

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00am, Wednesday 15 March 2023

Present:

Councillors Osler (Convener), Beal, Booth, Cameron, Dalgleish, Gardiner, Hyslop, Jones, McNeese-Mechan, Mowat and O'Neill (items 4.1-4.5 and 6.1-6.4).

1. General Applications and Miscellaneous Business

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

Requests for a Presentation:

Councillor Booth requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.1 – 29C Blair Street, Edinburgh, application no. 22/04393/FUL.

Councillor Beal requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.6 - 13 Ravelston Park, Edinburgh, application no. 22/05474/FUL.

Councillor Booth requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.7 – 36 - 38 Yeaman Place, Edinburgh - application no. 22/04369/FUL.

Decision

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

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

2. 54 Rosslyn Crescent, Edinburgh

At its meeting of 11 January 2023, the Development Management Sub-Committee agreed to continue consideration of application 22/00745/FUL–54 Rosslyn Crescent, Edinburgh, to allow for a site visit and a hearing.

The application for planning permission was for the proposed conversion of bowling club and bowling green to residential dwelling and garden at 54 Rosslyn Crescent, Edinburgh - application no. – 22/00745/FUL.

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The application site comprised the former Tramways Bowling Club, including a bowling green and a single-storey clubhouse. The site was located within a residential area, with neighbouring properties to the north-west, south-east, and north-east of the boundary.

Private gardens of properties at Pilrig Heights were separated to the north of the site by a boundary wall and the neighbouring Pilrig Bowling Club is located at the north-east boundary.

The proposal was acceptable with regard to Section 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. The proposal complied with the Local Development Plan and associated guidance. The proposal was acceptable in principle, in terms of its impact on open space and on the conservation area. The proposal would provide adequate levels of amenity for future occupiers and would not adversely impact on neighbouring residential amenity. There were no material considerations that outweighed this conclusion.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 15 March 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(b) Leith Central Community Council

John Wilkinson addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Leith Central Community Council. Mr Wilkinson said that regarding the previous refusal, in 2021, the proposal to convert the Bowling Club and Green to a private house was contrary both to National Planning Policy Guidance 18 and the Edinburgh Development Plan. Bowling clubs were major open spaces for the city and should stay that way. The Council should develop a policy as to what should be done with them for the common good. Local Pilrig community groups had expressed their interest in giving new life to the former Bowling Club. The Pilrig Conservation Area was not subject to economic decline, so the proposed change of use was not justified. The proposal did not demonstrate that good residential environment could be achieved, being directly overlooked by adjacent properties and the proposals would not contribute to a sense of space. The proposal did not demonstrate that in the future, residents would have good amenity in relation to noise, daylight and sunlight. The applicant had not submitted an daylight analysis to say that minimum light would not be achieved in the proposed house. The building could only be accessed through a single door which seemed to fall out with the ownership of the applicant. Finally, if permission was granted, this would become a private residence and would set a precedence for all similar applications.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 15 March 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(c) Tramways Community Garden

Jennifer Broadley addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of the Tramways Community Garden. Ms Broadley stated that she was Chair of the Tramway Community Garden. Over 50 households had become members and hoped to transform this site into a community garden. They were willing to commit their own funds to the garden and had received help from various bodies, including the Development Trust Association. Council policy stated that when bowling clubs closed, the greens

would be repurposed for the benefit of the community. Ms Broadley stated the proposed development clearly contravened planning policies. The Chief Planning Officer had reviewed the application in line with NPF4, however, Ms Broadley argued his arguments were unconvincing. Policy 9 supported the re-use of empty buildings. However, the building had been open for use for the local community, but the Covid Pandemic had prevented use for over 2 years. The reference to Policy 15 was also misleading. This did not fit in with neighbourhood strategy. This was not an old bowling club and the Clubhouse was widely used for a range of activities. Ms Broadley stated the Planning Officer had a narrow view of this and approving this would go against Council policy and strategy. In this densely populated area, there was a need to preserve green spaces. Therefore, Mr Broadley recommended Committee should turn down this application and any further applications for the site.

