

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00 am, Wednesday 8 September 2021

Present:

Councillors Gardiner (Convener), Child (Vice-Convener) (items 4.1-4.14 and 5.1-5.2), Booth, Cameron, Gordon (items 4.5, 4.6, 4.9, 4.10 and 4.12), Key (substituting for Councillor Gordon, 4.1-4.4, 4.7,4.8, 4.11, 4.13 and 4.14), Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose, Staniforth and Ethan Young.

1. General Applications and Miscellaneous Business

The Sub-Committee considered reports on planning applications listed in Sections 4, 5 and 6 of the agenda for this meeting.

Requests for a Presentation:

Councillor Staniforth requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.5 – 3B Dundas Street, Edinburgh

Councillor Rose requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.6 – 14-16 Hope Terrace, Edinburgh

Councillors Booth and Staniforth requested presentations in respect of Items 4.9 and 4.10 – Kirkland House, 2 Trefoil Centre, Gogarmuir Road, Edinburgh

Councillor Gardiner requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.12 – Powderhall Bowling Green, Edinburgh

Decision

To determine the applications as detailed in the Appendix to this minute.

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

2. Centrum House, 108-114 Dundas Street, Edinburgh

At the Development Management Sub-Committee meeting on 16 June 2021, Committee agreed to continue an application for planning permission and conservation area consent at Centrum House, 108-114 Dundas Street, Edinburgh, to be by means of a hearing at a future Development Management Sub-Committee. The Chief Planning Officer had identified an application for planning permission to be dealt with by means of a hearing. The application for

planning permission at Centrum House, 108-114 Dundas Street, Edinburgh for the proposed demolition of existing office buildings and erection of a mixed-use development comprising 50 flats with 3 commercial units (Class 1, 2 and 3 uses), amenity space, landscaping, basement level car and cycle parking and other associated infrastructure (as amended) - application no. 20/05645/FUL. The application for conservation area consent was for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and comprised two adjoining office blocks: 108-114 Dundas Street 116 Dundas Street, dating from the 1980s - application no. 20/05646/CON.

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The application was for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and erection of a mixed-use development comprising 50 flats, including 12 affordable units, with three commercial units in Class 1 (retail), 2 (office) and 3 (café/restaurant) uses at ground and lower ground level, private and communal amenity space, landscaping and basement level car and cycle parking.

The residential accommodation was as follows: – market price - four-bedroom x 1, 3-bedroom x 17 and two-bedroom x 20 = 38 – affordable - two-bedroom x 4 and one-bedroom x 8 = 12

The commercial units were as follows: Unit A 121sqm Unit B 165sqm Unit C 538sqm at ground and basement level.

An associated application for conservation area consent had been submitted for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site (application number 20/05646/CON).

The proposed building was L-shape in plan with a projecting corner element to Fettes Row and comprises eight levels in total with a basement, lower ground floor and top storey set back from the front building lines. These lines followed the building lines of the adjacent flats and Victorian tenements on Dundas Street and modern residential blocks on Fettes Row. The latter had a basement lightwell.

The architectural style of the proposed building was contemporary with three distinct sections and two stair/lift cores, incorporating modern interpretations of traditional tenemental detailing and ground floor shopfronts. The principal elevations to Dundas Street and Fettes Row would be finished in natural blonde coloured ashlar sandstone, with a rusticated lower ground façade on Fettes Row and the rear elevation would be in blonde coloured brick with natural sandstone string courses. The top floor would have extensive areas of glazing within dark-grey finished, rusticated aluminium clad framing with chamfered perimeter edges. The windows and door frames would be formed in dark-grey finished aluminium and this material would also be used for the window fascia panels between the first and second floors and recessed infill bay on Fettes Row. All safety balustrades would be in dark-grey coloured metal.

The stone and aluminium window reveals on Dundas Street would have chamfer detailing and the shopfronts and commercial unit frontage to the rear would be framed in dark-grey coloured aluminium with stone piers for the shopfronts within the section furthest north on Dundas Street. A biodiverse brown roof would occupy most of the flat roof surface and there would be two plant/lift cap enclosures at either end of the Dundas Street section formed in dark-grey coloured aluminium acoustic louvres. An extensive

array of photovoltaic panels would occupy a large area of the Fettes Row section of the roof.

