

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00am, Wednesday 21 September 2022

Present:

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

1. Minutes

Decision

- 1) To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 10 August 2022 as a correct record.
- 2) To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 17 August 2022 as a correct record.
- 3) To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 24 August as a correct record.

2. General Applications and Miscellaneous Business

The Sub-Committee considered reports on planning applications listed in sections 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the agenda for this meeting.

Requests for a Presentation:

Councillor Beal requested a presentation on item 4.1 – Report for forthcoming application by Scottish Widows Unit Trust Managers Ltd. for Proposal of Application Notice at 15 Dalkeith Road, Edinburgh - application no. 22/02659/PAN.

Decision

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

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

3. 17 Mcleod Street (Former Tynecastle High School), Edinburgh

The Chief Planning Officer had identified three linked applications to be dealt with by means of a hearing: 1) planning permission for the partial demolition, change of use and new build to form student residential development and community facilities with associated infrastructure,

landscaping, and access (as amended) at 17 McLeod Street (Former Tynecastle High School), Edinburgh - application no. 21/04469/FUL; 2) Planning permission for alterations to land to provide landscaping and planting beds as part of a community garden at 17 McLeod Street (Former Tynecastle High School - application no. 21/05152/FUL; and 3) Listed building consent for selective demolitions to enable adaptation of original school building to long-term future use including preservation of essential special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and its setting (as amended) at 17 McLeod Street (Former Tynecastle High School - application no. 21/04468/LBC.

(a) (i) Report by the Chief Planning Officer - application no. 21/04469/FUL

The application proposed the redevelopment of the site to provide a development of 100% student accommodation which totalled 468 bedspaces. A range of cluster and studio apartments would be provided.

The proposals were split into a number of different elements as follows:

- redevelopment of the original Tynecastle High school to provide student accommodation;
- demolition of the later additions and workshop buildings and the development of new student accommodation blocks;
- development of a new community space within the ground floor of the new northern block 284 square metres and
- redevelopment of the central space to provide amenity space and planting.

A total of 468 student beds will be provided split between 87 studios and 381 cluster bed spaces.

Tynecastle High School

The original building and early extensions to the eastern range, including the Janitor's House, would be retained. The following key external alterations were proposed:

- demolish the extension to the west wing and modern classroom extensions to the rear;
- carry out remedial works to the elevations affected by the proposed demolitions (described below) and install traditional and contemporary style window and door openings in restored sections;
- erect two brick/glazed stair extensions on the rear elevation and form connecting door openings from four existing windows;
- remove the existing rooflight on the rear roof pitch and slate the roof to match the original finish;
- remove a section of the existing railings and plinths at the south end of McLeod Street to form gated vehicular access to a new sub-station and
- remove the existing vehicular and pedestrian gates and a stone wall at the north end of the main school building to form new vehicular and pedestrian accesses.

Demolitions

The workshop ranges, including the single-storey extension to the western block and the modern blocks to the rear (classrooms extension, Games Hall and Dining Hall and Kitchen) would be demolished.

New Buildings

The proposed new blocks of student accommodation would extend along the northern (block C) and western boundaries (block B) of the site with a section towards the centre of the site. Block B would range from 4 storeys to 6 storeys high. Block C will range from 4 storeys at the eastern end of the site to 7 storeys at the western end of the site. Within the ground floor of each of the blocks a range of student amenity facilities were proposed including a gym, cinema and large breakout spaces facing onto the central landscaped area.

A community facility was proposed within the ground floor of Block C with direct access and facing towards McLeod Street. This facility would have an approximate floor area of 238 square metres and would include meeting rooms.

No provision was provided within the site for car parking. Delivery/servicing access would be provided from a controlled access to the north of the site on to McLeod Street. Cycle parking would be provided in a range of locations across the site with dedicated cycle storage for each block.

Scheme 1

The original application proposed the demolition of the Janitor's House on the eastern section of the main school building.