(d) Representors or Consultees

Benjamin Twist indicated that he was speaking as a resident. There was concern that this application was not environmentally strong and was detrimental to the local community. It was not the case that the application complied with LDP Policy ENV18, or that it maintained community use. The practicalities of the proposals had not been thought through. One of the local groups was located over a mile away. Also, there was a lack of toilet provision and disabled access. The Committee seemed to accept the report written by Galbraiths, which was written for the applicants and was dated June 2022, long after the date for comments and there had been a lack of proper consultation. There was concern that the comments in support of the application provided inadequate reasons and tended not to be from local residents. Mr. Twist stated that most neighbours objected to the proposals. Leith Walk ward was already densely populated and there was a big waiting list for allotments. Mr. Twist advised he was in favour of dense city neighbourhoods, however, these had to be well planned and thought out. There was a need to meet net zero targets by 2030 which would be challenging. Mr. Twist concluded that although this application seemed to have green intentions, there was a lack of rigorous thinking, and this application should be refused.

Mary Blackford said that she had been a resident in this area for 11 years. The applicant had said they would involve other bodies, but these were red herrings. There was already a nursery in Stockbridge with an extensive garden which was close to Inverleith Park and the Botanic Gardens. There were other nurseries that were more local to this area. There had been no risk assessment either for the building or the garden. Similarly, there were plans for an adult on the site to welcome/supervise visitors to be given clearance by Disclosure Scotland, the site was full of trip hazards and lacked toilet and educational facilities. There was also a lack of fire doors and an overall lack of good access. The applicant did not specify how events would be organised and frequent use would need authorization. The Chief Planning Officer indicated that there would be increased footfall, the street was already congested and there would be few spaces left in the street. A local resident had received 30 Saplings from Woodland Trust but when these trees were offered to the applicant, they refused them. The rewilding proposal was worthy but fanciful. Other, more appropriate sites existed for this use and a community garden would be much better. None of the proposals were in tune with the National Planning Guidelines. The relationship between the owners and local groups could be

discontinued at any time by the owners. Ms. Blackford recommended the members should therefore refuse the application.

Terence Anthony indicated that two previous applications had been refused. Mr. Anthony suggested the Authority would not want to create a precedent or encourage more population density. Pilrig Park could not be used as a type of offset for the loss of this site. The club wanted his organization to take this over and there were other possible buyers and groups who were interested in using the club. Their attempts to take over did not take place. There were also issues regarding the turf, but nothing had been done to address this. The construction of a large house did not fit in with re-wilding and this was the worst location on the site for a residential dwelling. The Chief Officer's comments did not reflect this and this change to residential use had nothing to do with home start or re-wilding. This represented an opportunistic property development as the value of the property would probably quadruple, which amounted to profiteering. The applicant had received warnings of planning restrictions from various bodies, but they ignored them, and they did not work with the local community body. This proposal would be a highly profitable change of use and was not what was intended by NPF4. Mr. Anthony conclude the application was not sustainable, livable or productive and should therefore be refused.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 15 March 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(d) Applicants and Applicant's Agent

John Campbell (Abor Green) and Alan Farningham (Farnmac) were heard in support of the application.

John Campbell explained that he was a representative of Abor Green nursery. Some of the public may have visited the nursery. This was an outdoor nursery and effectively they carried out landscaping to be a productive garden to feed the nursery, recognising the opportunities for learning in terms of resources, and making it a desirable place to be.

Most of the parents that came were amazed at the abundance and beautiful space that was provided. The biggest aspect was for there to be more use of the tramways to Rosslyn Crescent Gardens. They used gardening as a good way to bring together parents and children. It was often the children that seemed to be educating the adults and currently, the adults did not have a huge amount of knowledge in terms of how to look after potential growing space that they may have access to themselves.

Effectively, Rosslyn Crescent Gardens was an opportunity for their organisation to take their expertise and proven experience of delivering a project like this. This would serve broader and potentially less skilled and equipped charities and organisations, that could take advantage of the gardens they could create. They were quite an engaged community within the nursery, one of the parents was an agronomist and there were a few landscape gardeners as well. That contributed to helping the climate as well as providing expertise and bodies on the ground to make things happen.

