

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00am, Wednesday 23 August 2023

Present:

Councillors Osler (Convener) (items 4.1-4.5), Beal, Booth, Cameron, Cowdy (substituting for Councillor Mowat for items 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3), Dalgleish (Items 4.1-4.5), Gardiner, Mattos-Coelho, Jones (items 4.1-4.5), McNeese-Mechan (items 4.1-4.2 and 4.4-4.5), Mowat (items 4.1-4.5), Councillor Mumford (substituting for Councillor Staniforth) and Neil Ross (substituting for Councillor Osler for items 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3),

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.

Substitutions:

Councillor Neil Ross for Councillor Osler for items 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.

Councillor Mumford for Councillor Staniforth.

Requests for a Presentation

Councillor Mowat requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.2 - 5B Balcarres Street, Edinburgh - application no. 23/01379/FULSTL.

Councillor Booth requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.3 - 2 Bath Road, Edinburgh - application no. 23/00040/FUL.

Declaration of interests

Councillors Mowat, Dalgleish, Jones, McNeese-Mechan and Osler made non-financial declarations of interest in relation to items 6.1-6.3 – Centrum House, 108-114 & 116 Dundas Street, Edinburgh - application no's 22/05886/FUL & 22/05884/CON – as the application had been heard in its totality before and they did not feel that they could take part in the decision.

Decision

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

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

2. Chair

Decision

In the absence of the Convener, Councillor Booth was appointed to the chair for agenda items 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.

3. Granton Centrum House, 108-114 and 116 Dundas Street, Edinburgh

The Chief Planning Officer had identified an application to be dealt with by means of a hearing for the proposed demolition of existing office buildings and erection of a mixed-use development comprising 49 No. flats with 3 No. commercial units (Class 1, 2 and 3 uses), amenity space, landscaping, basement level car and cycle parking and other associated infrastructure at Centrum House, 108-114 & 116 Dundas Street, Edinburgh - application nos. 22/05886/FUL and 22/05884/CON.

It was detailed that appeals against refusal of above planning permission (application number 20/05645/FUL) and conservation area consent (application number 20/05646/CON) were dismissed on 7 July 2022 (DPEA references PPA-230-2364 and CAC-230-2005). The Reporter concluded that the general principle of the proposed mixture of uses within the appeal site was supported. However, the Reporter dismissed the appeal on the following specific grounds that tipped the balance out of favour of the development.

(a) (i) Report by the Chief Planning Officer - application no. 22/05886/FUL.

The application was for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and erection of a mixed-use development comprising 49 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:

General housing - five-bedroom x 2, three-bedroom x 15, two-bedroom x 19 and one-bedroom x 1 = 37

Affordable - two-bedroom x 4 and one-bedroom x 8 = 12

The commercial units were as follows: Unit A 125sqm Unit B 181sqm Unit C 565sqm 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 22/05884/CON).

(i) Report by the Chief Planning Officer - application no. 22/05884/CON).

The application was for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site comprised two adjoining office blocks: 108-114 Dundas Street 116 Dundas Street, dating from the 1980s.

An associated application for planning permission had been submitted for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and erection of a mixed-use development comprising 49 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 (application number 22/05886/FUL).

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 23 August 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(b) Newtown and Broughton Community Council

Annick Gaillard addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Newtown and Broughton Community Council. Ms Gaillard indicated that she had previously addressed the Sub-Committee about the original proposals. Regarding the trees, the key consideration then was the building line, specifically about Dundas Street. When the existing building was built, the recess existed because planning guidance stated that the front building had to be a certain distance from the centre line of Dundas Street. Details were provided of the building line for the whole of Dundas Street. The current proposals meant that the corner windows were no longer obscured, however, the recess for the set back was still partially obscured. Considering the aesthetic symmetry, she drew attention to the site on the opposite side of Dundas Street, the trees on the west side of Dundas Street had been removed, but those on Fettes Row remained, which provided screening for residents on south side of Fettes Row. There were also trees on the east side and on the west side of Fettes Street. That was the caveat that could be put forward, which was the aesthetic symmetry that could be a consideration. The caveat being the controversial loss of car spaces. That was the symmetry that could be offered regarding screening. Regarding the demolition, they could not make comment as there were residents of Fettes Row to address the meeting. They had concerns as everything was tightly connected to the site and they were looking for any measures, that would minimise impact. Other developments had been approved in 2022 and had certain informatives imposed. The other aspect was the dilapidation survey, which did not impose conditions, but was good practice for developers, to remediate any damage to neighbouring properties and that concluded the presentation.