An associated application for listed building consent had been submitted for the external and internal alterations to the listed buildings and demolition of listed curtilage buildings (application number 22/00671/LBC).

Supporting Information

- Pre-application Consultation Report;
- Planning Statement and Addendum;
- Heritage Statement;
- Design and Access Statement and Addendum;
- Transport Statement;
- Archaeology Assessment;
- Ecology/ Bat Survey;
- Sustainability Statement, Sustainability Design File Note and Sustainability Form S1;
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment and Daylight Addendum;
- Noise Impact Assessment and Addendum;
- Air Quality Assessment;
- Desktop Ground Investigation Report;
- Light Pollution Assessment ;
- Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) Report;
- Flood Risk Impact Assessment;
- Economic Impact Report and Addendum; and
- Surface Water Management Plan.

(ii) Report by Chief Planning Officer - application no. 21/05152/FUL

The application proposed the development of an urban farm on land adjacent to the former Tynecastle School.

The proposals would include the formation of growing areas, an orchard, greenhouses and storage shed.

Pedestrian access would be provided to the south of the site. Limited vehicle access would be provided to the north as required.

The removal of the buildings located on the eastern section of the site were considered separately under application 21/04468/LBC.

Supporting Information:

No information submitted in support of the application.

(iii) Report by Chief Planning Officer - application no. 21/04468/LBC

The application proposed the redevelopment of the site to provide a development of student accommodation. The associated works that required listed building consent comprised the following: –

- alteration, extension and refurbishment of the original Tynecastle High School to provide student accommodation;
- demolition of the early classroom extension to the west wing and separate workshop buildings on the northern and eastern edges of the site.

The proposed new student accommodation blocks and associated hard and soft landscaping formed part of the associated application for planning permission

Tynecastle High School

The original building and early extensions to the eastern range, including the Janitor's House, would be retained. The following key alterations were proposed:

External

- demolish the extension to the west wing and modern classroom extensions to the rear;
- carry out remedial works to the elevations affected by the proposed demolitions (described below) and install traditional and contemporary style window and door openings in restored sections;
- erect two brick/glazed stair extensions on the rear elevation and form connecting door openings from four existing windows;
- remove the existing rooflight on the rear roof pitch and slate the roof to match the original finish;
- fit existing windows with double glazing and replace original windows in poor condition with double-glazed versions to match the existing profiles and materials;
- remove a section of the existing railings and plinths at the south end of McLeod to form gated vehicular access to a new sub-station; and
- remove the existing vehicular and pedestrian gates and a stone wall at the north end of the main school building to form new vehicular and pedestrian accesses.

Internal

- remove selected walls and sections of walls within the original school building and Assembly Hall and erect new partitions to form student bedrooms, kitchen/lounges, a meeting room, reception area and stores;
- remove the majority of the existing walls and stairs within the Janitor's House and adjoining classroom extension and erect new partitions and stairs to form student accommodation;

Scheme 1

The original application proposed the demolition of the Janitor's House on the eastern section of the main school building.

Supporting Information

- Heritage Statement;
- Planning Statement; and
- Design and Access Statement

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 21st September 2022 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(b) Gorgie and Dalry Community Council

Mathew Reilly and Alex McKendrick addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Gorgie and Dalry Community Council:

Mr Reilly advised that the Community Council were opposed to this application. They had undertaken an online-survey and received 116 responses. 43% of respondents wanted mixed use, 19% wanted purpose-built student accommodation. 87% were opposed to the proposals, 9% supporting and 4% were undecided. The need to prioritise affordable housing was the biggest reason cited for opposition to the proposals. 85% thought there would be an excessive concentration of student accommodation that would be detrimental to diverse communities and 65% thought there would be pressure on local infrastructure.

