

# Minutes

## Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00 am, Wednesday 22 May 2019

### Present:

Councillors Gardiner (Convener), Child (Vice-Convener), Booth, Gordon, Griffiths, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Munn, Osler and Staniforth.

### 1. General Applications and Miscellaneous Business

---

The Sub-Committee considered reports on planning applications listed in Sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the agenda for this meeting.

#### Requests for Presentations

The Chief Planning Officer gave a presentation on agenda Item 4.1 – 136 Peffermill Road, Edinburgh (Land 44 Metres East of)– Requested by Councillor Gardiner

The Chief Planning Officer gave a presentation on agenda Item 4.3 – 3F2, 17 Bruntsfield Gardens, Edinburgh, EH10 4DX – Requested by Councillor Booth

#### Decision

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

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

### 2. 18 Cammo Walk Edinburgh (345 Metres Southeast Of)

---

The Chief Planning Officer had identified an application for planning permission for the development of a Local Development Plan (LDP) allocated site HSG20 for residential development supported by ancillary mixed uses including associated works and landscaping (as amended) – application no 18/01755/FUL to be dealt with by means of a hearing.

#### (a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The application was for the development of the allocated site within the Local Development Plan know as HSG20 and it was located at Cammo. It was a residential led development with ancillary uses on the site between Maybury Road and Cammo Walk. The site was on 28 hectares and was in agricultural use. To the north of the site were the residential properties of Cammo Grove, with Maybury Road forming the eastern boundary and Cammo Walk the western boundary of the site. Barnton Junction was located to the north east of the site. Cammo Estate was located further to the west of the site and included a number of designations. These included; Cammo Special Landscape Area, Cammo Estate Local Nature Reserve, Cammo Garden and Designed

Landscape, Cammo Tower and Mauseley Hill. Cammo House Knoll and Cammo Water Tower were both Category B listed buildings.

The LDP contained a site brief for the development at Cammo. The site brief included the following key principles: maximum accessibility by public transport, opportunity to change the character of Maybury Road with a residential frontage and reduced speed and views to key focal points, appropriate landscape frameworks, new woodland and landscape edge to the greenbelt, enhance links to the site and off-site connections and safe pedestrian crossing to Maybury Road.

The applications sought detailed planning permission for the erection of 655 residential units and a Community Hub located at the north east corner of the site. The proposals also included substantial landscaping and infrastructure works. The housing mix comprised of 491 private dwellings and 164 affordable dwellings. There was a mix of property sizes across the site with a mix of flats, terraces, colony style properties and detached dwellings. There was a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties within the affordable housing.

Vehicular access would be taken from two access points on to Maybury Road. The northern access would be positioned 150 metres to the south of the junction of Maybury Road and Cammo Gardens.

The Maybury Road elevation comprised of 3 and 4 storey flats. The maximum heights alter along the edge and there would be breaks in the development frontage. The view from Cammo Walk showed a variety of house types including detached dwellings and flatted properties and the detached houses were designed to face on to the substantial landscaped edge rather than turning their backs toward this area.

The provision of a strong landscape element was firmly embedded within the masterplan of the site. Area A to the east of the site provided the boundary at Maybury Road. This area would see the formation of a 20-meter wide landscape strip along this edge and this would create a 4-meter wide pedestrian active travel route set back from Maybury Road and would include a tree lined avenue and there would be defensible space to the edge of the residential properties. Area B which was mostly park, would be 32 meters wide and its linear park provided strong pedestrian linkage from Maybury Road through the site to the western edge. This contained a variety of functions including formal lawns, community growing areas, formal and informal play provision and a strong green network. Vehicle crossing of this area was limited to 2 points. Area C formed the western and southern edge of the site and formed the flood plain. This area would include wildflower meadows, varied grasslands, natural play spaces and tree planting. Area D was furthest south, this also linked from the Maybury to the western edge of the site. It had a similar form and function to the other linear park and this one was 18 meters wide.

A bus turning facility was incorporated in to the northern section of the site and pedestrian crossing facilities on Maybury Road were incorporated in to the proposals at 4 points. Additional bus stops were to be provided and the overall speed limit of Maybury Road would be reduced to 30mph.

