

## Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00 am, Wednesday 18 August 2021

### Present:

Councillors Gardiner (Convener), Child (Vice-Convener), Booth, Cameron, Gordon, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose (items 4.2 and 4.4), Staniforth and Ethan Young.

### 1. Minutes

---

#### Decision

To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 4 August 2021 as a correct record.

### 2. 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 a Presentation:

Councillors Booth and Osler requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.2 – 84N Barnton Park View, Edinburgh

Councillor Booth requested a presentation in respect of - Item 4.4 – 194 Fountainbridge (At Land Adjacent To), Edinburgh

#### Decision

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

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

### 3. 1 Edinburgh Airport (Main Terminal) Jubilee Road, Edinburgh

---

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 1 Edinburgh Airport (Main Terminal) Jubilee Road, Edinburgh proposed the formation of new access road and active travel route from east of terminal building to Gogar Roundabout - application no. 21/00217/FUL

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

Full Planning Permission was sought for the development of a single carriageway access road to link the main passenger terminal at Edinburgh Airport with the Gogar

Roundabout. The proposed route would extend 3km in length, with 2.4 km comprising new road alignment. The proposal would be fully accessible to general traffic and designed to a 30-mph standard.

The applicant stated that the purpose of the access road was to reduce congestion and increase airport resilience, relieving pressure on Eastfield Road, with the requirement for a new eastern access road identified in the Airport Masterplan 2025. The proposed access road would also provide enhanced access to the air freight and cargo areas at Turnhouse, providing additional access from the east both for public transport (buses and taxis serving the airport terminal) and private cars (to long/mid stay car parks).

A Planning, Design and Access Statement had been submitted in support of the application. This includes an Option Appraisal outlining the preferred route alignment selected by the applicant.

The western section of the route (approximately 680 metres length) would be based on the existing alignment of Gogar Bridge Road and Eastfield Avenue. This would involve the modification and upgrading of existing roads within the airport boundary, these currently serving airport parking and ancillary facilities related to the operation of the airport. Works would require reconfiguration to adjacent site boundaries with a single building proposed for demolition. A dedicated westbound cycle route would partially extend along the existing alignment of Eastfield Avenue.

The central section of the route would comprise a 7.3-metre-wide single carriageway requiring 2060 metres of new construction. Sections of the route would utilise existing airport accesses including former taxiways and the former Crosswind runway.

The proposed route would traverse in a north easterly direction towards Turnhouse where a now 3-arm roundabout is proposed. The northern arm would provide future access to the air freight terminal. The proposed route would then run parallel to the railway line in a south easterly direction for 1 km before diverging southwards.

The south eastern section of the route (approximately 260 metres length) would involve the modification of the northern arm of the Gogar Roundabout and the realignment works to the existing Myreton Drive, which forms vehicular access to the Tram Depot. This would include the construction of an access loop (400 metres length) to the southern edges of the site, with a 200-metre section of Myreton Drive being reconfigured as one way only.

Modifications to the Gogar Roundabout including the requirement for additional lanes circulating the roundabout and to the A8 eastbound were identified.

The proposal identified a range of access points, both existing and proposed, from north west to south east:-

- Existing access to the airport terminal to the northern end of Gogar Bridge Road;
- Existing accesses (x2) to airport parking situated to the east of Gogar Bridge Road;
- Existing western access and northern access via roundabout at Eastfield Avenue/Gogar Bridge Road;

- Existing northern access points to Eastfield Avenue (x3) these serving existing airport car parking;
- Existing southern access points formalised to Eastfield Avenue (x5) these serving existing facilities associated with the operation of the airport. This would include reconfiguration of access to an existing fuel depot;
- New southern access to the parking area occupying the extents of the former Crosswinds runway;
- New northern access via new 3-arm roundabout. This was identified as access for future development and relates to existing access routes serving the air freight terminal;
- New western accesses (x2) to the Crosswinds site. These were identified as Development Access Roads;
- New pedestrian access to the east via the existing railway footbridge, providing link to the Maybury/West Craigs development site. This would require construction of a ramped access formed by concrete retaining wall and gabian baskets;
- New eastern access via new junction to south eastern section of the Crosswinds site. This was identified as a Development Access Road;
- New western access via new junction to the Crosswinds site. This was identified as a Development Access Road, also forming a new exit loop from the Edinburgh Tram Depot;
- Existing western access via Myreton Drive to the Edinburgh Tram Depot would be converted to exit only;
- Existing eastern access to West Craigs land;
- Existing eastern access to Edinburgh Gateway Station.