All the existing street trees would be removed. A raised communal garden would be formed over part of the basement car park to the rear with a blonde coloured brick elevation incorporating a dark-grey coloured aluminium garage door and central flight of steps. A brick boundary wall would be erected on the north boundary where the existing building stood extending approximately 2.2 metres high from the garden terrace level. The commercial unit occupying the lower ground floor would have access to two private rear courtyards on this level and there were two private rear gardens serving the rear-facing and dual-aspect flat at lower ground level on Fettes Row. The latter flat and two remaining flats at this level facing Fettes Row would have private terraces within the front basement lightwell and the flats at top floor level would have private external terraces facing Dundas Street and Fettes Row.

The rear landscaping would comprise areas of porous clay paving in blonde and red tones laid in stretcher bond and herringbone patterns respectively. Evergreen hedges and shrubs would form boundaries between the private and public areas and climbing plants will be trained up the boundary walls. Six trees would be planted within the area. A Siberian Larch Pergola would run along the west edge of the terrace with communal seating areas and a barbeque area at the north end. The seats and tables would also be in larch.

The private courtyards to the front would be formed in natural sandstone (Yorkstone) pavers, including the cladding of the car park ventilation louvres and the private courtyard of commercial Unit C facing Fettes Row.

The residential flats would be accessed via a level bridge link on Fettes Row and a level access within the north block on Dundas Street. The flats would also have accesses from the rear terrace. The three commercial units would have level access from Dundas Street and the lower floor of commercial Unit C would be accessed from Fettes Row. Vehicular access to the car/cycle park would be via Henderson Row and there were two stair/lift accesses from the basement to the upper levels.

Centralised heating and hot water plant, cold water storage and electrical plant would be housed within the basement car park and rainwater attenuation tanks would also be located in this area. A waste store would be provided at side of the vehicular ramp access to the basement.

Within the basement car park, a total of 32 car parking spaces, including three accessible and seven with electric vehicle charging spaces and 118 cycle parking spaces are proposed.

Scheme 1 - The original scheme proposed:

- 44 flats with two, three and four bedrooms;
- the top story set further forward by approximately one metre;
- no 0.5 metre setback or eaves break and a stone parapet rather than metal balustrade on the north section facing Dundas Street;
- no advanced corner or shadow gap on the Fettes Row elevation;

- less rusticated stone tooling on the lower level facades facing Fettes Row; and
- no window chamfers on the Dundas Street elevation and less distinction between the elevational treatment of the two sections fronting Dundas Street.

Supporting Documents

- Pre-application Consultation Report
- Planning Statement;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Heritage Statement;
- Noise Impact Assessment;
- Daylight and Sunlight Report;
- Affordable Housing Statement;
- Transport Statement;
- Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Assessment;
- Sustainability Statement and S1 Form; and
- Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan and
- Tree Survey and Report.

The presentation can be viewed in full via the link below:

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 8th September 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(b) New Town and Broughton Community Council

Annick Gaillard and Richard Price addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of the New Town and Broughton Community Council

Ms Gaillard advised that the view from Dundas Street made it possible to see Centrum House and Bupa House. The trees looked healthy, however, this was a picture from 2008. Ms Gaillard would focus on the key issues, but first wanted to first give some context. The planning history was outlined, referring to the New Town in 1825. Both buildings were approved in 1970s. When the recommendation was made to approve these, it was stated that the front-line should be 68 feet from centre line of Dundas Street. 5 years later, approval was given for an office block at 120 Dundas Street. In 2006, there was an application for the demolition and re-purposing of the building. Approval was granted to demolish that building. There were no gable windows on the Victorian section of the buildings, gable windows were normally, but not always protected. For the re-purposing of the building, this respected the established building form and alignment. The key issue was the building line. The current application was for the demolition and replacement of Centrum House. The design did not consider the re-development of Centrum House, however the community council disagreed with this. When it was originally approved, the community council thought that the proposal would

prejudice the possibility to develop the area in front of the offices. The area in front of Bupa house, was not intended for development. When the building line was considered, the line was consistent with Georgian tenements. Considering the building line, the line was generally consistent, but some sections on 120 to 158 on Dundas Street, were set forward. Other sections aligned with the Georgian line. The only anomaly for the whole of Dundas Street, was the section of Fettes Row to Henderson Row. The community council thought that a better compromise for amenity, would have been to have the building line halfway to the Georgian tenements. That it would protect the amenity of 120 Dundas Street. If the buildings did not stand the purpose of time, then this was contrary to the planning process.