The principle of housing on the site was established through the allocation of the site for housing within the Local Development Plan. The Local Development Plan provided a capacity level of 500 to 700 homes for the site. The proposals submitted demonstrated a

coordinated masterplan for the delivery of 655 units which was within the range set within the Local Development Plan.

Through analysis of the site it was determined that a significant area of land could not be developed for housing due to some areas of flood risk. This had an impact on the total number of dwellings that could be build on the site.

The masterplan concept demonstrated a good overall layout with a mix of housing types and a range of open space opportunities. The proposed density and balance of open space and landscaping was a good example of the site lay out.

The mix of house types and property sizes complied with Hou 2 of the Local Development Plan. A minimum of 20% family housing was provided across the site and affordable housing was integrated in to the centre of the scheme. The mix of properties proposed in this scheme included flats and 3 bed terraces. The affordable housing was to be delivered in partnership with Places for People. The affordable housing policy units would be tenure blind and would have good access to the strategic landscape throughout.

There were a series of smaller open spaces and areas adjacent to the flatted blocks which provided local amenity space to these areas. These areas of open space complied with minimum standard required for flatted developments and provided a focus within the more local areas for the properties.

There was a series of transport interventions proposed as part of the proposals. The Local Development Action Plan and Supplementary Guidance Developer Contribution set a number of actions that relate to the site. A legal agreement will be required to secure these actions.

Cycle provision was integrated within the site and was positioned centrally to the flatted bocks. The provision of 860 secure cycle spaces exceeded the minimum requirement and the applicants also expressed an interest in extending the public hire bike scheme in to the site as well next to the community hub.

Parking provision across the site complied with the requirements of the Edinburgh Design Guidance. The lay out and form of these areas was revised to reduce the impact on the street scene. In addition, the developers committed to the provision of electric car charging points within each individual driveway and thereafter electric charging infrastructure for 1 in 6 spaces.

A significant number of representations had been received regarding the proposals. The wide range of matters raised in the representations had been considered in the assessment of the application.

The proposed development complied with the development plan and non-statutory guidelines and provided a strong landscape led masterplan for the delivery of 655 residential properties that was allocated within the Local Development Plan. It was recommended that the application be approved subject to the conclusion of a legal agreement.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/372416](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/372416)

**(b) Cramond and Barnton Community Council.**

Peter Scott and Ian Williamson gave a presentation on behalf of Cramond and Barnton Community Council.

Throughout the LDP process the Cramond and Barnton Community Council opposed the development proposed due to the landscape impacts, greenbelt incursions and infrastructure constraints. However, following adoption of the LDP, the Community Council accepted that the development may proceed if sought to influence the plans for community benefits and had constructive engagement with the applicants.

Mr Scott's presentation focussed on two specific issues. Firstly, ensuring effective delivery of essential infrastructure and secondly, minimising the traffic impact. On infrastructure delivery, Mr Scott argued it was not unreasonable to expect the council to ensure that sufficient infrastructure was in place to cater for residents needs as the development progressed as required by the LDP.

School provision was given as an example that highlighted the Community Councils concerns. Mr Scott stated the supplementary guidance and action programme in the LDP identified operational targets for a new Maybury Primary School by 2022 and a new west Edinburgh secondary school by 2023. Mr Scott argued these targets appeared unrealistic when considered against requirements for site acquisition, consultations, construction, staff recruitment etc. Especially the identification of these school as unfunded capital pressures in the Council's Capital Investment Programme. Mr Scott argued the Community Councils' concern regarding school's delivery appeared to be justified especially as the temporary receptor schools, Cramond Primary and the Royal High School, currently operated at or over capacity.

Mr Scott also stated the Community Council had similar concerns over traffic management, drainage and GP services. To allay these concerns, Mr Scott asked that the committee place a condition, if the committee approved the application, to require council staff and the developers to present a comprehensive infrastructure delivery plan to the committees next meeting which would identify key infrastructure requirements, total cost and funding commitments or funding gaps and realistic timescales and should satisfy members that essential infrastructure could be delivered by key stages in the housing occupation.