The central and south eastern sections of the route would include a shared use cycle/footpath. This would be located to the south before crossing to the east via an un-signalised crossing adjacent to the existing railway footbridge to Maybury/West Craigs. A shared cycle/footpath was identified to both sides of the route around the proposed new junction to the Crosswinds site, but pedestrian/cycle access to Edinburgh Gateway and Gogar Roundabout would be to the eastern side only.

The application was supported by detailed layout and landscape design proposals.

Soft landscape treatments would mainly comprise amenity grassland including areas of pictorial meadow and groundcover planting to the verges and site margins. Small clusters of avenue tree planting were identified to the north western site edge at the boundary with the railway, to the centre of the proposed roundabout and entrance to the parking area occupying the extents of the former Crosswinds runway. Species would include Silver Birch and Lime. Beech hedging would define much of the southern site boundary, with some sections incorporating 2 metre weldmesh fencing with double planting on either side. Conventional 2 metre weldmesh fencing, black powder coated, would be used to define other boundaries.

Other than new fenced boundaries to define the extents of the road alignment, minimal soft landscaping was proposed to the western section of the route.

A Swale feature would be formed to the western edge of the route to provide drainage. This would extend along most of the central section of the route from the proposed junction to the Crosswinds site to the proposed entrance to the car parking occupying the extents of the former runway.

The proposed alignment would mostly utilise existing land levels or require formation of a low embankment, although more extensive cutting would be required to the escarpment at the southern edge of the Crosswinds runway to accommodate the proposed changes to Myreton Drive. Cuttings will also be required to the earth mounding located to the north of the former runway.

In terms hard landscaping, the route including carriageway, footway and cycle routes would be surfaced using hot-rolled asphalt. Lighting columns were identified along the full length of the route.

The application was supported by a number of documents which were available to view on the Planning and Building Standards Online Services:

- Planning, Design and Access Statement
- Transport Assessment
- Landscape and Visual Appraisal
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Ecological Impact Assessment
- Archaeology Statement
- PAC Report
- S1 Sustainability Form

An Environmental Impact Assessment was submitted to support the application, which scoped in the following topic areas:

- Scope and Methodology
- Site and Scheme Description
- Transport
- Noise and Vibration
- Air Quality
- Water Environment
- Ground Conditions
- Cumulative and Residual Effects
- Mitigation, Monitoring and Conclusions
- Non-Technical Summary

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 18th August 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

**(b) Corstorphine Community Council**

Vickii Brown addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Corstorphine Community Council. Ms Brown indicated that there were general concerns from the residents about the proposals, which included the scale of development, more traffic and the impact on local amenity and infrastructure. Because planning concerns were difficult to understand, there had to be constructive engagement. The community council should be informed on current applications, but this was limited by the scale and complexity of large developments. The CC relied on applications to be cognisant with local and national policies, which this application was not. This being the case, it was detrimental to the local community. This application should be refused for several reasons. The airport road used a different route to the one in the Local Development Plan, there was not a coordinated development approach to West Edinburgh, the additional road would be detrimental on place making and environmental grounds and there would be induced vehicle demands. This was contrary to the Scottish Government Climate Change Update, and the Council's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030. Additionally, these proposals would facilitate private car movement, which was contrary to both guidelines on the reduction of emission and contrary to Edinburgh LDP policy Tra 10 on sustainable development. Moreover, the development aimed at increasing the capacity of the road network and the plans presented were of low quality in respect to placemaking. According to the LDP, this area was due for development, with the aim to construct new high-quality space, however, the proposals did not reflect this. Regarding the transport assessment, the traffic modelling was reliant on the West Edinburgh Transport Appraisal (WETA) Refresh Study 2016, which included improvements to the Gogar Roundabout, but to a large extent, there was no budget for this. Also, no traffic modelling had been carried out, using the roundabout's existing attributes. The design was contrary to Edinburgh LDP Policy Tra 9 and increased vehicle use at this junction would make crossing significantly more hazardous for pedestrians and cyclists, and no crossing signals had been provided. The current route was very poor, contrary to transport strategy and contrary to street design guidance. It was disappointing to see the shared use of paths and no advanced stop lines. Generally, it was expected for pedestrians to be separated from cycles, to be protected and for there to be consistent lines for pedestrians, without multiple crossing points.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 18th August 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