The benefit to his organisation was that they ran a sort of forest school program that would involve the staff and pupils going to the site. They had quite good ratios of 1 to 4, which was a very high staff to pupil ratio on outings. That was part of the policy of the nursery. They had identified that it was possible to get to the site within 30 minutes using public transport.

Some of the gardens that they had received were already in progress. Referring to the presentation, it was possible to see from some of the pictures some of the other projects that they had been working on. If one was to consider the plan for the community garden and the perennial system that ran around, the outside was effectively an almost edible ecosystem.

The perimeter was obviously going to look attractive both to the inhabitants and to the neighbours. It would provide food and other materials, such as flowers from February, through to first frost in October/November. It was also primarily a very low maintenance system once it was installed. Within a year or so, 90% of the labour involved would be simply harvesting the perennial crops, such as fruit and vegetables. This could be improved, in terms of potential annual raised growing beds, but that could be scaled back or increased as demand required. Food could be enjoyed within the community. Hopefully, there would be lots of surplus food and the capacity to cut flowers on and off site.

Alan Farningham spoke on behalf of Farnmac. By way of background, Mr. Farningham advised the Tramways Bowling Club officially closed its doors in 2019 and the property was sold by Lothian Buses to the applicants under open market by process, in December 2020. It was understood that there were 18 bids, but significantly, the applicant's bid was not the highest. The proposed garden ground was classified as open space in the Local Development Plan Proposals Map and was therefore required to be assessed against LDP Policy Env 18 (Open Space Protection). Now, in accordance with criterion A, there would be no adverse impact on the quality or character of the local environment by converting a disused bowling green to garden space and converting the vacant clubhouse to a residence. Any impact would be a positive one. Such an approach was also strongly supported by NPF4 Policy 9, which related to vacant and derelict land and empty buildings, which sought the sustainable re-use of vacant land and buildings.

With respect to criterion B, the site was of limited leisure value and there was good quality open space provision in the local area at Pilrig Park, as well as the neighbouring Pilrig Bowling Green on the site's north-eastern boundary. It complied with criterion C as there would be no loss to the biodiversity value of the site, changing from a disused and unmaintained bowling green to an active and growing garden space. It was consistent with NPF4 Policy 3 (biodiversity), which had not been referred to at this meeting or indeed in the Planning Officer's report, which sought to restore degraded habitats and buildings. This was also underpinned by NPF4 Policy 1, which sought to tackle the global climate crisis.

There would be a significant uplift to this site's biodiversity value, on account of its new, primarily garden use. The ability of the proposal to comply with the potential loss of protected open space was therefore contingent upon compliance with Criterion E, which stated that development must be for a community purpose and the benefits to the local community outweighed the loss. The current use of the site was vacant land with no community value, and this had been the case now for nearly four years. The lease arrangements which the applicants had signed with community groups, such as Homestart Edinburgh, a Leith-based group, a family gardening playgroup, Parent Meet-Up and Aborgreen Nursery, which was not locally based. But they were looking forward to making a local base here and therefore attracting participation from both the wider and local community. More recently, the applicants had signed a lease agreement with the Kin Collective Family Wellbeing, also a Leith-based community group, which was for an outdoor wellbeing and sensory play space for parents and families. These collectively provided community access for four mornings per week. The applicants would, however, also be open to having discussions with other local groups such as the Tramways Garden Group.

It was considered that on any balanced and objective interpretation, the proposal did not compromise the purpose and overall objectives of key Policy 18, Open Space Provision in the Local Development Plan. Furthermore, it did not prejudice the amenity of adjoining residential property. Indeed, if approved and implemented, the proposal would bring back into active use a site which had been vacant for four years, to the continued detriment of both the immediate environs and the wider surrounding Pilrig Conservation Area. There were also no technical objections to the proposal in respect of access, car parking or water and drainage issues, in what was a sustainable location that did not rely on the private car, with good access to the public, transport network and local facilities and services.