Mr McKendrick advised that the single use proposals would be unsustainable and detrimental to the community. They would be contrary to LDP Policy Des 4 on flexible use, LDP Policy Env 22 on noise pollution and LDP Policy Hou 8 on the excessive concentration of students. The proposals would also expose students to pollution. Student population in Gorgie was 20% percent in 2011, but this had greatly increased. Moreover, students were a transient community and this could cause problems for the area. The Community Council welcomed the retention of the High School building and the attempts to improve certain aspects for the community. However, there was a need to provide new affordable housing and not just student accommodation.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 21st September 2022 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(c) Living Rent Gorgie/Dalry Branch

Aditi Jehangir addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Living Rent Gorgie/Dalry Branch. Ms Jehangir advised that Living Rent was opposed to the proposals as more student accommodation was unnecessary. The Environmental Report stated that this site was not suitable for any accommodation. Therefore, this should include students. Regarding the community views, over the last decade, there had been a doubling of population, but only 100 new homes had been built. There was discontent at both the failure to provide affordable and the lack of meaningful engagement. Local services were at full capacity and more student accommodation would only exacerbate this. Everyone, including students, should have a suitable accommodation. In conclusion, local people were fed up of being ignored and the members should listen to them. If the site was unsafe, then it was unsafe for student accommodation, but if it was safe, then there should be residential housing provided.

The presentation can be viewed in full via the link below

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 21st September 2022 at 10:00am - City of Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(d) People Know How

Tanya Anderson addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of People Know How. Ms Anderson advised that she knew this area very well. Her organization undertook charitable work, created spaces in local communities and encouraged collaborative development. They provided a positive transition service from primary to secondary school and also believed that social inclusion was linked to digital inclusion and had launched a digital service. Most of their volunteers came from connections with Universities and Colleges. Operating directly within student accommodation demonstrated the benefit to their organization and for students. If the proposals were approved, they would operate a community space in the building and would provide digital support. They looked forward to working with S1 Development on this project should the development be approved.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 21st September 2022 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(e) Love Gorgie (Gorgie Farm)

Lynn Black addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Love Gorgie. Ms Black advised that Love Gorgie was greatly involved with the local community. The proposals were obviously controversial, however, S1 Developments had engaged with them and their proposals would benefit the community. This would greatly help with the work of Love Gorgie, which included support for vulnerable children and adults, as well as providing activities for young people and developing the farm as a

therapeutic resource. S1 wanted a strong community focus for the project and a new facility would be provided for multiple charities. If approved, the development would include a community garden, which would deliver environmental programmes and combat food poverty. Students would be crucial to this plan. Members should consider the overall potential community benefit when they made their decision.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 21st September 2022 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(f) Ward Councillors

Councillors Denis Dixon and Ross McKenzie addressed the Sub-Committee as members for the Sighthill/Gorgie Ward.

Councillor Dixon advised that he wanted to support these proposals. Because of its close proximity to the nearby industrial site, this site did not lend itself to long term occupation. The site and the buildings over the years had decayed. The developer proposed new student accommodation and he thought that this was the best way forward. In the past, there were examples of developers being refused applications and the land had stayed vacant, such as the proposals for the Royal High School and the nearby Scotmid Site, and he did not want this to happen with this site at Mcleod Street. This was an opportunity to bring new people in and enhance the area. The Sub-Committee should approve this application and bring this area back to life.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 21st September 2022 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

Councillor McKenzie advised that there was very strong opposition to the proposals from the local community, which had not been given proper consideration. He wanted to challenge the narrative given of the history of the site, which had stayed dormant for 15 years for various reasons. The proposals would contravene LDP Policy Des 5 in relation to industrial noise and LDP Policy Hou 8 on student accommodation. According to the impact assessment, there was no distinction between residential and student accommodation. Environmental Protection advised that the application should be refused. If members approved this application, then they would be accepting that students were less deserving of the same level of environmental protection as the rest of society. Therefore, they should refuse this application.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 21st September 2022 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(g) Councillor Fullerton (Sighthill/Gorgie Ward) had submitted written statement, which was circulated to members.