**(c) Cramond and Barnton Community Council**

John Howlson addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Cramond and Barnton Community Council. Mr Howlson explained that he had extensive

experience in road maintenance and transport systems and had been Director of Transport Scotland. The proposals were outwith the area of the Community Council, but this had the potential to impact on the transport connectivity of the area. The Community Council supported the proposals of the new airport access road in principle and thought that it would not generate new traffic. However, the new routing of the traffic would change. Gogar Roundabout was the critical node in the regional network. The trunk road lim this the responsibility of the Council and the impact of the proposal would be to re-route traffic to the north west lim of the roundabout. The assumption was that this lim of Gogar Roundabout would already be improved by extra lane, but if this did not take place, extra congestion would occur. The improvement of Gogar Roundabout was not part of this application, this was the responsibility of the Council and would be funded by the Council, but there was no indication that this was taking place. Therefore, the Community Council wanted a suspensive condition, which they set out in February. The new airport road link road would accommodate new access to the IBG and the Crosswinds Development. These would generate new traffic and compromise the Gogar Interchange and Maybury Junctions. The Community Council was looking for a further suspensive condition, until these aspects were mitigated by further Council infrastructure improvements. The suspensive condition would be that the new road should not be open to airport traffic until capacity of the Gogar Roundabout was increased by the construction of a new traffic lane and improvements of the Maybury Junction and the A8 east bound approaches to the Junction.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 18th August 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

#### **(d) Crosswinds Development**

David Kelman addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Crosswinds Development. Mr Kelman indicated that it could be demonstrated that the proposals could fulfil the objectives of both the T9 Gogar Link Road from the 2016 Edinburgh Local Development Plan and the new link road identified in the WETA Refresh Study 2016, opening this area of West Edinburgh for development.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 18th August 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

#### **(e) Transform Scotland**

Nigel Bagshaw addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Transform Scotland. Mr Bagshaw explained that he would set aside the issue of aviation fostering climate change and would focus on the transport and environmental issues raised by the new access road. Firstly, this was contrary to national, regional and local policy and Sustrans Regional Transport Strategy, which was designed to promote sustainable travel and the Council mobility plan. There was a global climate emergency

and transport was one of the biggest sources of carbon emissions. Secondly, the application set out unsubstantiated benefits, claiming that the level of air transport was expected to grow, but ignored the actual trends, post Covid. The Masterplan stated that the new eastern access road was necessary as it would supposedly reduce congestion. This would in fact increase road traffic and more road capacity would undermine sustainable transport. Some of the apparent benefits were unconvincing, for example, that this road could increase active travel. The design would supposedly enhance sustainable transport, but it was not reasonable to think that large numbers of people would travel to the airport by active travel. Thirdly, alternatives already existed, such as adequate public transport. These included more frequent trams, the expansion of dedicate bus lanes and the reduction in private car transport. This development would not bring benefits and was based on the erroneous principle that increased traffic was inevitable rather than created and that no alternative solutions existed. These assumptions were based on travel by car being the default priority position. Finally, the climate crisis should be considered. Proposals such as this would contribute to increasing carbon emissions. There had been a failure to reduce emissions in the last 30 years and this proposal would add to the problem. The Scottish Government had declared a climate emergency and the Council was committed to carbon neutrality, therefore, practical action was needed. In conclusion, the proposal was contrary to national, regional and council policy, was based on unsubstantiated assumptions and benefits, and merely added carbon emissions to a very carbon intensive activity.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 18th August 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

**(f) West Craigs Limited**

Adam McConaghy (Senior Planner, Icen) and Craig Latto (Transport - Arup) addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of West Craigs Limited.