Traffic management was a further concern. The site brief and action programme identified active travel, smart traffic lights, and improved pedestrian crossings at Barnton as its own means for catering for additional traffic. Mr Scott suggested a requirement that, before construction commences, the Development Management Sub-Committee should approve a report from the road service and the developers on traffic management measures for the Maybury and Queensferry Roads and Barnton Junction which recognised the strategic importance of these roads, assessed the impacts of new junctions in crossings on Maybury Road traffic flows and proposed effective measures to tackle capacity issues while minimising the impact on local road networks. Mr Scott also suggested the report should clarify the intentions for Cammo Walk and resolve potential issues of severance for the existing communities.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/372416](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/372416)

**(c) Davidson's Mains and Silverknowes Association**

Duncan Fraser gave a presentation on behalf of Davidson's Mains and Silverknowes Association. Mr Fraser stated that the Association had been working with local communities highlighted in the report.

Mr Fraser argued small increases in traffic flow to an already saturated road network could have disproportionately high impacts on congestion. Traffic congestion also had major implications on travel convenience, travel cost and adverse health implications due to poor air quality in the adjoining communities.

Mr Fraser requested that the development not be approved until a promise of how the additional traffic would be properly addressed. New traffic management solutions or doing nothing should not just transfer traffic flows on to the less suitable local road network as this would be inconsistent with the City of Edinburgh Council travel policies and the air quality strategy in particular.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/372416](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/372416)

**(d) Cammo Residents Association**

Sally Chalmers gave a presentation on behalf of Cammo Residents Association. Ms Chalmers was a resident for 20 years in Cammo. Photographs were presented showing long tail backs on the Maybury Road which occurred daily. Ms Chalmers stated that drivers could wait for 30 minutes when they came across the East Craigs roundabout on the way to the Barnotn junction. The problem was there was no lane for traffic turning left at the Barnton junction, so it got caught up in the rest of the traffic that wanted to go up this road and turn right.

Ms Chalmers stated that if she wanted to get in or out of the estate she would have to go by the Cammo Gardens exit, which was a dangerous exit as you could not see what traffic was coming from the Maybury road at this exit. The other exit, at Cammo Road, was also dangerous.

Ms Chalmers wanted to highlight some figures around air pollution. According to Friends of the Earth figures, Cammo Estate lay between two highly polluted roads - Queensferry Road and St Johns.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/372416](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/372416)

**(e) Almond Ward Councillors**

Councillors Kevin Lang and Graham Hutchison addressed the Sub-Committee as the members for Almond Ward. Alex Cole-Hamilton MSP also addressed the Sub Committee as a Member of the Scottish Parliament for Edinburgh Western constituency.

Councillor Lang stated that fellow ward councillor, Councillor Louise Young, could not be present but Councillor Young requested that Councillor Lang's comments were made on Councillor Young's behalf as well and that the comments should be considered as a joint submission. Councillor Lang argued the proposed site for development was probably the worst site anywhere in Edinburgh to progress a major housing development. The ward was undergoing rapid growth in population. The Cammo site sat immediately adjacent to Maybury Road, the Barnton Junction and the A90 Queensferry Road. It was well known that these areas were among the most congested in Scotland. Residents living nearby in Cammo and Barnton Park were already subject to illegal levels of pollution and poor air quality argued Councillor Lang. These key routes were already gridlocked, not just at peak times but for increasing times of the day and on increasing days of the week. There was no serious or credible plan to tackle the worsening daily traffic chaos on the Queensferry Road and at the Barnton Junction. The creation of 529 car parking spaces as proposed in the development could lead to 1000 additional vehicle movements everyday on to a local network where tens of thousands of vehicles already sat in traffic emitting emissions. The proposed transport interventions to support the application were inadequate. Whilst welcome, the contributions to improve cycling and walking infrastructure would not make a major difference. A public transport turning circle was proposed without a promise from any bus operator that will use it. Councillor Lang encouraged the Sub-Committee to reject the application.

