

## Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00am, Wednesday 02 March 2022

### Present:

Councillors Gardiner (Convener), Child (Vice-Convener) (Items 1.1-6.2), Booth, Cameron (Items 1.1-4.8 & 4.11-7.1), Dixon, Gordon, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose and Staniforth.

### 1. Minutes

---

#### Decision

To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 9 February 2022 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:

Councillor Booth requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.8 – 69-71 Marionville Road, Edinburgh.

Councillor Booth also requested a presentation in respect of Items 4.9 & 4.10 – 9-11 Maritime Street, Edinburgh.

Councillor Gardiner requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.9 – 9-11 Maritime Street, Edinburgh.

#### Decision

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

#### Declaration of Interests

Councillor Child declared a non-financial interest in Item 7.1 – 21-24 Joppa Terrace (at land opposite), Edinburgh as the application site was in her Ward and she had received lobbying emails from constituents, therefore she did not take part in this item.

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

### 3. 210 Craigs Road, Edinburgh (at land 369 Northeast of)

---

The Chief Planning Officer had identified an application for planning permission in principle to be dealt with by means of a hearing. The planning permission in principle at land 369 metres Northeast of 210 Craigs Road, Edinburgh for residential development, ancillary retail use, active travel route, open space, landscaping, access, services and all associated infrastructure – application no. 21/04210/PPP.

The application had been appealed for non-determination by the applicant, therefore Committee did not take a decision and instead came to a view on the application as the decision lay with the Scottish Ministers (DPEA) through the planning appeals process. It was advised that the hearing would take place to allow Councillors and representatives a public view on the application.

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

Planning Permission in Principle was sought for residential development at 210 Craigs Road, Edinburgh. The development would comprise of residential development, ancillary retail use, an active travel route, landscaping, access, services and all other associated infrastructure.

The indicative masterplan proposed up to 500 new family homes in a range of house and flat types, 50% of these being affordable. The masterplan adopted a landscape first approach, the key landscape principles included the creation of substantial landscaping along Craigs Road to the south and robust edge along the western boundary creating a threshold to the greenbelt and an informal public open space. Landscaped open space and woodland covering 40% of the site was proposed comprising one three-hectare public park which had LEAP play equipment and two 0.5 hectares small public parks which had LAP play equipment, the landscaped space also had community growing space.

The proposed 'North Park' was a linear park which would have created a northern edge to the development with SUDs integrated into low lying ground which promoted new habitats and biodiversity, would be overlooked by a residential development edge.

The proposed 'Paddock' was a small parcel of land contained in former field boundaries to the south of the site which would have created open space and play areas. Linear parks were proposed throughout the site, which focused views towards Mauseley Hill and Cammo Tower.

The 20m wide sewer wayleave and protected historical view corridor (Linear Open Space and South Avenue) aimed to provide useable open space and viewpoints from higher ground.

Around 1,820 new trees were proposed to be planted, the proposal aimed to retain existing perimeter trees and reinforced existing woodland and planting on the areas of steeply sloping ground and introduced avenues of trees which would have reduced build development massing. The indicative masterplan also proposed a hierarchy of streets with perimeter blocks that had active frontages and a landscaped public realm. The proposed density graduated from north-east to south-west and respected the existing contours of the land, it had higher density development within areas of lower lying ground to the south east, in closer proximity to the proposed public transport route.

The masterplan proposed to realign the north to south Active Travel Route through the site (Cammo Walk), and connected HSG20 and the development site to HSG 19's Craigs Road cycleway/footway, "Green Corridor" footway/cycleway, Maybury Primary and Edinburgh Gateway rail/tram station. It also had an east to west cycleway/footway through the site. It also included an informal footpath network and running routes through the site.

The principal vehicular access was provided via the fourth arm of the Boughtlin Roundabout on Maybury Road, and had a primary vehicular access route through the site which facilitated provision of a new bus route. New bus stops and bus penetration through site (Lothain 31), with bus gate and emergency access to Craigs Road access were proposed.

The application was supported by the following documents available to view on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Public Access Portal:

- Planning Statement;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Pre-Application Consultation Report;
- Utilities Capacity Assessment;
- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy;
- Transport Assessment;
- Affordable Housing Statement;
- Energy and Sustainability Statement;
- Sustainable Development Strategy;
- Landscape Report;
- Tree Survey;
- Solar Glare Hazard Study;
- Aerodrome Safeguarding Feasibility Study.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment**

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

- Cultural Heritage;
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment;
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal;
- Air Quality;
- Noise and Vibration;
- Ecology and Nature Conservation;
- Water Environment;
- Traffic;

- Disruption due to construction.