Adam McConaghy indicated that West Craigs Limited objected to the application. They were a significant landowner in West Edinburgh and had a current planning application in principle to deliver the eastern part of the Gogar Link Road. The purpose of the road was to create policy compliant access and they shared the concerns that this application was contrary to Edinburgh LDP Policy Des 2 on coordinated development, the delivery of the road would be at the expense of delivering transport proposal T9 and would sterilise the eastern delivery of IBG. There was a conflict between the application and the principle of coordinated development as stated in Edinburgh LDP Policy Des 2.

Craig Latto stated that he supported the reasons for refusal cited by the planning officers. He had concerns relating Edinburgh LDP Policies Tra 7, 8, 9 and 10. The road would remove the pedestrian and cycle crossing, the drive footway and accessibility by active travel. Additionally, it would compromise the allocated delivery of the Gogar Link Road and it did not fulfil the purpose or function of the Gogar Link Road. T9, stated that the proposal should run through IGB and prioritise active travel and public transport, which it failed to do. This does not represent the alignment or function of the



transport network framework in the WETA Refresh Study of 2016 and did not deliver access to the IGB. The link road would only serve access to prioritise the Airport, and to unallocated Crosswind Development. He disagreed with Mr Kelman that this proposal would develop transport infrastructure or coordinated development for West Edinburgh, as this prioritised the airport to the detriment of pedestrian and cycle provision. The Transport Assessment did not follow Edinburgh LDP Policy Tra 1. It failed to recognize the impacted on the road the network, did not recognize national guidance and failed to assess peak hour traffic. The response from Edinburgh Trams confirmed that they were experiencing annual flooding and demonstrated that they did accept the drainage proposed. It was surprising that the applicant had continued to pursue a road scheme that had not provided an acceptable drainage design. The Council's own guidance stated its concerns about the lack of consideration of flood risk, surface water and that this could not be dealt with by a condition. Absence of an adequate drainage solution was the key issue. The Sub-Committee should uphold the recommendations of the planning officers and refuse the application.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 18th August 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

**(g) Ward Councillor – Almond**

Councillor Work addressed the Sub-Committee as member for the Almond Ward.

Councillor Work declared that he had an interest as a former taxi driver/owner. He indicated that access was very important. Then, he referred to the proposed route being not consistent with the Edinburgh Strategic Design Framework and the comments made about the proposals compromising the viability of the Gogar Link Road. He thought that this was an opportunity to work with the Airport to find a solution and an opportunity to advance access. The need for a route to the airport was long overdue and he was, concerned that if this was rejected, the Gogar Link Road might never be constructed or at least not for 10 years. This development was not about the road, it was more about how the traffic was dispersed as the traffic already existed. Additionally, there were big developments, in Kirkliston, South Queensferry and West Lothian, which created traffic. He wanted to cite how this interfered with the trams flow. There was already a road to Eastfield, which he used to use as a taxi driver. There already was an existing road at the Gyle, which gave access to trams. It could be argued that the more roads that crossed trams lines, the more chance of an accident taking place. But the Gogar Link Road already crossed a tram line and here, the trams had priority and there were traffic lights in operation. It was claimed that Eastfield Road was adequate, but this was not the case. There were problems with the Highland Show and other events such as Truckfest, which had caused chaos and congestion. In fact, people had been late to the airport because of such events. This was an opportunity for another access road to be delivered.

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



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

Nicola Woodward (Planning Consultant, Lichfields) and Gordon Dewar (Chief Executive, Edinburgh Airport) were heard in support of the application.