Councillor Fullerton advised that she would like to support the planning

applications. This school had lain moribund for far too many years and was an excellent site for such a development and would bring community benefits too through the delivery of community space for charity People Know How and a garden managed by LOVE Gorgie Farm. She understood that there was evidence that the demand outweighed the supply of student accommodation in Edinburgh and this site had excellent travel routes to the various Colleges and Universities in Edinburgh. The constraints of the site, such as the location of the North British Distillery and Western Approach also meant that student accommodation would be a better use of this site than residential housing and would also ensure the careful restoration and repair of the Category B listed school building. In addition, and importantly, the development would boost the local economy of Gorgie and Dalry which was of great importance to her having lived in both Gorgie and Dalry and still shopped there regularly.

(h) Applicant and Applicant's Agent

Dan Teague and Luke McClelland (S1 Developments) and Steven Black (Planning Consultant of JLL) were heard in support of the application.

Dan Teague advised that he was the Owner and Director of S1 Developments. Mr Teague indicated that S1 was a family company based in Edinburgh with 15 years of experience, delivering high quality residential developments in Edinburgh. He illustrated some of the more recognisable developments they had undertaken around the city. This included Horne Terrace, Malta Terrace in Stockbridge and Ellerslie Road, which was the old Scottish and Newcastle site, and they had developed most of Ellerslie Road and the Rope Works Development in Salamander Place. They were primarily an opportunity-based developer and main contractor, which meant that they purchased largely brownfield constrained sites because they were the ones that they could compete for against the major housebuilders, who took greenfield sites that were easy to develop.

At present, they were on site with 3 residential developments, this included another site on the Union Canal, which was for 46 apartments features 25 percent on-site affordable housing, which would be Link Housing Association. There was also a small site in West Lothian of six units that would go to site, probably later in the year. Additionally, there was also the Rope Works Developments. This was a large 16-acre brown field site that they had developed of about 350 affordable homes on the site and about 320 private homes. They had managed to deliver all of those in the last five years, which for a family-owned company was a tremendous output, but it also showed the amount of affordable housing they were putting into the city. For some sites, they had to clear the site entirely which made it a lot easier to deliver residential housing. There was also a proposed development in St Andrews, which would be one of their first developments outside Edinburgh. It would be an expansion to the town centre in St Andrews and it would deliver high quality residential housing.

Everything they undertook was of quality. They had completed two student developments in the past 15 years, which was less than 5% of all the projects that they had taken on and they tended to carry out two or three developments per year. Additionally, they completed work on Pentland House in Chesser, which was 338 beds which they delivered for Edinburgh University. More recently, they completed work on a

site on Gilmore Place, which was listed building constrained, where they created a collegiate style courtyard with some high-quality sandstone and for the new buildings at the rear. Also, they converted the Chapel into communal space. They wanted to focus on the communal space. Within any student development, that was the key, as if students were going to live in a purpose-built student accommodation, they would have a small bedroom which was perfect with its storage solutions, but the key was mixing with other students, and this sort of space was ideal. There was also the same development at Gilmore Place which had just completely transformed the Old Nunnery and given that building a whole new lease of life. S1 were primarily residential developers. Edinburgh University had stated that the Gilmore Place development was the highest quality student residential they had in their portfolio. S1 certainly did not believe that students were second class citizens. At Tynecastle, they were trying to create high quality student development.

Finally, they were not speculators in land, they were developers, but were also the main contractor. As a family business, they built the sites that they bought and developed. That allowed them to retain the quality, to avoid arguments with contractors, which meant there would be a race to the bottom in terms of quality and result in a slower delivery. When on site, they were fast in delivery, the housing they delivered was well regarded throughout Edinburgh and they would continue to purchase sovereign development sites. Their first choice would always be to undertake residential accommodation. They considered themselves to be residential developers, it was just the case that the circumstances of some sites lent themselves to purpose-built student accommodation. This was an important development for the city and would provide economic benefits.

