

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

2.00 pm, Wednesday 10 August 2021

Present:

Councillors Osler (Convener), Beal, Booth, Cameron, Dalglish, Gardiner, Hyslop, Jones, McNeese-Mechan, Mowat and O'Neill.

1. 14 Muirhouse Parkway (Silverlea Old Peoples Home), Edinburgh

At its meeting of 12 January 2022, the Development Management Sub-Committee agreed to continue consideration of application 21/05056/FUL - Silverlea Old Peoples Home, 14 Muirhouse Parkway, Edinburgh, to allow for a site visit and a hearing.

Due to an error in the publication of the Pre-application Consultation (PAC) report, interested parties were re-notified of the planning application on the 15th of June 2022 and the application was readvertised on the 24th of June 2022.

On 9 February 2022, planning permission was granted for a proposed football pavilion, changing rooms and clubhouse and associated development for Craigmoynton Community Football Club (to replace the existing facilities within the south eastern part of the site) at 25 Marine Drive, EH4 5EJ (planning application ref.21/05175/FUL).

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The proposal was for the construction of 142 affordable flatted residences (100% of the proposed units) comprising: (i) five blocks of four-storey flats; (ii) a single two-storey block of flats; (iii) four two-storey and attic rectangular plan terraces of colony flats. The colony blocks contained a total of 48 flats. The split between the private and affordable was as follows:

Accommodation schedule	CEC(social rent) Living)	Mid-market rent (Edinburgh care)	Blackwood HA (social rent)	CEC Health & social
1 bedroom	16	23	0	0
2 bedroom	36	20	19	4
3 bedroom	16	8	0	0
Total	68	51	19	4

Total no units 142

The two flatted blocks located on the southern part of the site front southwards over an area of communal private open space onto Muirhouse Parkway. The rest of the flatted blocks, all of which were positioned to the north of the frontage blocks, had a north-south alignment and their windows had an east-west orientation. The colony blocks were located in the north eastern part of the site. The majority of them had a north-south alignment and their windows an east-west orientation.

A two-storey energy centre building housing air source heat pumps was located at a point on the west part of the site between two of the proposed flatted buildings.

The design of all flatted buildings was contemporary. The roof of the flatted blocks was flat and photo voltaic (PV) panels were mounted on them. All of the colony blocks had pitched roofs clad in dark grey roof tiles. The external wall material was facing brick. The framing of windows and external doors were grey in colour.

Vehicular access would be taken from Muirhouse Parkway from a point in the middle of the south boundary of the site.

The principal road within the proposed development was a north - south aligned road. Parallel to and along the length of the principal road was a 3.5 metres wide shared cycleway/footway which was separated from the road by a linear open swale. Accessed off that principal road was a one-way loop road from which the colony blocks would be accessed.

The proposal included 36 car parking spaces (25%) which included 27 standards bays and 9 disabled bays (25% of proposed parking). One in every six parking bays was to be equipped for electric vehicles. The car parking was interspersed with landscape pockets of tree planting.

An underground refuse storage (URS) solution was proposed. There were seven URS points dispersed within the layout. URS systems were designed to be lifted by crane lift refuse collection vehicles.

It was proposed to provide 200% cycle parking which would be contained within a mixture of cycle stores integral to flatted blocks and detached cycle stores adjacent to flatted blocks. The proposal included 4 health and social care units and 23 Blackwood Homes and care units which did not require cycle parking. However, the latter would have a large store for the housing of electric scooters (which would also allow for some bikes should circumstances arise).

A communal open space was proposed roughly in the centre of the site in the vicinity of an existing grouping of trees. It included a children's play area.

The northern part of the proposed residential development was on green belt land. An area of land within the green belt on the northern part of the site, located between the proposed residences and the existing football pitches, was to be recontoured as a green open space.

Sustainable urban drainage (SUDS) included a combination of: (i) two swales running north-south; (ii) "blue-green" roofs to all flat roofed blocks, which provided water storage; (iii) A sunken "storm garden" adjacent to blocks 8 and 9 designed to flood in times of extreme rainfall whilst also functioning as an equipped children's play area; and (iv) supplementary areas of porous paving.