Mr. Farningham advised he saw no reason why the applicant could not accept an appropriately worded condition, or an appropriately worded clause or clauses in a Section 75 agreement that would make sure that the community use, which was an integral part of these proposals, was actually maintained in perpetuity.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 15 March 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(e) Ward Councillors Caldwell and Rae

Councillor Caldwell made a declaration of transparency, as he was a resident of the wider Pilrig area. Site history was relevant as several of the LDP Policies from 2016 touched in the social issues of the site. Constituents were concerned about the change of use and wanted to preserve open space and there was high local community engagement with this site. The report listed the site as being of limited leisure value at present. It said there was good quality open space provision in the local area and Pilrig park. This was contradictory to the statement later in the same section that stated it

would not be appropriate to improve an existing public Park or open spaces as Pilrig Park was 250 metres away. The point being that 250 metres was still local but not local enough to request developer input or a Section 75. This was already a very densely populated area and there was growing pressure on the park, with no actions to improve the park. As it stood, the park was extensively used as a leisure space and there were 4 major developments in this area in recent years. Local spaces needed to be protected. There was no mechanism for enforcing the agreement between the applicant and the two organisations. Therefore, it was uncertain that the Council was protecting open space, which should be the case. Councillor Caldwell said he hoped that further dialogue between the applicant and neighbours could help matters. LDP Policies Env 18 and Hou 5 were the crux of the matter and should receive consideration.

Councillor Rae stated that she did not have a lot to add as there had been substantial contributions already. This had been a complex process and a number of conversations had taken place. There would be a loss of an important green space for the community. This was the crux of the issue. As Leith Walk ward was a very densely populated area, green space was vital to the community, this was particularly evident during Covid. More building puts pressure on green space. With the bowling club, there was a lost opportunity to make a community bid. There was concern that the Authority would put a development in the green space, once they did this, then they would be creating a precedent for other bowling clubs. No one wanted to lose this green space and this should be given careful consideration as it was clearly not in the interest of wider community.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 15 March 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

Motion

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to

- 1) The conditions, reasons and informatives, as set out in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) An additional condition that details of the toilet facilities to be submitted and approved by the Council, as planning authority, and made available when the use was taken up.

Reason:

In order for the Chief Planning Officer to consider this matter in more detail.

- 3) Additional information that the applicant engaged in further dialogue with the local community, e.g. Tramways Community Garden and Leith Central Community Council, with regard to provision of community use and access.
- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Mowat.

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Env 18 (Open Space Protection) and Hou 10 (Community Facilities).

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Beal.

Voting

- For the motion: - 4 votes
- For the amendment: - 6 votes
- Abstention - 1 vote

(For the motion: Councillors Hyslop, McNeese-Mechan, Mowat and Osler.)

(For the amendment: Councillors Beal, Booth, Cameron, Dalgleish, Gardiner and O'Neill.)

(For the abstention: Councillor Jones.)

Decision

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Env 18 (Open Space Protection) and Hou 10 (Community Facilities).

(References – Development Management Sub-Committee of 11 January 2023 (item 3), the report by the Chief Planning Officer, submitted.)

3. 23 Yeaman Place, Edinburgh

At its meeting of 11 January 2023, the Development Management Sub-Committee agreed to continue consideration of application 22/03556/FUL - 23 Yeaman Place, Edinburgh, to allow for a site visit and a hearing.

The application for planning permission was for the proposed demolition of existing buildings and structures and erection of a purpose-built student accommodation development, with associated active travel routes, landscaping, cycle parking and other associated infrastructure, as amended at 23 Yeaman Place, Edinburgh, EH11 1BT - application no. – 22/03556/FUL.

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The proposal was for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site, and the construction of 148 studio flats, ancillary uses, and associated infrastructure and landscaping. The flats would be purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA), organised into four blocks of flats of between 3 and 5 storeys in height. Block 1 in the south east corner of the site was five storey in height while block 2 in the south west corner of the site was four storey in height. Blocks 3 and 4 which sat to the rear of tenements in Yeaman Place were predominantly three storeys in height with a step down to two storeys along their respective boundaries with properties in Murdoch Terrace and Yeaman Place. Two new access routes from the Union Canal towpath to Dundee Street, and to the southern end of Yeaman Place were proposed.