Mr Price advised that he wanted to reinforce the comments of the previous speaker. From the perspective of the developers, they had chosen, in terms of the building line, something that was of benefit to them. There were other ways of looking at the situation, from the original and the amended application. The community council were clear that they did not support the building line.

The presentation can be viewed in full via the link below:

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 8th September 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(c) Local Residents – Dundas Street and Fettes Row

Chris Day addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of the Local Residents – Dundas Street and Fettes Row.

Mr Day advised that he represented 30 residents of Dundas Street and Fettes Row. The development would shape this part of the New Town for decades, but it would dominate excessively and was a wrong decision. The provision of affordable housing not an issue.

Mr Day outlined the key points. Firstly, heritage had been explored, including a variety of building lines and the height of the site since the 19th century. Immediately round this site, there was a combination of set-back buildings and trees which were included in the new development. In the previous meeting, an elected member had asked what historical point would be chosen, as a reference point for the future. There had not been a combination of advanced building lines and heights, since the 19th century. Sixty residents indicated that they quite liked the existing arrangement and the trees. Edinburgh World Heritage still objected to this design. It was claimed that the earlier presentation complied with existing New Town styles. This was in fact unsympathetic and was an overbearing monolith. If the existing buildings were in the contemporary style, then would this scheme stand the test of time and how did it create a sense of place? The line of trees was much appreciated. They were pruned in 2018 and 2020 and this had detracted from their natural form, but they were Lime Trees and would recover. Regarding the brick building in the report, that was described as being an entity which should be evoked at back. That was not the old tram depot, but was a 1990s building. There was a planning application in to demolish that building and replace it with flats. Secondly, in terms of sustainability, the assessment did not show carbon

impacts. There was also the issue of transport. This worked for office workers Thirdly, with regard to amenity, discussion had focused on new residents. The communal area at the back was not visible from the surrounding streets and the new trees would compensate for the trees lost to at the front. The new units were not comparable, their views were compromised, and it was known that windows helped residents' wellbeing. To conclude, there were 12 issues for the Sub-Committee to consider. This application failed six of these, which included preserving listed buildings, preserving the conservation area, creating a sense of place, being detrimental to residential amenity, having an adverse impact on trees and biodiversity and addressing public comments. LDP Policy Des 1 stated that designs should draw on the positive characteristics of the area and create a sense of place. The slide being displayed was a current street scene. Was this the kind of animated street scene that the council sought to evoke. The proposal was clumsy, overbearing and unsympathetic to the character of the area. The local residents faced the stress of two substantial applications and years of disruption. The consultation which took place was of a cursory nature and this was taken at a time when people's mental health had been adversely affected.

The presentation can be viewed in full via the link below:

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 8th September 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(d) The Cockburn Association

Terry Levinthal addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of The Cockburn Association.

Mr Levinthal advised that the association formally objected to this proposal. They had engaged a range of experts, including architects, planners and urban designers. Firstly, they believed that the housing-led re-purposing was an acceptable approach in principle and supported this, but the proposals did not reflect the quality, character or scale of the adjacent building. It seemed to be a speculative design approach. They did not feel that there was clear residential character being expressed, complementing the Georgian architecture nearby. They noted the stark contrast of the engagement at street level between the Georgian buildings and modern buildings. There was a lack of understanding of the top, middle and bottom components of the building. This contradicted the dominant architectural patterns. The development did not meet Edinburgh LDP Policy Des 4, in relation to mass, detailing or proportions in scale. Their main objection was the demolition of the entire structure. In line with the Council vision of carbon management, the demolition and re-development of the site was an inappropriate response to re-purposing these buildings. There was nothing they could find regarding the review and re-use of these structures that would mitigate against the carbon management. A wider design objective should be undertaken. There were challenges, but these could be overcome and in this way the scale of the building would contribute more to carbon management in the city. In considering carbon management, in the round, the proposals were not consistent with Edinburgh LDP Policy Des 6, and sustainability. The applicant should repair what was already in place,

as the structures could be re-used. Finally, considering the planning in context, with regard to the building line, the association would support the wishes of the community council and residents and retain the trees. They noted that the 1825 plan had been illustrated. However, it should be appreciated that this was a feuing plan, not an architectural or site plan for development. It was simply a mechanism to show how an area could be developed, behind this, there would be series of rules to be applied, including having setback from the street.