There was a grouping of small, dilapidated cabins located in the south east corner of the site adjacent to Muirhouse Parkway, which were presently used as club house and changing facilities for Craigroyston Community Youth Football Club. These were to be demolished to facilitate the proposed development. A replacement football pavilion, club house and changing facilities and associated car parking and access road off Marine Drive, for Craigroyston Community Youth Football Club, was proposed on the northern extremity of the site. These proposals were the subject of separate application 21/05056/FUL which stood to be determined on its own merits.

Supporting Statements:

- Planning Statement;
- Pre-Application Consultation Report;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Transport Assessment;
- Sustainability Statement;
- Topographical information;
- Tree survey assessment and tree constraints plan;
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment;
- Drainage Strategy and flood risk assessment;
- Ecological assessment Report;
- Noise Impact Assessment;
- Site Investigation;
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment;
- Waste strategy;
- Sun path diagrams.

These documents were available to view on the Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(b) Muirhouse and Salvesen Community Council

In the absence of a representative from the Community Council, the Committee Services Clerk read out the following statement: “The Muirhouse and Salvesen Community Council had no reservations with the planning application and welcomed the addition of more social housing in an area that desperately needed it. Edinburgh as a whole needed more social housing and in particular three-bedroom properties.”

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(c) Mr Colin Dudgeon

Colin Dudgeon addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee. Mr Dudgeon advised that he had lived with my wife and two sons and had been a resident in North Edinburgh his entire life. He was a founding member of Craigroyston Community Youth Football Club, which provided activities for hundreds of kids from the local community. Regarding the proposed development, for the last 13 years, the area had been a target of vandals and anti-social behaviour. This had become worse since the case since the closure and demolition of Silverlea Old Peoples Home in 2017/2018. People were taking advantage of that by carrying out extensive fly-tipping and businesses contractors were regularly using it as a dumping site for waste materials. As the only occupants of the Silverlea Site, the burden fell upon them to report it to the relevant authorities or remove it themselves, or with the help of volunteers.

Mr Dudgeon stated that there was also vandalism to the trees around the site, danger to wildlife and danger to the kids that came to the football club. It was also possible that fire raising could spread to properties. They were supporting the project, because they believed that if the housing development took place, then the presence of residents would help prevent these types of incidents and the damage being done to the environment itself would also diminish. They felt that with the housing and sports development, it would become a proper community hub. The present situation could not continue. Significantly, the problems of anti-social behaviour were much less when the Old Peoples Home was in existence, with people coming and going. Therefore, the sooner there was housing and residents back in their area, the better it would be.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(d) Mr Malcolm Warrack

Malcolm Warrack addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee. Mr Warrack advised that indicated that he lived in one of the former Lighthouse Keeper's Houses. The residents' issue with this development was about the lack of adequate parking for new and future residents of the Silverlea Development and for visitors to the football pitches used by Craigroyston Community Youth Football club. The Development would remove the informal parking on the Old Stable Site. In Salvesen, there was very little off-street parking and at night not much spare capacity.

Mr Warrack stated that when the Lighthouse Keepers' Family Accommodation was built at 1-16 Salveson Crescent, there was no actual provision made for off-street parking. Obviously in the early 1950's, there was actually relatively small car ownership. Therefore, in the late 1960's a block of six garages was built. During the course of the 1980's, the houses and later the garages were sold by the Lighthouse Commissioners. Current car ownership in 1-16 Salveson Crescent was 18 cars and the street in which

those properties were located, had actual capacity for about 12-14 cars. The balance of the car parking was taken up in its entirety by on-street parking and the garages. Significantly, at mid-market housing at MacGill Drive there was over 80% car ownership. This compared with the 25 % allocation of car parking proposed in the Silverlea application. Two of the blocks of mid-market rent houses, comprised of about 16 houses on the Silverlea Development. In the immediate vicinity, there was only four car spaces. The occupiers of the 16 houses would potentially find it easier to park in Salvesen Crescent. For this development to offer a good occupational experience for its residents, it had to provide parking at a rate of 80% to 100% car spaces to units, certainly for the mid-market element. So, in conclusion, before making a decision, the Committee should ensure that adequate parking for the mid-market element of the housing was provided.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(e) Edinburgh Poverty Commission

