regional centre for sport. There was also the huge risk of delay which was already having a negative impact on sport. Mr Munro fully endorsed the plans to ensure that athletics would continue to flourish.

The full presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(g) Edinburgh City Football Club

James Lumsden addressed the Committee on behalf of Edinburgh City Football Club. He indicated that Edinburgh City FC first moved to Meadowbank Stadium in January 1996, with one adult team. In 32 years the club had progressed to the Scottish Professional Football League. They now had over 30 teams from kids right up to adults, including Sunday amateur teams. Their tenancy of Meadowbank was central to them achieving this, providing the Scottish FA membership which made everything else possible.

The new plans for Meadowbank restricted their ability to grow their senior team. The spectator capacity would cause problems if they were to achieve promotion, the seating arrangements would cause very poor viewing, access to the pitch was also unsatisfactory and the SPFL would have to view the stadium to make stipulations, but had not been consulted.

In conclusion, Mr Lumsden was disappointed that in proposing to spend over £40 million on a new sports centre, every current user of Meadowbank would have poorer facilities than they had had before, and felt that the new plans risked the short and long-term viability as an ambitious SPFL club.

The full presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

(h) Presentation by Applicant and Applicant's Agent

Crawford McGhie (City of Edinburgh Council), Graham Groucher (City of Edinburgh Council), Gareth Yule (Holmes Miller Architects), Joanna Walker (Associate LDA Design) and Jo Matheson (Edinburgh Leisure) gave a presentation to the Sub-Committee.

Crawford McGhie, Acting Head of Operational Support for Communities and Families was the lead council officer for delivery of the Sports Centre Capital Project and provided a brief summary of the wider context for the project.

The existing Meadowbank was no longer fit for purpose. It had been a Council ambition to replace the sports facilities at Meadowbank for at least a decade and this covered the period of three administrations, and the current administration was committed to deliver new facilities at Meadowbank by 2021. Mr McGhie appreciated that it was not a planning issue but the financial strategy for the new sports centre that relied on capital receipts from the proposed mixed-use development and therefore securing planning permission would be a big milestone for Meadowbank.

Graham Croucher from the Council's Sports and Outdoor Learning Team advised that since 2016 his role was to lead on the consultation engagement with key stakeholders on the development of a sports centre design for Meadowbank, and described the various stages of consultation to the Sub-Committee.

Gareth Yule outlined the architectural design proposals. A key factor of the design was the decision to retain the existing running track. The track had an important link to Meadowbank's past and its retention would maintain this link to historic events, such as the Commonwealth Games held in 1970 and 1986 and to the many historic moments in the history of Scottish Athletics.

The main elements of the design were shown, and the existing running track was retained in its current position, the new sports centre was located parallel to the track and there was an additional 3G pitch and a separate outdoor throws area. The plan of the building was a parallelogram with a diagonal gable ends picking up the diagonal over the existing stadium as shown in the plan from 1968.

Joan Walker, landscape architect from LDA design advised that when developing the design for the Plaza, the focus was on the following objectives: to improve local amenity, by creating a useable active outdoor public space to develop an overall tree strategy which retained and enhanced the existing mature Wheatley Elms where possible and provided a robust replacement strategy to offset any loss and to improve visual amenity and townscape by strengthening the frontage along London Road and to create a

welcoming arrival space which announced the entrance to the sports centre while celebrating the sporting history of the site.

The importance and significance of the mature Wheatley Elms was recognised and they had worked hard to develop a tree strategy, to retain as many as possible and also offer a robust replacement strategy, to mitigate for any loss. Planting densities and ground conditions around many of the existing Elms would be retained. Being retained would give more space to celebrate the Elms as feature trees and allow the trees to develop in a less constrained environment. The proposals had been carefully considered to ensure there was no change in soil level within root protection zones and to minimise any adverse impact on the Mature Elm Trees.

Joe Matheson, Head of Property Estates in Edinburgh Leisure had been involved in the redevelopment of Meadowbank since 2013, both in her current role and in her previous position of Manager of Meadowbank Sports Centre and Stadium. Meadowbank was a busy and well-loved venue. Even in their final year of operation there was 550,000 visitors coming through the building and those were just the people that they managed to record.