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

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/651092](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/651092)

**(b) Corstorphine Community Council**

Steve Kerr addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Corstorphine Community Council via a written statement. He stated that the Community Council believed that the proposed development did not meet a range of CEC planning policy requirements. He also noted that the Local Development Plan (LDP) and City Plan 2030 were important pieces of policy, and while not yet formally adopted by the CEC the document was referred to in order to form their response on the planning application.

Mr Kerr stated that the proposed development would erode the greenbelt. He stated that the application's site was not approved for future development in either the LDP or the City Plan 2030, and that CEC's Landscape and Visual Assessment from 2019 noted that "There is no scope for development in this CAA". As there was no allocation of the site for future development according to CEC policy, Mr Kerr stated that it should be rejected outright for this reason.

Mr Kerr also stated that the development is in contradiction to LDP policies Policy Des 9 and Policy ENV 10 by eroding a well-defined greenbelt. He stated it also contradicted City Plan ENV 18. Mr Kerr also stated that the City Plan Proposals Map showed no allocation of the site for future development (in reference to City Plan 2.59), and that the proposed development was not included in any of the West Edinburgh strategic development plan covered by City Plan (in reference to City Plan 16). Mr Kerr argued that it was clear from both the LDP and City Plan that the site was not considered appropriate for future development, and that Corstorphine Community Council was concerned that should the development be given permission to proceed, it would set a dangerous precedent in the erosion of well-defined greenbelt boundaries around the city, and open the door for further erasure.

Mr Kerr also stated that the proposed site removed open space used and enjoyed by the local community. He said that developers stated that the proposed development was on existing low-quality open space, used only by occasional dog walkers. He stated that the local community was supportive of retaining the open space, as it contributed towards an improved quality of life, connected people to nature and the countryside, and was of potential use for agriculture. Locals especially enjoyed walking along Cammo Walk as it had a peaceful nature, and should this area be developed much of the enjoyment would be removed. Mr Kerr argued that the application therefore contradicted LDP Policy Env 18.

Mr Kerr also stated that the application did not meet the 20 minute neighbourhood criteria. He argued that City Plan 2030 aimed to embed 20 minute neighbourhoods as a cornerstone for new developments in Edinburgh. This was supported by the Plan's first aim. The application contradicted this aim as it was low density and single-use (residential), and provided very few additional amenities within the development itself, other than greenspace. Residents in the local community took some exception to the

developers assumptions about access to local amenities by foot, cycle and public transport, which in turn allowed the developer to tick the box for being compliant with this policy objective. The Community Council disagreed with the assertion that the development was within a 20 minute round trip on foot, cycle or public transport to various amenities. Mr Kerr gave an example of a local cycle route to a store which states it takes 10 minutes to get to, however in practice access to the store by cycling was impractical and dangerous, as there was no cycle parking at the store, and access was over the dangerous Maybury Junction. There was no safe cycle access to many local amenities within 10 minutes of the development meaning that people would need to travel by car. The developers asserted local centres to include industrial and commercial units as part of their Transport Assessment, and Mr Kerr argued that they should not be considered as “local centres”. He argued that the spirit of the 20 minute neighbourhood was for people to easily access amenities and services that are useful to them such as veterinary surgeons, banks, libraries, pubs, food shops, newsagents and cafes, and that residents could not get to any of these aforementioned useful amenities within 10 minutes.

Mr Kerr also argued that the development would exacerbate existing traffic congestion and associated air quality issues. The Corstorphine Community Council were concerned that the application’s Transport Assessment percentage impact assessment and junction modelling was looking at the development in isolation and did not take into account the traffic generation and impacts from neighbouring developments that were in the pipeline. The Community Council also noted from the Transport Assessment that figures were used from East Craigs in the 2011 census to compare transport modal share and behaviours, and there were inconsistencies between the East Craigs area and the new development, which casted doubts on the accuracy of figures provided in the report. East Craigs had different amenities, access points, public transport provision and infrastructure. The Transport Assessment made much of cycle connectivity to key amenities, but safe and direct routes to these amenities were often non-existent for people on cycle, meaning in practice it was unlikely people would choose to ride a bike to these destinations. Unless significant upgrades were provided to the active travel network in the wider area, Mr Kerr argued that people would drive instead.