Craig Sanderson addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of the Edinburgh Poverty Commission. Mr Sanderson advised that for over 30 years he was Chief Executive of the Link Housing Association, but was now member of the Edinburgh Poverty Commission. He would focus on the mix of provision for the development. Edinburgh Council had a policy of provision of 25 % for affordable housing of all new developments. However, this application proposed 100% affordable housing, with a combination of social rented, mid-market rented housing and housing for disabled people. All of the 142 houses would be accessible to the general populous. The term “affordable” included social rented, market rented, shared ownership and shared equity housing. Additionally, it should be of reasonable quality that was affordable to people on low or limited fixed incomes, which included pensioners.

Mr Sanderson stated that the definition of mid-market rent could be broadened to mean anything between a social rent and a full market rent. Affordable rent was by some definitions presently £184 a week and that was based on the assumption that this was affordable to people on the average salary in Edinburgh. This was currently said to be £44,000 per annum, but of course, this was lifted by the relatively high numbers of high salaries in the city. The median income of a council tenant was currently £19,000 per annum. This was a better way to consider the term affordability. Edinburgh Poverty Commission spent about 500 hours surveying hundreds of people, some of whom had experience in poverty at work. The average social rent in Edinburgh was currently £100 per week. This was unaffordable to many of the people that were surveyed. It was therefore necessary to maximise the amount of social housing.

Mr Sanderson indicated that he was pleased at the mid-market rent in this proposal would be provided by Edinburgh Living, which was a subsidiary company of the Council. This was therefore subject to regulation by the Housing Regulator and so there would be some protection against rent increases. 64% of this development would be for social rent. This was a positive development and it should be remembered that social rent offered more security than other types of tenure. However, social housing supply had always been behind target. In 2016/2021, the Scottish government set a target of

35,000 social rented houses by 2021, but only managed to build 28,000 houses. Regarding the situation in Edinburgh, in 2020, the Council set a target of the thousand new social homes each year. Edinburgh Poverty Commission asked for that to be doubled to 2,000 per year. In 2020/21 only social 252 houses were completed, therefore, they were well behind target. Therefore, he would strongly support this application to provide more social housing.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(f) Living Rent Muirhouse-Pilton (Caroline Cawley)

Caroline Cawley addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Living Rent Muirhouse-Pilton. Ms Cawley advised that they objected to the planned development for the following reasons. The loss of mature trees, the impact on local wildlife and the fact that the proposed development was on green belt land. 30 trees were listed for felling, including two Category A trees. New trees were planned and Had been planted near the site, however, a large number of them were already dead. The site was home to dozens of species of wildlife. Considering the current climate crisis, the loss of this biodiversity was totally unwarranted.

Ms Cawley indicated that the report stated that the site was unkept, only informally accessed, subject to fly-tipping and the land was contaminated. This was in fact council-owned land and was unkept because the Council had not done anything with to it, except erect fencing around the main entrance. Her own recycling area, which was also on Muirhouse Parkway, was constantly filled, often by non-residents and the new development would not stop this behaviour. The contamination resulting from the destruction of the care home, which was council owned and run, was entirely the responsibility of the Council. This was an extremely poor excuse to deprive the residents of green space. The report stated that the area was of low recreational value, however, basic maintenance and adding some benches would not be difficult. Muirhouse ranked as one of the most deprived areas Scotland. The green spaces were of vital importance for the physical and mental well-being of residents. Construction had already taken place on green spaces in the area and there was almost nothing left for the residents. The site was also of archaeological importance and a great opportunity for local residents and children to connect with the local history of the area.