Nicola Woodward firstly clarified some points from previous presentations. This included the extent of the active travel link, developer contributions, the Gogar Link Road and the extent of community engagement. She indicated that this proposal was about access for people, not access for cars, giving better opportunity for active travel and public transport, to access the Airport.

She then explained that the proposals were important for both Edinburgh Airport, Edinburgh and the wider Scottish economy and she would draw attention to key aspects of the proposal, before listing the reasons for refusal. In 1019, Eastfield Road was congested, was overcapacity and impacted on business passengers and on users in the Highland Showground. Investment had been made, but there was only one access road to the Airport and this was problematical. When passenger numbers returned to pre-pandemic levels, a second access road would be required. This was in line with the findings of the WETA Refresh Study of 2016. The proposals also aligned with the Edinburgh LDP Action Programme and various aspects of this were listed. This road did not deliver more transport, just managed it better and promoted active travel. There had been substantial public comment and on balance, the public was supportive of the proposals and there was also support from the ward councillors.

The applicant had provided a letter questioning legitimacy of some reasons for refusal. LDP Policy EMP 3 and SDP, could not be cited as a reason for refusal, as this would be actioned in the Edinburgh LDP Action Programme. The proposal did differ from the WETA Refresh Study of 2016, but the situation had changed since 2016. The Gogar Link Road and Eastern Access Road, could only feasibly be located in corridor between the runway and the Gogar Burn, but this was not ideal as it proposed a dual carriageway through a conservation site and was near to Castle Gogar which was a listed building. The decommissioning of the runway meant that it could be relocated in a better location and this would be an improvement. The Airport was prepared to deliver this, but the applicant intended to construct this in the least impactful way, according to quality of place and the environment.

As reasons for refusal, Edinburgh LDP Policies Emp 4, Des 2, Tra 7, 8, 9 and 10 and Des 1, 3 and 8 Part C, as well as Street Design Guidance were cited. The applicant thought that if the proposals met the test for the development and enhancement of the Airport, they should be supported. There had been much debate about the Airport Masterplan. In 2016 it was adopted by the board and published. In 2017 the Masterplan was considered by the Council and recommendations were sent back to the Airport for consideration. However, the pandemic took place and consideration was taken on board for a New Masterplan. Because the position of the airport changed, this had not

been made public. The Airport Masterplan was “in the mix”. These proposals were an important enhancement for the Airport. The development would aid the airport recovery, provide new dedicated transport, new active travel routes and would move away from private car transport. This connection from IGB to Eastfield Road was enabled by the proposals. It was outlined why Reason 1 was not a good reason for refusal. The proposal did not compromise the effective development of the nearby land or the wider area. The Southern Junction would maintain access to sites such as to West Craig’s site, and connection to railway over-bridges. The withdrawal of New Ingsiton Ltd in its opposition to the application supported this view. The southern junction linked through the infrastructure, to Crosswinds and linked through the indicative route that was outlined on the IGB Masterplan. The proposals represented coordinated development, therefore, reason 2 was not a credible reason for refusal. This was enabling a good connection to the Gogar Roundabout for the IGB developers in future. It was not contrary to Edinburgh LDP Policies Tra 7 and 10. Policy Tra 8 was not a credible reason for refusal as this did not apply to this type of development. The lack of signals for the crossing route and been highlighted, however, the applicant was prepared to accept conditions to provide this. Regarding LDP Policy Des 1, the extent of the dual carriageway had been minimized and this would reduce the impact of the new road, which would be single carriageway and would have a segregated cycle/pedestrian route. The siting of the new road was well chosen, the existing corridor was adjacent to the Gogarburn and Gogar Castle, the landscape proposals worked with the linearity of the corridor with Beech Hedging providing a boundary feature. In line with LDP Policy Des 8 Part C, interest was provided by trees along the boundary and landscaping was designed carefully. The applicant did not agree that the proposals prioritised movement over place, it did not generate traffic and they did not agree that LDP Policies Des 1 and 8 were credible grounds for refusal. Additional conditions could mitigate officers’ concerns. To conclude, the proposed development was an enhancement to the Airport, there would no cost to the public purse, it would “action” the LDP Programme, would unlock development sites in West Edinburgh, was compliant with the Edinburgh LDP and should be supported.