The presentation can be viewed in full via the link below:

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 8th September 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(e) Applicant and Applicant's Agent

Guy Morgan (Morgan McDonnell Architecture), Paul Scott (Scott Hobbs Planning) Andrew Rennick (Applicant representative) were heard in support of the application.

Mr Morgan highlighted some high-level points which had been overlooked by the community council and neighbour representors when making comparisons with the existing situation and their own proposals. These related to amenity, sustainability and townscape. With respect to amenity, specifically, the improved daylight and sunlight, in the proposed windows at the building at 120 Dundas street. There had been much discussion about the merits of bringing the building line forward, but no mention of the benefits of that to the rear of the proposed building at 120 Dundas street and the current Centrum House. Reference was made to 120 Dundas Street and Henderson Street and the shared amenity deck. It was interesting that 120 Dundas street had living rooms to the west facing the rear and kitchen and dining spaces to Dundas Street. The balconies on one side were obscured by the set back of existing building on the application site.

Looking at the comparison of the existing and proposed block, it was possible to see the benefits of daylight by pulling the building forward. Also, in terms of aspect, the balconies had currently a blank gable wall coming out. In the proposed scheme, this aspect was opened up and there would be more sunlight and daylighting. This was a significant improvement to the current situation. They would now compare the existing and proposed situation regarding the sunlight study. There was a significant difference in shadowing between the two situations. Regarding sustainability, the existing trees to the front had a limited lifespan. There as a full arborological report in the application, which highlighted the issue of the trees. These were all Category C and had only a 10-year life span. The existing rear car park was made of Tar McAdam, with no opportunity for biodiversity. In the proposed building, the communal garden would introduce variety of species. The proposed brown self-seeding roof allowed for biodiversity and offered a natural habitat. The existing roof was made of hard surface, whereas the brown roof would help with rainwater dispersion. Renewable energy solutions would give green energy to the proposed building, unlike the existing building which was heated by gas fire boilers. The new heating would be fossil free.

Finally, regarding townscape, the current building was compared to the proposed building. This was an opportunity to unify the city block and enhance the relationship. Earlier they engaged at pre application stage with the Planning Division and bodies such as the Edinburgh Heritage Trust. They all agreed that the Victorian building line was the correct response to the site. The existing deep set-back on Dundas Street provided a significant break, there was an established pattern of uses along this block and the proposal followed the pattern of residential over commercial frontage. The proposal followed this plan. The last piece of focus on the junction of the proposed building, was the front of 120 Dundas Street, the east façade of which was referred to and there was a shared boundary with application site. They were anomalous with the established Edinburgh feu development pattern. The developers had been careful to create a set back that met daylight requirement. The proposed building drew back 1.29 metres from the boundary, A detailed sunlight analysis had been carried out. This showed the proposal to be compliant with policy requirements, in relation to any potential impact on windows on 120 Dundas Street, not even accounting for improvements to living rooms, balconies and other rooms. It was hoped that this clarified these points, specifically in relation to the adjacent building and it was hoped that the Sub-Committee would support the recommendation for approval.

The presentation can be viewed in full via the link below:

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 8th September 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

Division 1 (for planning permission)

Motion

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

- moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor Cameron.

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission for the reason that the policies were contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Des 4, Env 3 and Env 6 as the proposal was considered to have a positive impact on its setting in terms of design, footprint and street relationship.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Mowat.

Voting

For the motion: - 2 votes

For the amendment: - 8 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Gardiner, Booth, Key, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Staniforth and Young.)

(For the amendment: Councillors Cameron and Rose.)

Cameron, Mitchell and Mowat.)

Decision

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee 8 September 2021

To **REFUSE** planning permission for the reason that the policies were contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Des 4, Env 3 and Env 6 as the proposal was considered to have a positive impact on its setting in terms of design, footprint and street relationship.

Division 2 (for conservation area consent)

Motion

To **GRANT** conservation area consent, subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

- moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor Cameron.

Amendment

To refuse conservation area consent for the reason that the policies were contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies ENV 5 and ENV 2 (Part C) as the replacement scheme did not justify the demolition of the existing building.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Mowat.