Ms Cawley stated that one of the main objections to this development was the impact of increasing the population without additional investment in local services. It was very difficult to get a doctor's appointment or to receive non-urgent prescriptions. There was a waiting list for early years places and the schools were at capacity. 142 new homes would be constructed, including individuals with complex needs, who were not going to be able to access essential services. Finally, the lack of parking provision was also a serious concern. The proposal for 142 flats but only 36 parking spaces, 9 of which were to be disabled bays, was wholly inadequate. 25 of the homes were designed for wheelchair users, many of whom would likely have mobility cars or who would use more of taxis and private vehicles for journeys. The number of cars on the streets during local events was impacting residents of these areas. Another planned local

development on Ferry Road would create 99 private houses on council owned land with 137 garage and on-street parking facilities. This was more realistic. Fundamentally, this site was not appropriate for this planned development. The loss of local outside space, the threat to services and the lack of realistic planning, was going to devastate the local area. Some of this would be on greenbelt land. The Council had made a pledge not to build on green belt land and this development went against this policy. The proposal should be rejected for all the reasons stated and the many that there was not time to discuss.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(g) Save Our Silverlea

Edward Murray addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Save Our Silverlea. Mr Murray advised that he was the Communications Secretary of the Save the Silverlea Campaign. He first moved to Muirhouse over 30 years ago with his daughter. Behind the primary school that then existed was a vast tract to Muirhouse Park/ House Green, there was a park where they held their community events and his daughter was allowed to visit the riding stables. But the primary school was demolished, much of Muirhouse Park was buried under bricks and the Riding School was shut down. Therefore, Muirhouse, which was the size of a small town, had no primary school, park, pub or supermarket. It was one of the most deprived areas in Edinburgh. The Council now wanted to remove the last green place, destroying a natural wildlife habitat.

Mr Murray stated that the site was more than a simple brown field site, it was a historical and a heritage site. There was a variety of wildlife and some of the trees were magnificent and it would be a total disaster to cut them down. The report of the Sub-Committee meeting of 12 January 2022 referred to the total number of trees to come down. It also stated that the aerial parts of several trees would be vulnerable to damage caused by construction and this would possibly destroy a lot more trees. It concluded that this could result in a temporary decline of the trees resulting in the loss of the amenity. The felling of 30 trees and damage to many more would mean an unacceptable loss of amenity. The Council's counter argument was for the Silverknows Park and Tree Planting initiative, where numerous species of indigenous plants would be planted in blocks. However, they had been planted in mid-February and the vast majority of these saplings were now dead. What now existed instead of the promised stands of native trees was numerous rows of plastic tubes propping up dead twigs.

Mr Murray argued that in this time of climate change, the Council had a moral obligation not to move numerous mature trees and exchange them for hundreds of dead twigs in tubes. Various environmental groups agreed with them completely. Therefore, they were considering submitting an FOI request to find out how much these dead twigs in plastic tubes cost the Council Taxpayer. However, they had an unsatisfactory outcome with the last FOI request, when a certain pack document was said not to exist, which was later found. Apparently, the development was supported by the Muirhouse and Salvesen Community Council. However, this council had been defunct since 2019. In conclusion, the people of Muirhouse were not making excessive demands, but only

asking that for a small part of their land be used as community green space. The community could then determine what the space could be used for. The remit of this campaign was to stop this development, so that the community could have a public meeting to discuss it, because they were previously denied this. The Covid Pandemic was used as a screen to prevent them having a proper public meeting and full discussion. So, it was not too much to ask for. The people of this area were entitled to for their trees to be retained.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(f) Ward Councillors - Almond

Councillors Lang, Work, Louise Young and Younie addressed the Sub-Committee as members for the Almond Ward.

Councillor Lang advised that this application had been a long time coming. In 2017, the Old Silverlea Nursing Home was demolished with the promise of new social housing on site. He knew this area well and also knew that some of community had real concerns about the proposals. These, he had considered, but as a ward councillor for the whole community, he concluded that this was a good application. There was a pressing need for new affordable homes in the city, with its excessively high rents and lengthening waiting lists for social homes. This development proposed 100% percent affordable housing, which was substantially more than most developments, which also included almost 70 new homes for social rent. There was a need to improve facilities and this development would include a new children's play area. Additionally, there was a need to create green spaces and this proposal would take a currently unkept area and turn it into high quality green space. There was a need create safer spaces for vulnerable people and this proposal would improve existing paths with better lighting.