Councillor Hutchison stated that his comments at the Sub-Committee were not an indictment of the developers and he was impressed by the developer's engagement with the local community. The reason the application should be rejected was due to the failure of the Council to improve the infrastructure in the area to accommodate a development of this scale. School runs would add traffic to an already gridlocked Barnton Junction. Councillor Hutchison encouraged the Sub-Committee to reject the application.

Alex Cole-Hamilton MSP stated the proliferation of housing developments in the locale, and the housing developments of South Queensferry would see additional traffic to the area of Barnton. There was, argued Mr Cole-Hamilton, a serious issue around the lack of public transport services. The 64-bus service which was run by E & M Horsburgh was missed by the residents of Barnton and East Craigs. Bus stops were being put in where no buses ran. Section 75 money provided from the developer would potentially be used to sustain a new service. The main reason the 64-bus service was withdrawn was that it was not viable due to journey times caused by the gridlock Barnton. Until this was addressed, no public transport routes along that service would be economically viable. Mr Cole-Hamilton questioned who would treat the new patients moving in to the development. Mr Cole-Hamilton encouraged the Sub-Committee to reject the application.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/372416](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/372416)

**(f) Applicant and Applicant's Agent**

Ewan McIntyre (EMA), Pol MacDonald (OPEN), Gavin Pope (CALA Homes), Nicholas Wright (David Wilson Homes) were heard in support of the application.

Engagement was an important part of the process and important to the developers. The developers were selected as preferred bidders for the site in July 2017 and sought to have an open line of discussion with key stakeholders since being selected as preferred bidders. Mr Pope thanked parties who contributed to the design process because it had led to a change in the design such as building heights and landscape design.

Mr MacDonald summarised the landscape led design solution for the site landscape was a fundamental part of shaping the Cammo site. The scale, lay-out and form was guided by the context. The site had an interesting context, Cammo Grove to the north and East Craigs to the east. The 28-hectare site also had an interesting play with the historic 18th century Cammo Estate that sat to the west. The developers tried to bring some of that landscape in to the site. Mr MacDonald stated that 38% of the site was public landscape space.

Mr McIntyre stated that the Council had allocated the site in the Local Development Plan for the development of up to 700 homes. The Council had also created a design brief for the site in the form of 12 principles set out in the Local Development Plan. The developers had worked with Council officers, Architecture Design Scotland, national statutory authorities and the community over a two-year period to create a design that responded to the brief. This was a unique site that responded to a main road, the back of other people's houses, a green belt edge and the design landscape at the same time. This context created challenges and opportunities.

The various housing types of the proposed development were summarised: the flats on Maybury Road varied from 3 to 4 storey and included front doors, semi-private gardens, living rooms, balconies and all overlooked the new active travel route and the avenue planting. Flats were designed to incorporate quiet pocket parks behind. On Mosely Park, active frontage of colonies and town houses overlooked the community park, the cycle and foot paths, the activity spaces for children and adults. Overlooking Cammo Tower view was traditional family housing with formal gardens where pedestrian focussed lanes encouraged activity to the front of the buildings. The western edge included villas. Behind the prominent edges were prominent family neighbourhoods designed to keep cars away from the front of houses and allow for activity in the streets and lanes. A building dedicated to community use was at the Barnton end of the site. Mr McIntyre argued the new site offered a plethora of housing types. In terms of density, the proposed plans were 33 dwelling per hectare which was within the parameters set out in guidance. The proposal of 655 homes was within the Local Development Guidance of 500 to 700 for this site.

The proposed development included 164 affordable housing units which were tenure blind. Affordable housing would be delivered via a variety of medians including, social rent, mid-market and low-cost home ownership.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/372416](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/372416)

## **Decision**

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, an additional informative that further design of cycle and walking infrastructure should be considered, in consultation with Council officers as part of the road Construction Consent Process (RCC) and a legal agreement.