Voting

For the motion: - 2 votes

For the amendment: - 8 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Gardiner, Booth, Key, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Staniforth and Young.)

(For the amendment: Councillors Cameron and Rose.)

Decision

To **REFUSE** conservation area consent for the reasons that the policies were contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies ENV 5 and ENV 2 (Part C) as the replacement scheme does not justify the demolition of the existing building.

(References – Development Management Sub-Committee 16 June 2021 (item 3); report by the Chief Planning Officer, submitted.)

3. Kirkland House, 2 The Trefoil Centre, Gogarmuir Road

Details were provided of an application for planning permission for the change of use class from Class 8 Residential Institution (care home / hospice) to Class 9 houses. Removal of non original extensions to North & West of the property, replaced with new town houses. Internal alterations to retained property. Remove and replace existing glazing with double glazing & upgrade existing services. New parking and landscaping arrangements at Kirkland House, 2 The Trefoil Centre, Gogarmuir Road, Edinburgh - application no. 20/03901/FUL

The Chief Planning Officer gave details of the proposals and the planning considerations involved and recommended that the application be granted.

First Vote

Motion

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

1. The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
 2. An additional condition for a reduction in the capacity of car parking to a more appropriate standard.
- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child.

Amendment 1

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposal breached Edinburgh LDP Policies Env 10, Env 11 and Tra 2, and represented a danger to the preservation of the greenbelt.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Booth.

Amendment 2

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

- moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor Osler.

Voting

For the motion: - 4 votes

For amendment 1: - 2 votes

For amendment 2: - 5 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Child, Gardiner, Gordon and Ethan Young.)

(For amendment 1: Councillors Booth and Staniforth.)

(For amendment 2: Councillors Cameron, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler and Rose.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 1 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion and Amendment 2.

Second Vote

Motion

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

1. The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
 2. An additional condition for a reduction in the capacity of car parking to a more appropriate standard.
- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child.

Amendment 2

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

- moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor Osler.

Voting

For the motion: - 6 votes

For amendment 2: - 5 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Child, Booth, Gardiner, Gordon, Staniforth and Ethan Young.)

(For amendment 2: Councillors Cameron, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler and Rose.)

Decision

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

1. The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
2. An additional condition for a reduction in the capacity of car parking to a more appropriate standard.