Councillor Lang stated that regarding the issue of affordable housing, he had constituents who were in desperate need of new housing, or whose landlords were terminating a rental agreement and who faced homelessness or B&B accommodation. He had promised to help people with housing problems, therefore, to oppose a 100% affordable housing development would be contrary to this. Although part of the land for this development sat in the Green Belt, this was not lush, panoramic countryside. Much of it was unkept, fenced-off and inaccessible, especially for those with limited mobility. It was far from a safe, secure, welcoming place for vulnerable people to enjoy and many parts of the site were contaminated. When considering the greenbelt land concerned, the vast majority of it would be turned from open space area into new open park quality area and would also improve the path network. He thought that these were positive developments that would not just benefit the new residents, but the area as a whole. Therefore, he thought that this was a good application, it provided much-needed new housing and amenities, and it had been well thought out over a long period of time. He hoped that the Sub-Committee would approve this application.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm -](#)

[City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

Councillor Work indicated that he was not here to object to the application. He was encouraged by the proposed development mainly because 64% would percent would be social rent. Additionally, he was encouraged with the partnership arrangements, the social care element, the work with the Craigmoynton Football Club and the renewable energy that would be used. He had asked for a site visit, but could not attend and maybe some of the concerns would have would have been addressed had he attended. If this development had been on the footprint of the care home, he did not think he would have needed to attend this meeting. Comments by the elected members seemed to suggest that the development intended to tidy up the low value contaminated and flooded land. It was good that it would benefit the community, but he needed some clarification about the extent of encroachment on the Green Belt, which was the subject of many of the objections. Also, there were 30 trees, some which were mature, would have to be felled to clear the site.

Councillor Work stated that his main concern was about the other trees which had been not been categorised to be felled and would still be at risk. The report, previously referred to, stated that the ariel part of several trees were close to construction activities, making them vulnerable to damage. A potential conflict could be not be mitigated by protection measures and he was concerned about that. He was also concerned that the extent of the pruning and the loss of the rooting volume exceeded industry best practice. Therefore, a lot more trees could be felled than was originally intended. Was “carte blanche” been given to developers to cut down trees on the basis that they had been damaged, or did they have to seek further permission? Mr. Murphy referred to the trees had been planted on the Silverleas Plantation. They would never replace mature trees, but he was not sure about how many trees had been planted to replace the ones that were being felled. If possible, could consideration be given to the area where a lot of trees had died. He knew that was offsite, but maybe some consideration could be taken about that as well.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

Councill Young advised that the site visit had been particularly helpful with this application, as it gave some context to the surrounding area and to the condition of the site itself. Councillor Lang had already made very clear the key considerations and she felt no need to repeat these. But she would like to give emphasis to the reasons why she felt this application was slightly different from others that had been considered. Although she had sympathy with those with concerns about building on this site, on balance, she thought it was the right thing to do. She would also just like to draw attention when making reference to local individuals and groups. The Muirhouse and Salvesen Community Council made a written submission that had subsequently received comments suggesting that they were not currently operational. Although they had perhaps struggled during lockdown, they were very much in existence. The site was in a location that she was very familiar. The natural growth was largely a result of the overgrowth of a derelict site and it was actually not usable green space.