Mr Kerr also noted concern at the Transport Assessment stating that, Lothian Buses has confirmed the 31 service diversion will be delivered following the completion of the above works and the Myabury Junction,” as in practice this would mean that there was a chance that the development could be completed before the necessary transport infrastructure upgrades were completed meaning that the development would have no public transport provision from Lothian Buses. He argued that should the development be granted, that works should only commence once the required junction upgrades had been completed. He also argued that the proposed developments contradicted LDP Policy Tra1(d) and Tra 8, as well as City Plan policies Inf 3 and Inf 4.

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

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/651092](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/651092)

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

Peter Scott addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of the Cramond and Barnton Community Council. Mr Scott stated that he would be addressing concerns from residents to the north of the site, and that the development has had 118 objections and around 900 petitionary signatures opposing the site. He stated that the development was contrary to current and emerging planning policies.

Mr Scott stated that 2500 homes were already being built and Maybury and Cramond areas were losing wildlife, habitats and greenbelt space due to these developments. All of these developments required access to Maybury Road and Barnton and Maybury junctions. He stated that in 2016 the Development Management Sub-Committee had refused an application by the same applicant as the development undermined the greenbelt objectives, nature of the urban edge, special character of the city and the setting of Cammo Park Estate. Although at the time the applicants stated they did not intend to build on the greenbelt, archaeological excavations were carried out a short time after at the site. Mr Scott stated that the Cramond and Barnton Community Council were against the development due to further erosion of the greenbelt, coalescence of Cammo, Maybury and West Craigs developments, and that Maybury Road and Craigs Road provided a robust urban edge boundaries that he would like to keep.

Mr Scott stated that emerging national and local policies promoted brownfield developments rather than greenbelt developments, and that the application would impact amenities. Development on northern slopes on Craigs Road would significantly impact amenity values on special landscape area including Mawsley Hill and Cammo Estate Historic Gardens and designed landscaped sites. He stated that 500 homes through the strategic Maybury Road and Maybury and Barton junctions exacerbated congestion, business would lose money due to delays on stock, and air quality would be significantly reduced. Waste from Braehead Quarry which was adjacent to the site would also cause noise and odour issues within the development site, which would stop residents from enjoying the outdoor space. The land that the site was being developed on was high quality and could be used for agriculture space, or for nearby residents to use as a growing space, which instead could be used to contribute to net zero rather than for housing. He also stated that the area did not have enough school capacity for residents should the application be approved.

Mr Scott also stated that Cammo Walk was being considered as an Active Travel Route for the development, but by continuing closures would promote entrapment to residents. It would encourage people to use more dangerous routes on more hazardous roads. He argued that a decision on Cammo Walk had already taken 8 years, and that a Statutory Community Participation Request had also been issued but with little progress. He stated that either Cammo Walk should remain open to south bound vehicles via an Active Travel Route or converted to an Active Travel Route with traffic lights at Cammo Gardens to enhance road safety and prevent community severance.

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

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/651092](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/651092)

**(d) Living Streets Edinburgh**

John Kennedy addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Living Streets Edinburgh. Mr Kennedy advised Committee that Living Streets had already submitted an objection to the planning application, and that he was against the application on the basis of additional car impact and the reasons set out in the assessment section of the Report by the Chief Planning Officer, specifically section E.

Mr Kennedy stated that car parking provisions for the development were much less than 100%. He also condemned a remark made in the Transport Assessment, paragraph 5.145, which stated, “development will have no material impact on the road network or proposed transport interventions”. Mr Kennedy did not agree with the statement. He also voiced concerns over findings in the East Craig’s and Craigmount area in the East Craigs Better Choices Report, as the report noted increased rat-running in the area. He argued the proposed development would increase rat-running further in the East Craigs and Craigmount communities.

Mr Kennedy argued that the development and developments in HSG 19 and HSG 20 were effectively increasing codependency with cars and that there was no active travel infrastructure to useful amenities. He stated the development posed issues for access to amenities such as the High Street in Corstorphine by walking or cycling. He stated that better active travel routes were needed in the area for reasons such as arterial routes being hostile and unsafe places for crossing roads, and pollution being breathed in when crossing these roads. There was concern over crossing at junctions in the area, as there were a lack of crossings. When asked by Councillor Gardiner if this would affect safety when walking to and from school in the East Craigs area, Mr Kennedy replied that the area gets particularly busy when the school day ends and that close interactions with the pupils and traffic combined with confusion over new highway code rules, would mean that school pupils could face dangerous situations caused by traffic. He noted there was a school assessment that was ongoing to put a zebra crossing beside the school for safer crossing.