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

Appendix

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
Note: Detailed conditions/reasons for the following decisions are contained in the statutory planning register.		
4.1 – Currie High School, 31 Dolphin Avenue, Currie	Proposed 3G Pitch including floodlighting, fencing and spectators' area - application no. 21/02381/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
4.2 – 12 Dean Bank Lane, Edinburgh	Alter windows, doors and roof materials from previously consented proposals outlined in application 20/01245/LBC (as amended) - application no. 21/03192/LBC	To GRANT listed building subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
4.3 – Drylaw House, 32 Groathill Road North, Edinburgh	Section 42 application for Drylaw House. Variation of Condition 1 of application 20/04410/FUL to allow use of the building by all class 7 uses - application no. 21/03191/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to the informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
4.4 – Drylaw House, 32 Groathill North, Edinburgh	Change of use of Drylaw House to short-term let visitor accommodation (Sui Generis) - application no. 21/02664/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to the informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
4.5 – 3B Dundas Street, Edinburgh	Change of use of from flatted dwelling to use for short-term letting - application no. 21/03226/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to the informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>4.6 – 14-16 Hope Terrace, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Change of use from a children's hospital, to reinstating the villas back into use as residential dwellings. Contemporary extensions are proposed to both villas to expand and rationalise their layouts. A new single residential dwelling is also proposed to an open area to the East of the plot currently occupied by a tennis court - application no. 21/00857/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.7 – 28 Inglis Green Road, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Erect Hoarding Sign - application no. 21/02911/ADV</p>	<p>To GRANT advertising consent subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.8 – 7B Jamaica Street South Lane, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Change of use dwelling to commercial short term holiday let - application no. 21/03509/FUL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission for the reasons given in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.9 – Kirkland House, 2 The Trefoil Centre, Gogarmuir Road</p>	<p>Change of use class from Class 8 Residential Institution (care home / hospice) to Class 9 houses. Removal of non original extensions to North & West of the property, replaced with new town houses. Internal alterations to retained property. Remove and replace existing glazing with double glazing & upgrade existing services. New parking and landscaping arrangements - application no. 20/03901/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer. 2. An additional condition for a reduction in the capacity of car parking to a more appropriate standard. <p>(on a division)</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>4.10 – Kirkland House, 2 The Trefoil Centre, Gogarmuir Road</p>	<p>Alter Residential Institution (care home/hospice) to from Houses. Removal of non original extensions to North & West of the property, replaced with new town houses. Internal alterations to retained property. Remove and replace existing glazing with double glazing & upgrade existing services. New parking and landscaping arrangements - application no. 20/03902/LBC</p>	<p>To GRANT listed building consent subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.11 – 18 Pipe Lane (At Site 30 Metres North Of), Edinburgh</p>	<p>Proposed residential development comprising 10 flats with associated car and cycle parking, infrastructure and landscaping - application no. 21/02434/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.12 – Powderhall Bowling Green, Broughton Road, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Phase 2 of 3 phase masterplan at Powderhall. Phase 2 is the former Bowling Green Site, this area is a mixed use development, to include an early years nursery, accessible housing for independent living for those aged 55 and over, outdoor amenity space for Broughton Primary School and associated landscaping, including new public entrance square and enhanced landscaping works to St Mark's Path - application no. 21/00381/FUL</p>	<p>To continue consideration of the matter to allow transport officers to investigate interim solutions for the provision of disabled parking as soon as possible.</p>
<p>4.13 – 28 Wellflats Road (At Land 135 Metres Northeast Of), Kirkliston</p>	<p>Approval of matters specified in conditions 1, 6 and 10 of 17/04571/PPP comprising residential development, landscaping, access and associated works (amendment of planning permission 20/00718/AMC) - application no. 21/03112/AMC</p>	<p>To APPROVE matters specified in conditions subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>4.14 – Western Harbour, Western Harbour Drive, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Approval of matters specified in condition 3 of planning permission 20/03225/PPP for residential and commercial development providing for use classes 1, 2, 3 and 4 and associated infrastructure - application no. 21/02203/AMC</p>	<p>To APPROVE matters specified in conditions subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>5.1 – Lochside Way (At Land Adjacent To), Edinburgh</p>	<p>Development of southern phase of Edinburgh Park to comprise mix of uses including residential (Class 9 houses and sui generis flats), offices (Class 4), hotel (Class 7), crèche (Class 10), leisure (Class 11), ancillary Class 1/Class 2/Class 3 and sui generis public house, car parking, landscaping, roads, access and associated works - application no. 20/02068/FUL</p>	<p>To AGREE to extend the deadline for concluding the legal agreement by a further three months to enable planning permission to be released for this application.</p>
<p>5.2 – 7 Redhall House Drive, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Alteration and conversion of existing building to form six duplex apartments; the erection of a detached garage block accommodating six garages; and the erection of two detached dwelling houses with all associated site development works and landscaping - application no. 18/09642/FUL</p>	<p>To AGREE to extend the deadline for concluding the legal agreement until 27th October 2021 to enable planning permission to be released for this application.</p>
<p>6.1 – Centrum House, 108-144 Dundas Street, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Chief Executive - application no. 20/05645/FUL and 20/05646/CON</p>	<p>To note the protocol note.</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p><u>6.2 – Centrum House, 108-114 Dundas Street, Edinburgh</u></p>	<p>Proposed demolition of existing office buildings and erection of a mixed-use development comprising 50 flats with 3 commercial units (Class 1, 2 and 3 uses), amenity space, landscaping, basement level car and cycle parking and other associated infrastructure (as amended) - application no. 20/05645/FUL</p>	<p>To refuse planning permission for the reason that the policies were contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Des 4, Env 3 and Env 6 as the proposal is considered to have a positive impact on its setting in terms of design, footprint and street relationship. (On a division)</p>
<p><u>6.3 – Centrum House, 108-114 and 116 Dundas Street, Edinburgh</u></p>	<p>Complete demolition of existing buildings - application no. 20/05646/CON</p>	<p>To refuse conservation area consent for the reason that the policies were contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies ENV 5 and ENV 2 (Part C) as the replacement scheme did not justify the demolition of the existing building. (on a division)</p>