Ramped access to Yeaman Place would be facilitated by a path running under Block 1 from Yeaman Place into the centre of the site, and the access to Dundee Street from the towpath would pass through a central courtyard/amenity area. Amenity spaces would be provided, including three roof terraces, two enclosed courtyards, the central courtyard, and space by the canal, as well as internal amenity spaces.

Supporting Information

- Design and Access Statement (Revised)
- Planning Statement
- Waste Management Plan
- Surface Water Management Plan (Revised)
- Tree Survey
- Daylighting Study (Revised)
- Sustainability Statement
- Noise Impact Assessment (Revised)
 - Air Quality Impact Assessment
- Bat Roosting Potential Survey
- Bat Survey and Assessment
- Union Canal Wall Survey Letter
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment
- Heritage Assessment
- Transport Statement
- Materials Statement
- Landscaping Details Planting Tables
- Soil Volumes Arrangement
- Typical Soil Volume Buildups

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 15 March 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/webcasts/public-i.tv/development-management-sub-committee-wednesday-15-march-2023-1000am)

(b) Merchiston Community Council

Marianna Clyde addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Merchiston Community Council. Ms Clyde stated that Merchiston Community Council objected to the application. Their principal concerns were design quality, congestion, overdevelopment, and the impact on day light and sun light on neighbours' properties. Also, there were objections about the concentration of student housing in the area. Looking down Yeaman Place, on the left there was a fine tenement building. Elsewhere, the current set up was unpleasant, so it was hoped that any building there would be of sufficient design quality. One of facades facing onto Yeaman Place was somewhat bleak, there was a lack of fenestration. On the other side was a large amount of steel cladding. There was also a lack of fenestration and articulation, which also presented a bleak aspect. This was an area of high density and lack of garden space, with proposals for 148 student bed spaces. For the lower buildings, there would be a lack of privacy for students. These buildings were overlooked and cramped, with a lack of usable open space. Referring to lighting and the building opposite, according to the presentation in January, the lower residential buildings would lose a lot of light. The upper windows were also residential and would be impacted by loss of light. Additionally, the windows on first and ground floor would also be impacted by loss of daylight.

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

(c) Ward Councillors Cowdy, Walker and Key

Councillor Key indicated that wished to raise two points. When he first saw the proposals, he was delighted that there would be access from Yeaman Place to the Canal. But then the developers said that access would not be accessible but would include steps. He could not support the application on this basis as there should be an accessible through-route for everybody. When the planning application was lodged, there was stepped access, but many people in the community wanted accessibility for all. Councillor Key noted he was thankful the developers changed their mind and now there was ramped access in the proposal.

His second point was about the general application. If this was a residential application for social housing/affordable housing being built to rent, they would probably not be having a hearing. But that was not the case, it was a student housing project. If one was to consider this as a micro area around this application, to the South was the canal, to the north was Dundee Street, there was Yeamen to the West and Viewforth to the east. In this square, there were about four residential streets. There were already four student accommodation setups and they were now considering five, which would mean there would be more student blocks than residential blocks. So, he would ask the Committee that as there was a density issue in this case, they should be refusing it on that basis. He would also like the members to think about what was best for the site and what was best for Edinburgh.

Councillor Walker advised that she objected to this development. Fountainbridge was a lovely, vibrant area, with the Canal on one side, on the other side, Harrison Park, Dundee Street and on Lothian Road, the refurbished Kings Theatre. This was a traditional area, with a great deal going for it. The issue was the amount of student housing already in the area. Along the road, from the Lothian Road end, along Fountainbridge to the location of this site, a pedestrian would be passing four or five large blocks out of student accommodation. This was taking the heart out of the community. The relevant planning policies stated that the proposals would contribute to local living, but this development was the opposite of that, as in Fountainbridge, the student community did not engage much with the local community. New residents tended to use local shops, restaurants and amenities; however, her experience was that students visited the supermarkets only. The student population had a strong internal sense of community, rather than engaging with the wider Fountainbridge community. Therefore, the members should turn down this proposal.