(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><a href="#"><u>Item 4.1 - 136 Peffermill Road, Edinburgh (Land 44 Metres East Of)</u></a></p>	<p>136 Peffermill Road, Edinburgh (Land 44 Metres East Of) - The development of a Sports village for the University of Edinburgh at Peffermill playing fields to accommodate redeveloped playing surfaces, the erection of a new sports centre building incorporating ancillary facilities and the erection of a new student accommodation building incorporating ancillary facilities – application no 19/01249/PAN</p>	<p>To note the key issues at this stage and request that the applicants consider opportunities to link the pedestrian and cycle links to wider city, in particular Craigmillar, and how it addresses Peffermill Road.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Item 4.2 - 62 Broughton Road, Edinburgh (At Land 35 Metres Southeast Of)</u></a></p>	<p>62 Broughton Road, Edinburgh (At Land 35 Metres Southeast Of) - Erection of six one-bed apartments with associated pedestrian access, hard and soft landscaping, bicycle and bin storage - application no 19/00451/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission for the reasons set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Item 4.3 - 3F2, 17 Bruntsfield Gardens, Edinburgh, EH10 4DX</u></a></p>	<p>3F2, 17 Bruntsfield Gardens, Edinburgh, EH10 4DX - Creation of new flatted dwelling within attic space and alter existing third floor flat. Proposed new access from existing communal stairwell (as amended). application no 19/00792/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>CONTINUE</b> consideration of the application to allow for a site visit to take place.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Item 4.4(a) - 19C Fettes Row, Edinburgh, EH3 6RH</u></a></p>	<p>19C Fettes Row, Edinburgh, EH3 6RH - Single storey extension to rear – application no 19/00095/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission 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
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.4(b) - 19C Fettes Row, Edinburgh, EH3 6RH</u></a>	19C Fettes Row, Edinburgh, EH3 6RH - Single storey extension to rear and associated internal alterations – application no 19/00096/LBC	To <b>GRANT</b> listed building consent subject to the informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.5 - 31 Groathill Road South, Edinburgh (Land 30 Metres South Of)</u></a>	31 Groathill Road South, Edinburgh (Land 30 Metres South Of) - Application to amend the design of the consented and commenced development of 9 flats on the site at the south end of Groathill Road South, Edinburgh (planning ref 14/00026/FUL). The proposal aims to provide further amenities to the penthouse apartment through the addition of a room to the roof – application no - 19/01333/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission.
Item 5.1 - 198 Great Junction Street, Edinburgh, EH6 5LW	198 Great Junction Street, Edinburgh, EH6 5LW - Amendment to previously consented scheme 17/05415/FUL. Proposal for 37 flatted units comprising of refurbishment of existing foyer building and new build extension. – application no - 18/09563/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to conditions and informatives as set out in Section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer and a legal agreement to deliver the commuted sum for affordable housing.
<a href="#"><u>Item 6.1(a) - 18 Cammo Walk Edinburgh (345 Metres Southeast Of)</u></a>	18 Cammo Walk Edinburgh (345 Metres Southeast Of) - Protocol Note by the Head of Strategy and Communications – application no 18/01755/FUL	Noted.

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<a href="#"><u>Item 6.1(b) - 18 Cammo Walk, Edinburgh (345 Metres Southeast Of)</u></a>	18 Cammo Walk Edinburgh (345 Metres Southeast Of) - Development of LDP allocated site HSG20 for residential development supported by ancillary mixed uses including associated works and landscaping (as amended) – application no 18/01755/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer, an additional informative that further design of cycle and walking infrastructure should be considered, in consultation with Council officers as part of the road Construction Consent Process (RCC) and a legal agreement.
<a href="#"><u>Item 7.1(a) - 20 Duncan Street, Edinburgh, EH9 1SR</u></a>	20 Duncan Street, Edinburgh, EH9 1SR - Change of Use from car servicing and repairs centre to student accommodation (comprising 24 student studios coupled with shared quiet spaces, reception, laundry and ancillary spaces) and associated works (as amended). – application no 19/00114/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
<a href="#"><u>Item 7.1(b) - 20 Duncan Street, Edinburgh, EH9 1SR</u></a>	20 Duncan Street, Edinburgh, EH9 1SR - Alterations from car servicing and repairs centre to student accommodation (comprising 24 student studios coupled with shared quiet spaces, reception, laundry and ancillary spaces) and associated works (as amended) – application no 19/00131/LBC	To <b>GRANT</b> listed building consent subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.