Luke McClelland advised that he was Project Manager for the Tynecastle Site. Mr McClelland indicated that a narrative was required about how they had reached the decision to provide a student development. There had been a number of views from consultants and from statutory consultees, all of them were relevant and all of these they had considered. It was important to state that they did not purchase this site with a view to putting student housing on it. They purchased it with an open mind about providing a housing mix or student accommodation. But when the secrets of the site had been revealed, they came to this conclusion to provide student accommodation and he would set out exactly how they arrived at that point. They purchased the site in March last year and it was apparent that it was constrained. The Project Summary provided an outline of how the constraints would be addressed and how the development would proceed.

Old Tynecastle High School

Project Summary

On 20/05/22 Tynecastle Teague submitted an updated planning application for the redevelopment of the Old Tynecastle High School site into student accommodation. This note had been prepared as a concise summary of the supporting material and a list of primary drivers for the chosen form of development. Their aim was to deliver a high quality and sustainable scheme that was compatible with the neighbouring uses and benefits the local community.

The development was impacted by a number of specific site constraints:

1. Sensitive neighbouring uses in the form of North British Distillery and Tynecastle Stadium
2. Proximity to the Western Approach Road increased noise and air quality issues
3. HSE Consultation Zone restricted residential development on western boundary
4. Existing sewer ran through the middle of the site with an associated 'no-build' zone
5. Poor condition and difficulty to convert the existing Category B Listed school building

They had consulted extensively with local representatives to develop a number of key community benefits:

1. Inclusion of a 2,734sqft community space to be operated by 'People Know How', a Scottish social innovation charity with existing ties to Tynecastle School
2. An 18,298sqft Urban Farm space to be operated by LOVE Gorgie Farm
3. Biggar Economics had reported on positive economic impacts including:
 - job creation and associated spending from the development.
 - increased spending from student population.
 - increased council tax revenue from 180 properties freed up for family homes.
4. NBD and Hearts supported student use as compatible with their own operations.

The proposed development had a strong focus on sustainability, including:

- Increased biodiversity with 40% increase in green space across the site including extensive green roofs.
- Fully electric heating via air source heat pumps.
- Car free development.
- 100% cycle provision (with potential links to proposed Roseburn to Union Canal cycle path).
- Adaptive reuse of the existing school building and school hall.
- Focus on circular economy through re-use of existing materials

Their considered approach to the heritage of the site included:

- The careful restoration and repair of the original Category B Listed school building. The single aspect cellular layout of the existing building works for student conversion without extensive alterations to the existing fabric. This would not be the case for other uses.
- Key internal features, such as the grand atrium and staircase, would be restored to their former glory.
- The repurposing of existing school hall as a high-quality central amenity hub.
- The historic setting of the original school building was preserved through the reinstatement of the original courtyard arrangement and the reduced heights of the new blocks closest to it.

Biggar Economics had produced a report outlining student demand in the local area:

- The student population in Edinburgh was rising by 3% each year.

- The total student population of the Gorgie/Dalry Community Council Ward boundary was currently 2,260 (15% of the area's total population), of which 669 were in PBSA; and 1,591 were in non PBSA residences.
- This meant that more than 70% of the students within the Gorgie Community Council Area were currently living within open market housing stock.
- Should all proposed PBSA in the Community Council area be built, the total student population would be 3,320 which would account for 20% of the area's population. This figure sat well below a level where the Council would consider the concentration to be excessive.
- As it stood, 35,575 (64.69%) of Edinburgh students must obtain accommodation outside PBSA and this shortfall puts pressure on traditional housing stock.
- The Biggar Economics Report identified that PBSA was effective in reducing impact on traditional housing stock, and also estimated that the development could release 180 properties back to the housing market.

A high quality scheme that exceeded amenity standards on other award-winning and recently consented PBSA:

- The design was centred around a high quality collegiate-style courtyard, with landscaping accounting for more than 65% of the total site area.
- The courtyard provided a communal amenity space that could be sheltered from the surrounding noise constraints by the proposed new blocks.
- External amenity provision was 8.26 sqm/student, more than five times the provision at the consented Westfield Road development in Dalry.
- Internal amenity provision was 2.05 sqm/student, more than double the provision at Westfield Road.
- Robust high-quality materials were proposed, with a palette sympathetic to the existing buildings.