Councillor Cowdy indicated that Yeamen Place had very particular characteristics that defined it from the surrounding streets of the area. It was a Breakers Yard in the middle of a residential area, it had a busy route for traffic and had a continuing problem with litter. There was also quite a lot of disrepair of stonework and ironmongery. This meant that there was room for improvement on this street and this was supported by the views of the residents. The residents from Yemen Place thought that the scrap yard had been

very noisy and disruptive, so any move away from this type of industrial use was welcomed, as was improved access to the canal. In respect of the appropriateness of student accommodation, whilst private residential would have been the preferred outcome, the general feeling was that adding to the current local mix of social housing, private housing with student housing, was a better outcome than the existing Breakers Yard. The main concern from Yeaman Place residents was the height of the two pods at the center of the site and how their height might diminish the privacy of the back rooms of Yemen tenement flats. Councillor Cowdy had also been attending Merchiston Community Council meetings and had discussions with their members. He thought that the development in principle would be beneficial to the street and the area, by improving local amenity and the main concern was privacy and overshadowing, but he hoped that his input would help the Committee to make a decision.

(d) Submission from Joanna Cherry MP

The Sub-Committee considered a written submission from Joanna Cherry MP who objected to the proposals. She indicated that the committee would have noted the large number of local objections to this application. This proposal should be rejected as it would further erode the local community in and around Yeaman Place and Fountainbridge.

Local people were not against any development on this site. They were however rightly concerned about yet another development of purpose-built student accommodation. Her main concern is that this proposal is not in line with Policy Hou 8 Student Accommodation.

From the presentation given by officers at the previous meeting of the Sub-Committee, she was surprised by the large radius drawn when analysing the density of student housing under the existing City of Edinburgh policy. It was important that there was diversity in the social composition of residents to create strong and sustainable communities. It was also necessary for residents to build an attachment to their surroundings and find a sense of permanence.

Approving this application would remove the site and prevent a more appropriate development which would support and enhance the local community. She urged the Committee to listen to the views of local residents and heed its own guidance to ensure that priority was given to the diversity, vibrancy and sustainability of the community in Fountainbridge.

(e) Applicants

Paul Scott (Scott Hobbs Planning) and Paul Harkin (Fletcher Joseph Architects) were heard in support of the application.

Paul Scott advised that he was a planning consultant on the project and Paul Harkin was from Fletcher Joseph Architects, the architects in the project. They welcomed the recommendation to approve this application and the very comprehensive and professional report, prepared by the planning officer recommending that the members approve this application, to deliver a historic new route from the Canal through this site to Dundee Street and up on to Yeaman Place.

Paul Harkin indicated that rather than go through the proposals again, in addition to the planning officer's comprehensive presentation, it was felt that the members could maybe gain further understanding of the proposals if he outlined the key principles which, brought them to this stage. The best way to do this was in a diagrammatic format.

Their initial appraisal of the site recognised that it presented a complex challenge of taking a long, narrow, site setting between the tenemental streets of Yeaman Place and Murdoch Terrace, and how that could be reconciled with prominent frontages to Yeaman Place and the Union Canal. Interrogation of the constraints and opportunities quickly revealed that there was one singular strategy which dominated their thoughts and largely informed the subsequent design process. This hinged on the identification of the three key access points to the site from Yeaman Place, Dundee Street and the Canal and the creation of active travel routes, which would link these connections throughout the site and to the wider connections along the canal and to the north.

The establishment of this route effectively defined three development zones, which were linked by two key areas of public realm, in the centre of the site and adjacent to the canal. The subsequent accommodation blocks were then laid out in response to this structure, to effectively channel movements through the site, via a series of lanes and the public community spaces. In respect of each of these prospective development zones, it was necessary to respond to a distinct set of circumstances and go through these individually.