Councillor Young stated that the proposals would bring a new welcome structure and more appealing space, both for the new residents and for people who were living in the area. There would be a much improved path network and safer places to move around. She would not normally support a housing application on a green area, but the history of the site and the fact that it was previously used by the Nursing Home gave it some context. She believed that the site should be used again. There was a desperate need for social and affordable housing, both across the city and in this area and members had frequently pushed for solutions to this. Members often received enquiries from people who were trying to find permanent council housing. It would be a disservice to the community for members not to support an application like this. The application was quite unique in the fact that it was 100% affordable housing. Additionally, it offered some specific residences, designed to cater for those with additional physical needs which were not normally provided. On balance, she believed that this was the right option for this land and would give more to the community than if it was left in its present state. She asked the Sub-Committee to support the application.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

Councillor Younie indicated that since he was elected, the vast majority of the correspondence he received had centered on both housing and the lack of access to housing, throughout his ward. He often told his constituents that he would try to help them access housing and housing, that was more suitable to their needs, but that a successful outcome might be difficult. It struck him how resigned people were to this reality. He did not think that this should be the case and the path to changing that reality was through projects such as this one. This could transform an unsafe, derelict area into one of immense social value, especially with regards to accessibility, safety and the increase in affordable housing. It was somewhat unique in proposing 100% affordable housing, so he strongly endorsed this project.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(g) Applicant and Applicant's Agent

Elaine Scott (Head of Housing Strategy & Development at CEC), Elise Schneider (Senior Construction Manager, Edinburgh Waterfront Team), Linda Hamilton (Planning Advisor, Edinburgh Waterfront Team), Eugene Mullan Smith and John Lancaster (Smith Scott Mullan) were heard in support of the application.

Ms Scott advised that she was head of Housing Strategy and Development with the Council and was also part of the senior management team of Edinburgh Living. Edinburgh needed more affordable homes. They had heard about the need locally, but in terms of putting a citywide context on this issue, around 150 households would bid for every social rented home that became available in the City, whether it was Council or registered social landlord homes. There were currently around 4,000 households in different forms of temporary accommodation within the City. So this development was

really important in responding to those needs. Around 70% of council homes that become available were let to homeless people and the remaining homes were let to people with the highest housing need. These were often people who could not remain in their existing home because it was not accessible, or they were in hospital and needed to move to a more accessible home. Mid-rent housing played a really important role in meeting the needs of those, who would not be prioritised for social housing, but who needed a more affordable home. The average private sector rent in the City in the first quarter of 2022 was £1,121 per month, which compared to around £600 per month which would be the Edinburgh living average mid-market rent. This would represent a saving of around £5,340 to a low-income household.

The vision for Silverlea was for a well-designed, energy efficient, sustainable and affordable housing. This would be set in high quality public realm and a place where people would choose to live, connected to the green space, as part of a community and for and that community to be integrated within existing neighborhood. The Council's Development and Regeneration Team had taken forward this development and took a holistic place-based approach to developing site, which supported wider regeneration and development of 20-minute neighborhoods. Development of the Silverlea Site would therefore deliver improvements beyond the site itself, including access to open space, new facilities (as they had heard for Craigmyle Community Youth Football Club) and new active travel infrastructure. They were also seeking to take forward investment in existing homes and estates, in the adjacent development. She thought the works had already been referenced, where they were taking forward whole house retrofit works to end the multistorey blocks adjacent to the site. This would be addressing fuel poverty and helping to deliver the ambitious energy efficiency standard for social housing.

The Silverlea Site, comprising the former Care Home and Riding School was transferred from the General Fund to the Council's Housing Revenue account, to develop affordable housing. In 2018, the former care home was demolished in preparation for the site to be developed and the Council appointed Cruden Building East as the main contractor to design and build the development. The proposed development of Silverlea would deliver affordable and accessible homes. 72 homes for social rent by the Council and 19 social rented homes that would be owned and managed by Blackwood. They were a registered social landlord that provided a range of accessible modern and bespoke housing, providing value to people with a range of disabilities and housing needs. The 19 Blackwood homes at Silverlea would be designed to their own bespoke standard which sought to deliver highly accessible wheelchair homes, making maximum use of digital technology so there would be smart, accessible homes. Four of the council homes would be leased to health and social care, to meet the needs of people with complex needs. They would require higher levels of care and support to be able to live in the community. 51 homes would be purchased by Edinburgh Living to let mid rented property to people on low incomes. Edinburgh Living was a limited liability partnership (LLP) that the Council established to own and manage mid-rent housing. It was 99% owned by the Council. Therefore, our partner in the LLP was Scottish Futures Trust whom own 1%. Therefore, it was a public sector, limited liability partnership. They had a senior management team drawn from officers and members and the corporate body

was formed of elected members and a director from the Scottish Futures Trust. They aimed to deliver low-cost mid rent housing to people on low incomes and their policy also prioritised people who were working homeless households on low incomes. In addition to housing, development of this site would provide a range of community benefits. In particular, they were looking to provide training opportunities for adults and young people, linked to the colleges and to improve access to improved sport and leisure facilities.