(c) Residents of Dundas Street and Fettes Row

Chris Day addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of the residents of Dundas Street and Fettes Row. Mr Day indicated that this development would dominate the neighbourhood for decades, there were issues of the street pattern and there was the question of the building line. The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland thought that the building had been excessively large. This was probably inconsistent with the historic building line and the street trees were not consistent with the New Town. Reference was made to the retention of the trees and the setting of the

listed building. It had been set back and had trees in front of it in the mid 2000's. The building on the left was a parody of nearby buildings and the building on the right was a contemporary response on the re-interpretation of nearby buildings. The Cockburn Association was critical of the proposals. The proposals would cause harm to the outstanding value of the Edinburgh World Heritage site. There would be less shadowing with the new proposals, but that was overstated and there were high temperatures in the area in summer. There was the issue of the street trees and the width of the pavement. Regarding built heritage, sustainability, biodiversity, residential amenity, the proposals failed on all of these. In respect of transport and carbon, it was assumed that the commercial deliveries would be on Dundas Street, however, it was not convincing that they would make deliveries as proposed.

(d) Anne Russell - Represented by Nicholas Morris

Nicholas Morris addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Anne Russell who was a resident of Dundas Street. Mr Morris indicated that he was a planning consultant, acting on behalf of Anne Russell. She was not opposed to the development, however, she worked from home, relying on natural light and the proposals would compromise her ability to work from the current position. They would also negatively impact on her privacy and amenity. Significantly, she was not given proper notification of the proposals. The proposed works would negatively affect the penthouse windows and adversely affect the views of the residents on the fifth floor. Additionally, the proposals were in breach of LDP Policy Des 5, which indicated that the amenity of neighbourhood should not be adversely affected. Regarding the view from the resident's house, the current proposals would mean that the height and massing of the building would be much higher than what was there at present. There would be loss of privacy and light, and a loss of one third of existing space. The roof lines would be much higher, would block the light in the resident's flat and the building line would go up to the edge, where there was a ridge. This would have a detrimental impact on the quality of the resident's life and, overall, the proposals, would obscure everything the resident had enjoyed over the past several years.

(e) Christina Davies (On Behalf of Neighbours John Miller and Alison Summers)

Christina Davies addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of neighbours, John Miller and Alison Summers, who were residents of 30 and 31 Fettes Row, and who objected to this application. Ms Davies indicated that the plan outlined the development of 30 and 31 Fettes Row and Centrum House which at the time of the original development were numbered 108-114 Dundas Street. When originally designed, the development did not include 116 Dundas Street. The flats and the office blocks were built together. Removing the office block would remove the flats' architectural connection with the street and adversely impact on the structural integrity of their building. One favoured option would be retro fitting, or renovating the existing structure, before any plans were approved. At the rear of the building, the flat owners had right of access as did office workers, who had access to this area to access Centrum House, mostly during office hours. However, the proposals would allow much greater times of access. There were concerns about potential noise generated from the gardens at the rear of the development, which would not be covered by the noise impact

assessment. Currently, certain parts of Fettes Row did not have a garden and they only had basement and open car parking, therefore, it would be out of keeping installing a garden in this location. Any planting in this area would suffer from restricted light, as they would have tall structures on three sides. There were further concerns about one area as it currently served as a car park for 116 Dundas Street. It might developed at a later date to serve a commercial unit, which had no proper access at the front of the building for deliveries and waste collections.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 23 August 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(f) Edinburgh World Heritage (Christina Sinclair) – Written Response Circulated

Chrisina Sinclair thanked the members for inviting Edinburgh World Heritage to speak at the Sub-Committee. She apologised that she was unable to attend and hoped this agreed form of statement was helpful.

Edinburgh World Heritage had provided advice regarding this development on a number of instances and full context for their comments could be found in their letters of 02/02/2021, 06/05/21 and 13/12/22. The redevelopment of the site, if done sensitively, had the potential to add a layer of interest to Edinburgh's rich architectural legacy. They had, and continued to advise, that the proposal was revised in order to take the positive opportunity to develop the site in a manner which conserved and enhance the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage site associated with the heights, design details and urban planning ideals of the successive New Towns. This could be done by:

- Removal of the top storey of the development and introduce a roofscape design which would reinforce local character.
- Responding to local architectural quality by adding contextual and architectural depth to elevations as seen in surrounding historic buildings.
- Adding contextual architectural embellishment and, where possible, entrances to the 'upper ground' floor level on the Fettes Row elevation to respond to local character (e.g. see 13-24 Fettes Row)
- Further stepping-down of the height of the Fettes Row elevation after the corner block to respond to local heights and hierarchies of secondary vs primary streets.
- Seeking opportunities to reduce the commercial area in favour of high-quality residential space.