The first one was the development zone adjacent to Yeaman Place at the at the end of the tenement, and this was possibly the most straightforward to address. They believed the extension of the established scale, wall and roof height of the existing tenements from the eastern edge of Yeaman Place was the most appropriate solution. This gave them the opportunity to finish the street elevation, as they always acknowledged the prominent corner which signaled the junction with the canal and Yeaman place. The key challenge, as they had discussed previously, was how to accommodate an accessible connection to the canal.

As the difference in the ground level was so significant at 3.00 metres, immediately at the south end of the site, that would have demanded a quite complicated practical arrangement of ramps and switchbacks, if they were relocating this immediately adjacent to the bridge. It was therefore thought that the introduction of a pedestrian pend, adjacent to the existing tenement, was the most appropriate solution, as the levels dropped down to this area. This meant they could accommodate the reduced levels with a more direct, accessible ramp, while still maintaining the wholistic, long street elevation and not fragmenting this. This view demonstrated that the scale of the building responded to both sides of the canal.

The response along the canal was informed by reconciling the scales and that building heights, Yeaman Place and Murdoch Terrace. This was as well as reflecting the established pattern of the gable frontage, which currently existed to the east, where the tenements on the Murdoch Terrace should be arranged perpendicular to the canal.

These principles again defined appropriate development zones they felt it was appropriate to build and which also would frame the safeguarded access point to the canal. The image referred to was really just to represent the use of the building's transitional scale, not just in Yeaman Place but along the canal as well.

The central section of the site was always expected to be on a lower scale, in deference to the height and existing tenements and recognition of the lower buildings, which originally occupied the site in its historical usage as Yeaman Lane. This informed a model which they felt would reflect the more muse-type character. The development zones were defined, firstly by prescribing a 45-degree line from the head of the boundary walls. Thereafter, the 25-degree line from the ground floor windows of the nearest affected habitable properties.

They also thought that the application of a reasonable privacy distance of 60 metres between new and existing windows was a reasonable application, as this was fairly common and typical of built-up city centre locations. This exceeded the existing difference across Yemen, Place and Murdoch Terrace. These rules then effectively defined the development zone for the internal blocks and informed the resulting three-storey arrangement along the centre of the site, dropping to the two stories, immediately adjacent to the boundary. The staggered arrangement on the plan of these two buildings also helped to define the central space central space, as well as shared the impact between the boundaries equally.

The three distinct development zones, therefore combined to create what they thought was a coherent and legible site layout and form, which responded to the adjacent properties. Thereafter, they would look to develop the detailed design and respond to the client's brief requirements in a sympathetic style and the language which they felt responded to present day trends and met demands but did not introduce a building which was going to be a "statement building" on the corner.

They believed the proposals presented a logical solution to quite a complex site, one that was simply, fundamentally organised around the creation of a new, much needed active travel route and provided wider links to the canal in the north of the city beyond. They considered that the proposals represented sensitive regeneration of an unattractive industrial site, which was not compatible with residential neighbours. This would introduce a more appropriate development, which respected the character and amenity of the adjacent properties.

Decision

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

- 1) The conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) An amendment to condition 9 to state that "Notwithstanding previous drawings provided, cycle parking shall comply with the details shown on drawing 13C-B2&3 GROUND FLOOR

PLAN, provided on 10 March 2023, and shall be implemented upon occupation of the development hereby approved.”

- 3) An additional informative that the applicant liaises with the Council, as roads authority, with regard to providing appropriate signage to promote the active travel links through the site.

(References – Development Management Sub-Committee of 11 January 2023 (item 2), report by the Chief Planning Officer, submitted.)

4. 29C Blair Street, Edinburgh

Details were provided of an application for planning permission for a change of use from residential to short-term let visitor accommodation (sui generis). Retrospective at 29C Blair Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1QR - application no. - 22/04393/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.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Jones.

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposal was contrary to Policy 30 e) ii of NPF4 because the proposal would result in the loss of residential accommodation where such loss was not outweighed by demonstrable local economic benefits.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor O’Neil.