Eugene Mullan advised that he was the Director of Smith Scott Mullan Architects in Edinburgh. There had been a lot of information provided as part of an application in the planning report. He would focus on some of the more complicated aspects of the design, to ensure that they were fully understood. The topics to be covered, other than the 20-minute neighborhood, consultation process, site context, trees, greenbelt design proposals, accessibility and sustainability. The 20-minute neighbourhood meant creating places where daily services could be easily accessed. The site in question was an 800-meter zone around that and about a 10 minute's walk. In this area, there were primary schools, medical centres, community facilities, local shops and public parks within a 10-minute walking area. They were retaining and enhancing the current pedestrian cycle connection, which was Muirhouse Parkway to Marine Drive at the north side. There was also easy access to the bus routes along Muirhouse Parkway. It was also important to note the scale of the green belt that existed north of the site.

The pre-application consultation took place online during COVID-19 restrictions and was in accordance with the Scottish Government guidelines. There was a public notice advertisement in the Edinburgh Evening News, papers were displayed at Craigmoynton High School and the Muirhouse Salveson Community Council notice board, which was adjacent to the site. There was approximately a thousand leaflets distributed within the local community in the area of Salveson Muirhouse, Pennywell and Granton. It targeted social media posts, including Facebook, Twitter and Next Door and there was a presentation to the Improving Your House and Penny Well group. The dedicated website showing exhibition boards with outline design proposals from members of the client and design team were available for an online Q&A. Comments were received through the different communication channels. The design proposals were changed to reflect some of those comments received, such as a six-storey flats on Muirhouse Parkway being reduced to four-storey.

In relation to the context, the photograph displayed was taken in 2000 and showed the Care Home, Craigmoynton Football Club and the riding arena. Another photograph showed the site in 2009, where the Care Home was still standing, but other areas had been demolished. This illustrated that some sections of the site had mature landscaping, particularly along Muirhouse Parkway, the west boundary with Silverknowes Golf Course and to the centre of the site. Other areas of the site of the remainder of the demolition were derelict and unkempt, with a makeshift area of car parking. This was very much a brownfield site. In relation to the site investigation, contamination was found in various parts with some of a more serious nature. There was a larger area described as Mid Ground which needed to be treated like contaminated ground and there was also contaminated ground within the Green Belt

area. All the contamination would be remediated as part of the development and removing risk to the public.

A comprehensive tree survey had been carried out. The main points of that was that many of the trees were of poor quality and self-seeded. There were 77 trees, tagged and named as part of that report and given the categories of A, B and C. The plan showed the trees that were to be retained or moved. That was proposed to improve access and provide opportunities for development. The report also showed low quality tree and planting groups. The ecology report which was carried out, did not identify any protected species within the site. There was an Arboricultural Impact Assessment carried out, based on the design proposals, which provided independent recommendations in relation to design, removal and construction works. The key points from this, was that the assessment included the consideration of the 20-year growth. The trees that were to be removed of the smaller subservient nature, relative to the retained neighbours and the removal of the trees, would not have a negative effect on the retained trees. There was also a tree protection plan prepared, to ensure that construction works would not damage the trees being retained. This included clearly defined construction exclusion zones and would ensure that those retained trees would not be damaged.