Whilst they acknowledged the improvement of using more contextual materials for the ground floor commercial space, limited amendments had been made with respect to

their comments above. In its present form, they therefore considered that the proposed development would have some harmful impact on the OUV of the World Heritage Site as a result of development within its immediate setting. They therefore could not support the proposals in their current form in line with relevant legislation and planning policy regarding management of change in the historic environment.

(g) Ward Councillor Nicolson

Councillor Nicolson addressed the Sub-Committee, indicating that she was representing Inverleith Ward constituents and from an amenity perspective, the proposed development would cause noise, construction and adversely impact on outlook. This development was excessively large, unknown for this site and the height and scale would negatively impact on street scape. It did not meet the Local Plan Guidance or safeguard the special characteristics of the city or meet the needs of residents and other users. Regarding climate change, the benefits of demolition, compared with refurbishing should be reconsidered. Rebuilding to modern standards would have a significant carbon impact. There were environmental concerns about not repurposing the existing buildings, as the carbon footprint of the structure had not been adequately addressed. The current buildings would require their mechanical and electrical systems upgraded, with cost implications. Regarding carbon management, the proposal was inconsistent with LDP Policy Des 6 and probably not compliant with NPF4 Guidance. There was a lack of appropriate affordable housing. There were also concerns regarding the delivery of waste from commercial units as they might eventually be collected from Henderson Place, as there was a lack of parking space at the front of Dundas Street. This would cause noise issues for residents. The proposals would remove trees and replace them with a roof and raised rear garden area. However, the rear of the property received limited light and it was important to retain trees. Apparently, there would be connection with local green spaces, but there were very few of these nearby. Finally, the proposals would adversely impact on some of the residents on 120 Dundas Street and 30 and 31 Fettes row.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 23 August 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(h) Applicants and Applicant's Agent

Paul Scott (Scott Hobbs Planning Managing Director), Guy Morgan (Morgan Architects Managing Director), Andrew Rennick (Managing Director, Rennick Property, Applicant), Craig Ormond (Director, Mactaggart and Mickel) and Andrew Mickel (Director, Mactaggart and Mickel, Applicant) were in attendance in support of the application.

Guy Morgan of Morgan architects addressed the Sub-Committee in support of the application. As stated previously, development necessitated change and this development was an opportunity to effect a really positive change. It was a good development for Edinburgh, and there were really good reasons to vote in favour of the proposals.

The proposed development had been recommended for approval by officers of CEC Planning Department and complied with the Local Development Plan. If approved, the proposed development would deliver 49 city centre flats, of which 25 would be on site affordable. The proposed development aligned with the Council's policy aspiration for the creation of 20-minute neighbourhoods, where everyone could meet most of their daily needs within a short walk, wheel or cycle from their home. This proposal would facilitate a healthy, green and thriving development of mixed tenure homes and workplaces, and promote a shift away from longer journeys to reduce congestion and increase active travel.

This would help enable a Net Zero Edinburgh, where everyone could live well locally. It was estimated that the proposed development would deliver circa £100,000 of additional council tax revenue to Edinburgh Council per year and at least £100,000 in additional business rates revenue for Edinburgh Council per year. Overall site investment by the applicant was around £20 million. At the start of this application process, it was agreed with the case officer that the reasons for the appeal refusal from the DEPA reporter who assessed the previous application focused on two main issues. Firstly, the design of the corner block at Dundas Street, and secondly, the extent of impact on the immediate outlook. These issues had since been addressed in the revised scheme. The developer had taken further steps to improve this relationship with 120 Dundas Street. Mr Morgan then outlined the following:

- A condition whereby the non-accessible roof surrounding the proposed terrace would be property in common ownership.
- Steps to address the unacceptable impact on immediate outlook from the south facing windows.
- Advice received from renowned bodies that there were no features worthy of retention on the current site.
- The positive findings of the supporting daylight analysis.
- The proposed removal of 7 lime trees on Dundas Street and 2 Elms on Fettes Row which had a condition category of poor.
- The development would meet the Council's aspiration for 20-minute communities.
- The efficient re-use of brownfield sites was critical to the delivery of the new City Plan targets for homes in the city.