Voting

For the motion: - 6 votes

For the amendment: - 5 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Beal, Dalgleish, Jones, McNeese-Mechan, Mowat and Osler.)

(For the amendment: Councillors Booth, Cameron, Gardiner, Hyslop and O’Neil.)

Decision

To **GRANT** planning permission.

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

5. 36-38 Yeaman Place, Edinburgh

Details were provided of an application for planning permission for a change of use from class 1 (shop) to restricted class 3 (food and drink), alterations and refurbishment. (As amended) at 36 - 38 Yeaman Place, Edinburgh, EH1 1BT - application no. – 22/04369/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 and reasons as set out in section C

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee 15 March 2023

of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

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

Amendment

To **CONTINUE** consideration of the matter for a formal response from Transport and a consultation response from Scottish Canals.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Hyslop.

Voting

For the motion: - 8 votes

For the amendment: - 2 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Beal, Cameron, Dalgleish, Gardiner, Jones, McNeese-Mechan, Mowat and Osler.)

(For the amendment: Councillors Booth and Hyslop.)

Decision

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

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

Appendix

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>Note: Detailed conditions/reasons for the following decisions are contained in the statutory planning register.</p>		
<p>4.1 – 29C Blair Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1QR</p>	<p>Change of use from residential to short-term let visitor accommodation (sui generis). Retrospective - application no. - 22/04393/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission. (On a division.)</p>
<p>4.2 – 12 Loch Road, Edinburgh, EH4 3PW</p>	<p>Proposal: Extension and alterations to house. (AS AMENDED) - application no. – 22/05907/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.3 – 31 Lothian Road, Edinburgh, EH1 2DJ</p>	<p>External works to facilitate use of balcony as a customer terrace - application no. – 22/06022/FUL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission subject to the reasons as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.4 – 31 Lothian Road, Edinburgh, EH1 2DJ</p>	<p>External works to facilitate use of balcony as a terrace and internal alterations involving reconfiguration of toilets - application no – 22/06023/LBC</p>	<p>To REFUSE listed building consent subject to the reasons as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.5 – 83 Pentland View, Edinburgh, EH10 6PT</p>	<p>Erect 6x new houses, conversion of former farmhouse to 3x residential units and associated landscaping and alterations - application no – 22/01495/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as 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>4.6 - 13 Ravelston Park, Edinburgh, EH4 3DX</p>	<p>Two-storey extension to east with part-wrap around to south elevation (as amended) - application no. – 22/05474/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.7 - 36 - 38 Yeaman Place, Edinburgh, EH11 1BT</p>	<p>Change of Use from class 1 (shop) to restricted class 3 (food and drink), alterations and refurbishment. (As amended) - application no. – 22/04369/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer. (On a division.)</p>
<p>6.1 - 54 Rossllyn Crescent, Edinburgh, EH6 5AX</p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Interim Executive Director of Corporate Services</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>6.2 - 54 Rossllyn Crescent, Edinburgh, EH6 5AX</p>	<p>Proposed conversion of bowling club and bowling green to residential dwelling and garden - application no. – 22/00745/FUL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Env 18 (Open Space Protection) and Hou 10 (Community Facilities). (On a division.)</p>
<p>6.3 - 23 Yeaman Place, Edinburgh, EH11 1BT</p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Interim Executive Director of Corporate Services</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>6.4 - 23 Yeaman Place, Edinburgh, EH11 1BT</p>	<p>Proposed demolition of existing buildings and structures and erection of a purpose-built student accommodation development, with associated active travel routes, landscaping, cycle parking and other associated infrastructure, as amended - application no. – 22/03556/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The conditions, reasons and informatives as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer. 2) An amendment to condition 9 to state that “Notwithstanding previous drawings provided, cycle parking shall comply with the details shown on drawing 13C-B2&3 GROUND FLOOR PLAN, provided on 10 March 2023, and shall be implemented upon occupation of the development hereby approved.” 3) An additional informative that the applicant liaise with the Council, as roads authority, with regard to providing appropriate signage to promote the active travel links through the site.