In relation to the Green Belt, the Local Plan Development plan situation was complicated, there was a significant area of green belt to the west and north of the site. Part of the site was within the current Green Belt boundary and part of it was in the area of site allocated for housing in the City Plan 2030. On the diagram being displayed, there was also designated open space area within the Local Development Plan. The boundary of the new housing was to the rear of the Salvesen housing. This area (being described) and the area of green belt they were developing as partially contaminated ground and of low environmental quality. The remaining area would be significantly improved accessible open space for existing and new residents. The design would not negatively affect the biodiversity of the site, the green network, or the edges of the Green Belt. There were detailed discussions as part of the pre-application process to agree the appropriate response to the Site Designation, in this respect. They had prepared this image which was located within the Green Belt area.

Looking back at the development it was important to note the variety of buildings that were being proposed. Also, the houses faced onto the space and there would be gables with front doors and windows. It would be an area that was overlooked and an area the provided street lighting. In relation to the site proposals, there was a variety of homes and buildings, with a variety of height and form. The entrance to the site of Muirhouse Parkway had been subject to a transport assessment which confirmed that the proposals were acceptable. The housing was gathered around the central open space and provided the opportunity to relocate and provide new facilities for the football club. It was anticipated that the vehicle access for the new football club would be from Marine Drive.

In relation to the landscape, it was very much a landscape-led solution. Buildings were set back from the trees along Muirhouse Parkway, the buildings were kept away from the trees and to the west. The new public landscape square and children's play area

was located around a group of mature trees to the centre of the site. The existing stone wall was retained and extended to the front of the site. A new pedestrian access route would be created through the site. Approximately 120 new trees and 4,500 new plants would be planted as part of the development which would include significant improvements to the quality of the green belt. A photograph showed the view taken along Muirhouse Parkway. The view west, showed the way the buildings were set back from the existing tree line.

This design actively promoted accessible neighborhoods. All the homes were designed for varying needs general. 17 had been designed for wheelchair users, 19 of those were homes for the Blackwood Group and four for the CEC affordable housing section. A description was given of the location of the Blackwood Housing and the housing for social care residents with complex needs. There were nine parking spaces for wheelchair users and storage areas for mobility scooters. The requirements for health and social care accommodation and Blackwood Homes were difficult to incorporate into developments, because of their scale and that they did not stand alone very easily. Therefore, it was a very positive development that these had been incorporated into the brief and the design. This was a fabric first approach to the design of the buildings with its highly insulated airtight triple glazed approach. There was a blue-green panel solar roofs that provided sustainable drainage, increased biodiversity and included integrated PV and solar panels, which would generate renewable energy on the site. The zero carbon heating system involved individual exhaust air source heat pumps located inside the homes and an underground refuse system, to deal with recycling and waste. There would also be 280 secure cycle parking spaces. The image displayed was a view from Muirhouse Parkway and gave that sense of mature landscaping. It was in the centre of the site and the way in which the buildings had been designed would reflect and incorporate that. They believed that this design proposal would create a high quality area of desirable, affordable homes, while retaining and enhancing the best aspects of the existing site.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 10th August 2022 at 2:00pm - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

Decision

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

- 1) The conditions, reasons and informatives and a legal agreement or Memorandum of Understanding as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) An additional informative that prior to the commencement of works on site, further details of the cycle parking will be provided for approval by the Planning Authority. For the Avoidance of doubt, the cycle parking will contain a higher proportion of single tier racks to comply with Council guidance.

(References – Development Management Sub-Committee of 9 February 2022 (item 2) and 12th of January 2022 (item 3); 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>6.1 – 14 Muirhouse Parkway (Silverlea Old Peoples Home) – application no. 21/05056/FUL</p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Chief Executive</p>	<p>To note the protocol note.</p>
<p>6.2 – 14 Muirhouse Parkway (Silverlea Old Peoples Home), Edinburgh</p>	<p>Proposed residential development comprising 142 flats including colonies with associated roads, parking and greenspace - application no. 21/05056/FUL - report by the Chief Planning Officer</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The conditions, reasons and informatives and a legal agreement or Memorandum of Understanding as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer. 2) An additional informative that prior to the commencement of works on site, further details of the cycle parking will be provided for approval by the Planning Authority. For the Avoidance of doubt, the cycle parking will contain a higher proportion of single tier racks to comply with Council guidance.