In conclusion, the proposed development would not only benefit the local economy but had strong place-making and design principles which respect the natural and distinct, architectural characters of Dundas Street and Fettes Row. It would provide much needed sustainable city centre homes, including 25% on-site affordable. It aligned with the Council's policy aspiration for the creation of sustainable 20-minute neighbourhoods and would contribute to a sense of place by emphasising the predominantly residential character

of the surrounding area, providing active uses at street level and helping to improve the vitality of the streetscape in this key city centre site. Mr Morgan therefore urged Members to support the recommendation for approval.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 23 August 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

Centrum House, 108-114 & 116 Dundas Street, Edinburgh - application no. 22/05886/FUL

Decision 1

Motion

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

- 1) The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) The following additional conditions:
 - (a) Details of a strategy for re-use of demolition materials on the site, as part of a pre-demolition audit, should be submitted to and approved by the Council, as planning authority, before development commences and the recycling of demolition materials shall be carried out in accordance with the aforesaid strategy.
 - (b) Notwithstanding what was shown on the approved plans details of a proposed screen between the terrace of flat 07.01 shown on drawing 16A (Level 07 floor plan as proposed) and the windows of flat 9, 120 Dundas street should be submitted to and approved by the Council, as planning authority, before the proposed flat is occupied and the privacy screen should be retained in perpetuity.
 - (c) Notwithstanding what was shown on the approved plans, details of cycle parking for the development to achieve increased not-standards cycle parking space and greater accessibility in terms of the balance of two-tier parking, taking account of Council policy and the Cycle Parking Factsheet, to be submitted to and approved by the Council, as planning Authority
- 3) The following additional informative that the applicant pays particular attention to the Council's Environmental Protection webpages in relation to "Considerate Construction".

- moved by Councillor Cameron, seconded by Councillor Gardiner.

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Des 2 and Des 5 (paragraphs b and c), and NPF4 Policies 9 and 16 (e).

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Mumford.

Voting

For the motion: - 5 votes

For the amendment: - 3 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Beal, Cameron, Mattos Coelho, Gardiner and Ross.

For the amendment: Councillors Booth, Cowdy and Mumford.)

Decision

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

- 1) The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) The following additional conditions:
 - (a) Details of a strategy for re-use of demolition materials on the site, as part of a pre-demolition audit, should be submitted to and approved by the Council, as planning authority, before development commences and the recycling of demolition materials shall be carried out in accordance with the aforesaid strategy.
 - (b) Notwithstanding what was shown on the approved plans details of a proposed screen between the terrace of flat 07.01 shown on drawing 16A (Level 07 floor plan as proposed) and the windows of flat 9, 120 Dundas street should be submitted to and approved by the Council, as planning authority, before the proposed flat is occupied and the privacy screen should be retained in perpetuity.
 - (c) Notwithstanding what was shown on the approved plans, details of cycle parking for the development to achieve increased not-standards cycle parking space and greater accessibility in terms of the balance of two-tier parking, taking account of Council policy and the Cycle Parking Factsheet, to be submitted to and approved by the Council, as planning Authority
- 3) The following additional informative that the applicant pays particular attention to the Council's Environmental Protection webpages in relation to "Considerate Construction".

Centrum House, 108-114 & 116 Dundas Street, Edinburgh - application no. 22/05884/CON

Decision 2

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

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

4. 2 Bath Road, Edinburgh

Details were provided of an application for a new build development comprising 3 No. residential flats and ground floor extension to public house (as amended) at 2 Bath Road, Edinburgh - application no. 23/00040/FUL.

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

Motion

To **GRANT** planning permission and notify application to Scottish Ministers subject to:

- 1) The conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
 - 2) Additional conditions:
 - (a) No development should be carried out until the applicant has submitted details of street cycle parking (in addition to the details submitted as part of the planning application) to the Council, as planning authority, for approval and such infrastructure to be constructed prior to the residential use hereby approved being taken up.
 - (b) Flood resilient materials and construction methods should be used to limit the vulnerability of the ground floor non-residential properties to flooding.
 - (c) A flood evacuation plan should be developed and integrated into the operation of the development to improve the resilience of the non-residential and residential development to flooding.
- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Osler.

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to LDP Policies ENV 21 and NPF4 Policy 22.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Mumford.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion: - 7 votes

For the amendment: - 3 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Beal, Dalglish, Gardiner, Jones, Mattos Coelho, Mowat and Osler).

For the amendment: Councillors Booth, Cameron and Mumford).