Gordon Dewar outlined the benefits of the proposed development to the Airport. It would relieve traffic congestion, as events next door were a major constraint on the operation of the Airport and would give better access for public transport. As car transport to the Airport was down to 36 percent, this was already one of lowest in United Kingdom. The proposals would also provide new active travel, especially for staff and facilitate the development of West Edinburgh. Significantly, the required development had not taken place over three property cycles, over a 30-year period. It would enable the IGB, enable Crosswind and help existing operators, such as the Highland Showground. It would also open East Craig’s development and would enable active travel. This was a new route to the airport and would be segregated. In conclusion, this development would be entirely located on land belonging to the applicant and the funding of £21 million was provided by the applicant. It provided new facilities, including active travel, protected access for all neighbors, was compliant with Council strategy and met many of the policy obligations. He then asked “if not us and not now, then who and when?” to deliver this and the wider component of the wider WETA strategy.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 18th August 2021 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

### **Motion**

To **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

### **Amendment**

To **GRANT** the application subject to an additional condition that work did not proceed on the additional lane of the Gogar Roundabout until the actions in the West Edinburgh Transport Appraisal (WETA) Refresh Study 2016 were implemented, before the road could operate.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Cameron

### **Voting**

For the motion: - 7 votes

For the amendment: - 3 votes

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

(For the amendment: Councillors Cameron, Mitchell and Mowat.)

### **Decision**

To **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

(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><b>4.1 – <a href="#">11 Abercorn Terrace (Abercorn Nursing Home), Portobello, East</a></b></p>	<p>Change of use, extension and alteration of existing nursing care home to form 8 residential dwellings (as amended) - application no. 21/03148/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>
<p><b>4.2 – <a href="#">48N Barnton Park View, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Conversion of existing lockup garage (formerly a railway bridge) into a three bedroom dwelling - application no. 18/02021/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>
<p><b>4.3 – <a href="#">13 Edinburgh Road, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Erect new standalone workshop / studio building with separate access - application no. 20/05222/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission for the reasons given in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p><b>4.4 – <a href="#">194 Fountainbridge (At Land Adjacent To), Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Proposed use for the North East commercial unit, lower ground floor of Block A. Current planning consent allows for class 1, class 2, class 3, class 4, and/or ancillary residential use e.g., storage. Application is seeking permission for a class 11 (gym) use for this unit - application no. 21/02326/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The conditions, reasons and informative as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</li> <li>2) The amendment of condition 2 to read: “Details of appropriate noise mitigation measures supported by a noise impact assessment are to be submitted and approved by the planning authority. The approved mitigation measures are to be implemented prior to the operation of the unit as a gymnasium.”</li> </ol>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p><b>4.5 – <a href="#">Totle Wells Lodge, Westfield, Winchburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Demolition of an existing house and the erection of a replacement house on the same site - application no. 20/04495/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>
<p><b>5.1 – <a href="#">194 Fountainbridge (At Land Adjacent To), Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Approval of matters specified in conditions 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12 &amp; 13 of 15/02892/PPP for Building E including form + massing; design + materials; daylight + sunlight; design + operation of private/public open spaces; roads, footways/cycleway/access/servicing + parking; venting + electric vehicle charging; drainage; waste management; operational requirements for commercial uses/ sustainability/floor levels/lighting; site investigation/hard + soft landscaping details + noise mitigation. (As Amended) - application no. 19/02993/AMC</p>	<p>To <b>AGREE</b> 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><b>6.1 – <a href="#">1 Edinburgh Airport (Main Terminal), Jubilee Road, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Chief Executive</p>	<p>To note the protocol note.</p>
<p><b>6.2 – <a href="#">1 Edinburgh Airport (Main Terminal), Jubilee Road, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Formation of new access road and active travel route from east of terminal building to Gogar Roundabout - application no. 21/00217/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission for the reasons given in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.  (On a division.)</p>