Edinburgh Leisure had been delighted to work with the Council on the project to create a Meadowbank that could build on the legacy of the old. They were delighted at the prospect of a new state of the art venue than met the physical activity and sporting needs of Edinburgh citizens and wanted to be at the discussions from the beginning. When considering the facility mix at the New Meadowbank they wanted to future-proof the venue. Edinburgh Leisure would be very proud at the prospect of operating the new facility.

The full presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971

Decision

Motion

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions, informatives and a legal agreement or memorandum of understanding as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer and subject also to the following additional informatives:

- (a) consideration be given to the provision of additional cycle parking over and above that which was currently proposed.
- (b) the applicant should take cognisance of cycle routes in the wider Master Plan and make changes to this proposal if necessary.
- (c) The applicant should work with Edinburgh City Football Club to explore the potential to increase spectator capacity.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child.

Amendment

To refuse planning permission as the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan Policy ENV 12 (Trees) and ENV 19 (Facilities).

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Neil Ross.

Voting

For the motion - 6 votes

For the amendment - 2 votes

For the motion - Councillors Gardiner, Child, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths and Mowat.

For the amendment - Councillors Booth and Neil Ross.

Decision

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions, informatives and a legal agreement or memorandum of understanding as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer and subject also to the following additional informatives:

- (a) consideration be given to the provision of additional cycle parking over and above that which was currently proposed.
- (b) the applicant should take cognisance of cycle routes in the wider Master Plan and make changes to this proposal if necessary.
- (c) The applicant should work with Edinburgh City Football Club to explore the potential to increase spectator capacity.

(Reference – report by the Chief Planning Officer, submitted.)

Appendix

| Agenda Item No. / Address | Details of Proposal/Reference No | Decision |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Note: Detailed conditions/reasons for the following decisions are contained in the statutory planning register.</p> | | |
| <p><u>Item 6.1(a) – 139 London Road, Edinburgh</u></p> | <p>Protocol Note by the Head of Strategy and Insight</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p><u>Item 6.1(b) – 139 London Road, Edinburgh</u></p> | <p>Proposed redevelopment of existing Sports Centre site to provide new Sports Centre facilities and redevelopment of surplus land for mixed uses including residential, student accommodation, hotel and commercial uses, together with car parking, landscaping, drainage and ancillary works – application no 18/00154/PPP</p> | <p>To GRANT planning permission in principle subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conditions, informatives and a legal agreement or memorandum of understanding as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer. 2. The addition to condition one that the Masterplan should include the following details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that it had been prepared: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) With substantive consultation from the local community and the relevant stakeholders. (b) With the input from a working group comprising of representatives from the local community and other relevant stakeholders and chaired by a local ward Councillor or alternative party, as agreed by the Planning Authority. |

| Agenda Item No. / Address | Details of Proposal/Reference No | Decision |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Note – Committee requested the removal of the following text on page 19 of the report in relation to Education Infrastructure: “The assessment is based on: West of site (Drummond Education Contribution Zone) – 134 Flats. East of site (Sub-Area LT-1 of the Leith Trinity Education Contribution Zone) – 313 Flats and five houses.”</p> |
| <p><u>Item 6.2(a) – 139 London Road, Edinburgh</u></p> | <p>Protocol Note by the Head of Strategy and Insight</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

| Agenda Item No. / Address | Details of Proposal/Reference No | Decision |
|--|---|--|
| <p><u>Item 6.2(b) – 139</u> <u>London Road,</u> <u>Edinburgh</u></p> | <p>Redevelopment of Meadowbank Sports Centre. The detailed proposals include the development of a new sports centre facility, including a new sports centre building with offices for Edinburgh Leisure, the retained athletics track, new spectator stand, sports pitches and floodlighting, with associated access, roads, car parking, landscaping and ancillary works – application no 18/00181/FUL</p> | <p>To GRANT planning permission subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conditions, informatives and a legal agreement or memorandum of understanding as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer. 2. Additional informatives that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Consideration is given to the provision of additional cycle parking over and above that which is currently proposed. (b) The applicant should take cognisance of cycle routes in the wider Master Plan and make changes to this proposal if necessary. (c) The applicant should work with Edinburgh City Football Club to explore the potential to increase spectator capacity. <p>(On a division.)</p> |