Decision

To **GRANT** planning permission and notify application to Scottish Ministers subject to:

- 1) The conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) Additional conditions:
 - (a) No development should be carried out until the applicant has submitted details of street cycle parking (in addition to the details submitted as part of the planning application) to the Council, as planning authority, for approval and such infrastructure to be constructed prior to the residential use hereby approved being taken up.
 - (b) Flood resilient materials and construction methods should be used to limit the vulnerability of the ground floor non-residential properties to flooding.
 - (c) A flood evacuation plan should be developed and integrated into the operation of the development to improve the resilience of the non-residential and residential development to flooding.

(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>4.1 – Proposal of Application at Kaimes Renewable Energy Park at Existing Kaimes Substation, Old Burdiehouse Road (West Of), Edinburgh</p>	<p>Proposed renewable energy development comprising Installation of BESS (Battery Storage) with associated infrastructure and access - application no. – 23/01765/PAN.</p>	<p>To notes the key issues at this stage.</p>
<p>4.2 – 5B Balcarres Street, Edinburgh, EH10 5JB</p>	<p>Change of use (retrospective) from ancillary garden building to short-term let unit (Sui Generis) - application no. – 23/01379/FULSTL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>

4.3 – 2 Bath Road, Edinburgh, EH6 7JT

New build development comprising 3 No. residential flats and ground floor extension to public house (as amended).- application no. 23/00040/FUL.

To **GRANT** planning permission and notify application to Scottish Ministers subject to:

- 1) The conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) Additional conditions:
 - (a) No development shall be carried out until the applicant has submitted details of street cycle parking (in addition to the details submitted as part of the planning application) to the Council, as planning authority, for approval and such infrastructure to be constructed prior to the residential use hereby approved being taken up.
 - (b) Flood resilient materials and construction methods should be used to limit the vulnerability of the ground floor non-residential properties to flooding.
 - (c) A flood evacuation plan should be developed and integrated into the operation of the development to improve the resilience of the non-residential and residential development to

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
		flooding. (On a division.)
<p>4.4 – Cameron Toll Shopping Centre, 6 Lady Road, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order No. 203 - Report by the Chief Planning Office</p>	<p>To CONFIRM Tree Preservation Order No. 203.</p>
<p>4.5 - 11 Lochend Road, Newbridge (Land 200 Metres North Of), Edinburgh.</p>	<p>Change of use of agricultural land to use as a dog exercise area, erection of building for use as kennels in connection with the exercise area, parking and alterations to existing access - application no. – 22/01180/FUL.</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>6.1 – Centrum House, 108-114 & 116 Dundas Street, Edinburgh - application no's 22/05886/FUL & 22/05884/CON</p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Service Director – Legal and Assurance</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>6.2 – Centrum House, 108-114 & 116 Dundas Street, Edinburgh - application no. 22/05886/FUL</p>	<p>Proposed demolition of existing office buildings and erection of a mixed-use development comprising 49 No. flats with 3 No. commercial units (Class 1, 2 and 3 uses), amenity space, landscaping, basement level car and cycle parking and other associated infrastructure – application no. 22/05886/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 C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer. 2) The following additional conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Details of a strategy for re-use of demolition materials on the site, as part of a pre-demolition audit, shall be submitted to and

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
		<p>approved by the Council, as planning authority, before development commences and the recycling of demolition materials shall be carried out in accordance with the aforesaid strategy.</p> <p>(b) Notwithstanding what is shown on the approved plans details of a proposed screen between the terrace of flat 07.01 shown on drawing 16A (Level 07 floor plan as proposed) and the windows of flat 9, 120 Dundas street shall be submitted to and approved by the Council, as planning authority, before the proposed flat is occupied and the privacy screen shall be retained in perpetuity.</p> <p>(c) Notwithstanding what is shown on the approved plans, details of cycle parking for the development to achieve increased not-standards cycle parking space and greater accessibility in terms of the balance of two-tier parking, taking account of Council policy and the Cycle Parking Factsheet, to be submitted to and approved by the Council, as planning Authority</p> <p>3) The following additional informative that the applicant pays particular attention to the Council's Environmental Protection webpages in</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
		<p>relation to "Considerate Construction".</p> <p>(On a division.)</p>
<p>6.3 - Centrum House, 108-114 & 116 Dundas Street, Edinburgh - application no. 22/05884/CON</p>	<p>Complete demolition in a conservation area – application no. 22/05884/CON.</p>	<p>To GRANT conservation area consent subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>