To conclude, S1 recognised the issues in front of the Committee. There was a massive issue in Edinburgh with affordable housing, and student housing was an incredibly emotive subject. He understood the concerns of Living Rent and Gorgie Dalry Community Council. S1 had looked at this site in isolation, they had considered the statistics provided by the Council and had taken the advice from or environmental consultants. That was how they had reached this conclusion and had tried very hard to make it the best student development possible on the site. They believed that not having balconies, private gardens, or being able to open a window was an issue for private housing, but it was something that could be mitigated through communal living in student housing. He thought that was the crux of the argument. Additionally, there would be single operator which was the other important point. S1 looked at each site in its own merits and their development history provided very clear evidence of a willingness to provide good quality affordable housing where possible. They had worked hard to create a sustainable scheme that benefited the local economy, safeguarded an important heritage asset and provided much needed community space for two established organisations. S1 would continue to provide good quality private and affordable residential housing on other sites, which did not have these site-specific constraints.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday, 21st September 2022 at 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

17 Mcleod Street (Former Tynecastle High School), Edinburgh (application no. 21/04469/FUL)

Motion

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor McNeese-Mechan.

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposal was contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Hou 1 (paragraph 1D), Hou 8 and Des 5 (paragraph A).

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Gardiner.

Voting

For the motion: - 4 votes

For the amendment: - 5 votes

Abstentions: - 1

(For the motion: Councillors Beal, Cameron, McNeese-Mechan and Osler

For the amendment: Councillors Booth, Dalgleish, Gardiner, Hyslop and Jones

Abstentions: Councillor Mowat)

Decision 1

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposal was contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Hou 1 (paragraph 1D), Hou 8 and Des 5 (paragraph A).

17 Mcleod Street (Former Tynecastle High School), Edinburgh (application no. 21/05152/FUL)

Decision 2

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to the informatives set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

17 Mcleod Street (Former Tynecastle High School), Edinburgh (application no. 21/04468/LBC)

Decision 3

To **REFUSE** listed building consent as the proposed development was contrary to HES's guidance on the "Use and Adaptation of Listed Buildings" as the proposals involved the removal, or demolition, of parts of a listed building and an appropriate scheme which would enable the significant parts of a listed building to be retained had not been agreed.

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

Appendix

| Agenda Item No. / Address | Details of Proposal/Reference No | Decision |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Note: Detailed conditions/reasons for the following decisions are contained in the statutory planning register.</p> | | |
| <p>4.1 - Report for forthcoming application by Scottish Widows Unit Trust Managers Ltd. for Proposal of Application Notice at 15 Dalkeith Road, Edinburgh, EH16 5BH</p> | <p>The selective demolition, adaptation, extension and upgrading of a Class 4 office building, demolition of car park and ancillary buildings, and the proposed development of standalone residential accommodation with associated landscaping, parking and infrastructure – application no. 22/02659/PAN</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To note the key issues at this stage. 2) To note that forthcoming development should address issues of energy rating and sustainability as buildings from the 1970s tended not to have good energy ratings. 3) To note that energy policy should be embodied in new structures and planning officers should consider the impact on the integrity of a building when parts of the building were removed. |
| <p>4.2 - 58 Gogarloch Road (Land 39 metres west of), South Gyle</p> | <p>Erection of a new dwelling - application no. 22/02375/FUL - Report by the Chief Planning Officer</p> | <p>To REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p> |
| <p>4.3 - 43 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh</p> | <p>Construct new residential mews incorporating part of existing boundary wall – application no. 22/01348/FUL</p> | <p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p> |
| <p>4.4 – 43 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh</p> | <p>Alter existing boundary wall to incorporate it into new residential mews building - application no. 22/01345/LBC</p> | <p>To GRANT listed building consent subject to the informatives set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p> |