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

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/651092](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/651092)

**(e) Ward Councillors Lang and Young**

Councillor Lang addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Councillor Young and the residents in his Ward. Councillor Lang noted that he was disappointed the applicant was not on the call in order for questions to be asked about the development site.

Councillor Lang stated that the development should not be accepted and should be refused, as there would be a loss of greenspace, a destructive impact on the view of Cammo Estate and Cammo Tower, and the detrimental effect increased traffic would have in the area. He stated that Barnton Junction and Maybury Road were already heavily congested, and that the development would cause further congestion.

Councillor Lang stated that the land which the development would be built on was greenbelt land, and that according to the Local Development Plan the development would be against policy. He argued that the application breached greenbelt policies and Council planning policies, particularly on the setting of listed buildings, historic gardens and design landscapes and transport policies. Schools would also be impacted as there was not enough space in nearby schools to allow more pupils to join. Councillor Lang stated that although Committee could not decide on the application, he was against it and hoped that Committee could form an adequate response for the Scottish Government to appeal.

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

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/651092](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/651092)

## **Decision 1**

### **Motion**

To **AGREE** to the hearing for this application.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child.

### **Amendment**

To **REFUSE** to the hearing for this application.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Rose.

### **Voting**

For the motion: - 9 votes

For the amendment: - 2 votes

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

(For the amendment: Councillors Mowat and Rose.)

### **Decision**

To **AGREE** to the hearing for this application.

## **Decision 2**

### **Decision**

To note the Officer recommendations in the report by the Chief Planning Officer as a basis for appeal.

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

## **4. 9-11 Maritime Street, Edinburgh**

---

Details were provided of an application for planning permission for a proposed upwards extension and change of use from office to residential to form 22 flats, with associated infrastructure, landscaping and cycle parking at 9-11 Maritime Street, Edinburgh – application no. 21/04479/FUL

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

### **Motion**

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives, and a legal agreement, as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer, and an additional condition that notwithstanding the approved plans, the cycle parking was not approved and would need to be re-submitted to the Council's planning authority and be installed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child.

### **Amendment**

To **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer and on the grounds of policies ENV3, ENV4 (a,b&c), ENV 6 (a&c), Policy Hou 2, Hou 5 and Des 5.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Staniforth.

### **Voting**

For the motion: - 8 votes  
For the amendment: - 2 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Child, Dixon, Gardiner, Gordon, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler and Rose.)

(For the amendment: Councillors Booth and Staniforth.)

### **Decision**

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives, and a legal agreement, as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer, and an additional condition that notwithstanding the approved plans, the cycle parking was not approved and would need to be re-submitted to the Council's planning authority and be installed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved.

(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="#">Report for forthcoming application by E&amp;A Partnerships Ltd &amp; Niddrie Development Company Ltd. for Proposal of Application Notice at 26 Cleikiminrig, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Residential development with associated landscaping, vehicular link route, active travel route, SUDS, infrastructure, engineering works including removal of onsite materials, and other ancillary works – application no. 22/00112/PAN</p>	<p>1) To note the key issues at this stage.            2) To request that the applicant take into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increasing active travel and improving pavements in the area.</li> <li>• Liaising with planning developers at nearby sites for cross-border co-operation for these developments. Providing sustainable development to the site. How the site fits within the green belt/ countryside.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.2 – <a href="#">Report for forthcoming application by Crosslane Co-Living SPV 2 Ltd. for Proposal of Application Notice at 94 Ocean Drive, Edinburgh (land 143 metres southeast of)</a></b></p>	<p>Residential development and associated co-working and amenity space, with landscaping, public realm, infrastructure, and access arrangements – application no. 22/00096/PAN</p>	<p>1) To note the key issues at this stage.            2) To request that the applicant take into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to greenspace and especially play space for children. Providing adequate street frontage. Providing adequate amenities within the development. Consideration of the nearby planning development to the east of the site</li> </ul>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
4.3 – <a href="#">53 Belford Road, Edinburgh</a>	Change of use from commercial to residential – application no. 21/06632/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to the informatives set out in Section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
4.4 – <a href="#">34 Blackford Avenue, Edinburgh</a>	Demolition of existing and erection of new dwelling – application no. 21/03066/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to the informatives set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
4.5 – <a href="#">31 Dolphin Avenue, Currie (Currie High School)</a>	Construction of a new ultra-low energy community high school, swimming pool and sports facilities plus associated landscaping and parking; demolition of existing school building (as amended) – application no. 21/04443/FUL	To note that the report was <b>WITHDRAWN</b> from the agenda at the request of the Chief Planning Officer.
4.6 – <a href="#">23 Elm Row, Edinburgh</a>	External seating area – application no. 21/05858/FUL	To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission for the reasons set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
4.7 – <a href="#">25 Lasswade Road, Edinburgh</a>	Alterations and change of use of existing class 1 convenience store with hot food takeaway counter to form class 3 café / restaurant – application no. 21/03154/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p><b>4.8 – <a href="#">69-71 Marionville Road, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Demolition of two existing business units and erection of a residential development comprising two apartment buildings, a terrace of mews houses, car parking, landscaping, and other associated works (amendment to 19/04508/FUL) as amended – application no. 21/04703/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives, and a legal agreement, as set out in section 3 of the report by the chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p><b>4.9 - <a href="#">9-11 Maritime Street, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Proposed upwards extension and change of use from office to residential to form 22 flats, with associated infrastructure, landscaping, and cycle parking (as amended) – application no. 21/04479/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives, and a legal agreement, as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer, and an additional condition that notwithstanding the approved plans, the cycle parking was not approved and would need to be re-submitted to the Council's planning authority and be installed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved.  (on a division)</p>
<p><b>4.10 – <a href="#">9-11 Maritime Street, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Proposed internal alterations and upwards extension to facilitate change of use from office to residential (as amended) – application no. 21/04480/LBC</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p><b>4.11 – <a href="#">65 Ravelston Dykes Road, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Extend on the ground floor to add a sunroom, bedroom and garden storage to ground – application no. 21/03298/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p><b>4.12 – <a href="#">65 Ravelston Dykes Road, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Extend on the ground floor to add a sunroom, bedroom and outdoor storage – application no. 21/03296/LBC</p>	<p>To <b>GRANT</b> listed building consent subject to the informatives set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p><b>4.13 – <a href="#">13 St Fillan's Terrace, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Single storey rear extension and attic conversion, including rear dormer. New ancillary garden room (as amended) – application no. 21/06137/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to the informatives set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p><b>5.1 – <a href="#">2-4, 6, 14 Bonnington Road Lane and 200 Bonnington Road, Edinburgh</a></b></p>	<p>Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment comprising build to rent residential accommodation, commercial uses, associated landscaping and infrastructure (as amended) – application no. 20/01932/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>AGREE</b> to a Stopping Up Order to facilitate full planning permission at the site and for the re-siting of telecomms equipment, as set out in the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p><b>5.2 – <a href="#">34 Cramond Road North, Edinburgh (at land adjacent to former)</a></b></p>	<p>Section 42 application to vary condition 1 of planning permission reference 13/01843/FUL (which modified consent 05/02947/FUL, which previously modified consent 01/01881/FUL), to extend the proposed timescale for laying out and operating the approved sports pavilion and sports pitches for a further five year period – application no. 20/02916/FUL</p>	<p>1) To note the report by the Chief Planning Officer. 2) To ask developers for quicker development of the site to allow further progress.</p>
<p><b>6.1 – <a href="#">210 Craigs Road, Edinburgh (at land 369 metres northeast of)</a></b></p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Service Director, Legal and Assurance – application no. 21/04210/PPP</p>	<p>To note the protocol note.</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p><b>6.2 – <a href="#">210 Craigs Road, Edinburgh (at land 369 metres northeast of)</a></b></p>	<p>Residential development, ancillary retail use, active travel route, open space, landscaping, access, services and all associated infrastructure – application no. 21/04210/PPP</p>	<p><b>Decision 1</b></p> <p>To <b>AGREE</b> to the hearing for this application.</p> <p>(on a division)</p> <p><b>Decision 2</b></p> <p>To note the Officer recommendations in the report by the Chief Planning Officer as a basis for appeal.</p>
<p><b>7.1 – <a href="#">21-24 Joppa Terrace, Edinburgh (at land opposite)</a></b></p>	<p>Erection of dwelling with landscaping, boundary treatment and parking, formation of two community gardens – application no. 21/06429/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission subject to the reasons set out in the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>