| Agenda Item No. / Address | Details of Proposal/Reference No | Decision |
|--|---|--|
| <p>4.5 - 98 Ocean Drive (Ocean Terminal), Edinburgh</p> | <p>Part demolition of existing shopping centre, remodelling and re-facing of facade to provide reconfigured commercial units (Class 1/2/3) at ground floor level, reconfigured visitor attraction space (Class 10) and potential co-working office space (Class 4), commercial units (Class 1/2/3) and/or leisure uses (Class 11) on upper floors, relocation of access bridge to Royal Yacht Britannia, temporary landscaping on the cleared site, and associated works - application no. 22/01372/FUL</p> | <p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p> |
| <p>5.1 - 126 - 130 Raeburn Place, Edinburgh</p> | <p>Section 42 Application seeking variation to condition No.9 of Planning Permission 12/03567/FUL, to allow the use of acoustic glazing on the elevation fronting onto Comely Bank Road - application no. 21/01222/FUL</p> | <p>To AGREE to a further one-month extension to the period to conclude the legal agreement which will enable the planning permission to be released for this application.</p> |
| <p>5.2 - Scotstoun Avenue (at Former Agilent Technologies)South Queensferry</p> | <p>Residential development comprising 16 flats with associated car and cycle parking, infrastructure and landscaping (as amended) - application no. 21/00518/FUL</p> | <p>To REFUSE planning permission as the applicant has failed to secure an appropriate legal agreement within the specified period. It is recommended that the application be refused on the basis that the appropriate infrastructure to mitigate the development has not been provided contrary to policies DEL 1 and HOU 6 of the Edinburgh Local Development Plan.</p> |

| Agenda Item No. / Address | Details of Proposal/Reference No | Decision |
|--|---|--|
| <p><u>6.1 - 17 Mcleod Street (Former Tynecastle High School), Edinburgh -</u> application nos. 21/04469/FUL, 21/05152/FUL and 21/04468/LBC</p> | <p>Protocol Note by the Chief Executive</p> | <p>To note the protocol note.</p> |
| <p><u>6.2 - 17 Mcleod Street (Former Tynecastle High School), Edinburgh</u></p> | <p>Partial demolition, change of use and new build to form student residential development and community facilities with associated infrastructure, landscaping, and access (as amended) - application no. 21/04469/FUL</p> | <p>To REFUSE planning permission as the proposal was contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Hou 1 (paragraph 1D), Hou 8 and Des 5 (paragraph A). (On a division)</p> |
| <p><u>6.3 - 17 Mcleod Street (Former Tynecastle High School), Edinburgh</u></p> | <p>Proposed alterations to land to provide landscaping and planting beds as part of a community garden - application no. 21/05152/FUL</p> | <p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the informatives set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p> |
| <p><u>6.4 - 17 Mcleod Street (Former Tynecastle High School), Edinburgh</u></p> | <p>Selective demolitions to enable adaptation of original school building to long-term future use including preservation of essential special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and its setting (as amended)- application no. 21/04468/LBC</p> | <p>To REFUSE listed building consent as the proposed development was contrary to HES's guidance on the "Use and Adaptation of Listed Buildings" as the proposals involved the removal, or demolition, of parts of a listed building and an appropriate scheme which would enable the significant parts of a listed building to be retained had not been agreed.</p> |

| Agenda Item No. / Address | Details of Proposal/Reference No | Decision |
|--|--|--|
| <p><u>7.1 – St James Square (Proposed Festival Event Space at), Edinburgh</u></p> | <p>Erection of temporary structures and enclosures, including Spiegel tent and bar, and other associated works to facilitate use of St James Square as an external events space - application no. 22/02035/FUL</p> | <p>To REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p> |
| <p><u>8.1 - 30 Canaan Lane (land to rear of), Edinburgh</u></p> | <p>New dwelling and driveway (amendment to 18/04505/FUL) - application no. 21/05402/FUL</p> | <p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p> |