

Minutes

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00am, Wednesday 26 April 2023

Present:

Councillors Osler (Convener), Beal, Booth, Cameron, Dalglish, Gardiner (items 4.1-4.6, 4.8-4.10, 5.1-5.3, 6.1-6.4 and 7.1-7.3), Hyslop, Jones, McNeese-Mechan, Mowat and O'Neill (items 4.1, 4.3-4.4, 4.6-4.10, 5.1-5.3, 6.3-6.4 and 7.1-7.3).

1. Minutes

Decision

- 1) To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 15 March 2023 as a correct record.
- 2) To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 17 March 2023 as a correct record.

2. 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 4.2 - 44 Biggar Road, Edinburgh, EH10 7BJ - application no. 22/04184/FUL.

Councillor Booth requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.5 - 159 Fountainbridge, Edinburgh (Site At Former) - application no. 22/04045/AMC.

Councillor Osler requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.5 - 159 Fountainbridge, Edinburgh (Site At Former) - application no. 22/04045/AMC.

Request for Site Visit and Hearing

Councillor Gardiner requested a hearing in respect of Item 7.2 and 7.3 – Bonnington Mains Quarry (At Land 177 Metres West of), Cliftonhall Road, Newbridge - application nos. 22/02513/FUL and 22/02514/FUL.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Gardiner made a non-financial declaration of interest in item 4.7 – 5B Hope Terrace, Edinburgh – as he knew one of the neighbours of the adjoining property and did not take part in

the discussion and decision on this item.

Decision

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

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

3. 43 Main Street, Davidson Mains, Edinburgh

At its meeting of 1 March 2023, the Development Management Sub-Committee agreed to continue consideration of application 22/04940/FUL - 43 Main Street, Edinburgh, to allow for a hearing.

The application for planning permission was for the proposed 48-bed care home at 43 Main Street, Davidson's Mains, Edinburgh - application no. 22/04940/FUL.

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The proposal was for the erection of a 48 bed 3129sqm Class 8 (Residential Institution) care home with associated parking, landscaping and access from Main Street.

The facility would provide specialist respite, dementia, palliative, convalescence and nursing care to frail and elderly residents.

The care home was designed in line with the Care Inspectorate's new 2022 design guidelines including identical wards on each storey with breakout amenity space/dining areas, balcony/garden access and the ability to isolate individual wards in the event of virus outbreak. A range of facilities were available on the ground floor including public cafe, hairdressing salon, cinema/activity room and staff changing facilities via a service corridor.

The 3-storey building was L shaped with gable ends, dormers, two tone buff brick, grey aluminium windows and faux slate fibre cement roof tiles. The ridge height is 62.5m AOD.

Hard landscaping proposals included an asphalt access road, block work paved footways and stone wall/timber fence boundary treatment. The 480sqm south facing secure garden was paved in flag stone with patio space, raised beds and a pergola.

Soft landscaping proposals included a sensory garden, mixed species shrub planting, spring bulb and summer wildflower meadow planting; and berry producing/flowering native hedgerow. 8 heavy standard and regular standard trees were also proposed in a range of species including Cherry, Birch, Rowan, Hornbeam and Oak.

There were 9 parking spaces proposed including 2 accessible bays and 2 electric vehicle parking bays. There was a secure external cycle parking store for 6 members of staff/residents with space for 2 non-standard inclusive cycles as well as 6 visitor cycle parking spaces. An electric scooter/wheelchair store had also been proposed with a 3kw external power supply.

Access was from Main Street and includes an ambulance/delivery/refuse bay in the turning head. The proposed 2m wide footway would provide continuous, segregated pedestrian access from Main Street to the building entrance via a raised table crossing. The development would create vehicle access to 27 Main Street via a new side street on the western boundary.

Space heating and hot water within the building will be all-electric, powered by renewable energy generated by a ground source heat pump and solar PV array. A heat recovery system would also redistribute excess heat throughout the building as required. The surface water management plan included a combination of SUDS features including above and below ground attenuation.

Supporting Information

- Planning Statement;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Transport Statement;
- Landscape proposals, including open space requirements.
- Daylight, privacy and overshadowing information;
- Waste management information;
- Flooding risk assessment and drainage information;
- Noise impact assessment.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(b) Davidson's Mains and Silverknowes Association

Mr Alexander and Ms Cowe addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Davidson's Mains and Silverknowes Association. Mr Alexander indicated that most of the local residents were opposed to this development. They were not against care homes, but had thought that new housing would be developed. The report recognised their preference for housing, but it underplayed the alternative uses for this site. The big issue was what was developed on this site. This was a brownfield site and it was possibly considered to be too small for housing. But this was the only potential site for much needed housing. This would be consistent with council policies and the City Mobility plan. This area had a good mix to be a viable centre of a 20-minute neighbourhood. New housing would be very important as over 100 residents would use local facilities, which the care home residents and staff would not use to the same extent. He was concerned about the scale and density of the development. In summary, there was an overwhelming case for new housing. Members may feel obliged to approve a care home because of limitations in current planning legislation. However, the Care Home would not provide the same benefits and it would be detrimental to the community. This was a test case for Council commitment to the City Plan. Active travel and local centres should be supported. Some of the shops in Davidson Mains were

struggling and new housing residents would benefit the local centres. However, if there had to be a care home, the scale and density would have to be reduced.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(c) Ward Councillors Lang, Young and Younie

Councillor Lang thanked the Sub-Committee for agreeing to this hearing, which gave an opportunity to explore important issues. This site was ideal for development and everyone concerned wanted this site developed, however, it should be questioned if this application was an appropriate development for this site. This site was very different from every other site in his ward where care homes had been approved and they had been located in highly accessible locations, with open space. This was very different as it was overdevelopment of a heavily constrained site. He challenged the assertion that there were high levels of public transport and this could be a very busy site. There would be 45 staff, visitors and servicing requirements, but there was a narrow single site, off Main Street and there was significant footfall. There was disappointment locally, as the residents had thought there would be residential housing of a good standard. The Main Street was “fragile” as some local businesses were successful, but some were not. It was important to think about the sensitivity of development on this site and how it would fit in to the area. This site was small, constrained, lacked access and this specific site was not suitable for a care home of this scale.

Councillor Younie indicated that everyone knew the issues at stake and outlined some key issues. Parking was one of the challenges and it was important to highlight that only 9 parking spots would be available, and up to 16 staff would be on site, with visitors and other services. That would worsen traffic problems in an area that was already congested. It was important to note there were not strong public transport links in this area. This was especially the case for accessibility needs. It was necessary to look at accessibility, in what was a very constrained street at times. Anyone would have challenges navigating this street, especially with traffic issues. At the roundabout, there had been traffic incident. Also, there were vulnerable residents in the area, who should be given consideration. He thanked the Sub-Committee for hearing him, indicating that he had a number of reservations about this application being granted.

Councillor Young appreciated that this seemed a relatively small development for a hearing, but this would have massive impact for Davidson Mains Village, which historically had a village culture. The members’ questions had seemed to focus on the merits of the development, however, they should keep an open mind. It spoke volumes that the Sub-Committee was receiving such contributions from Ward Councillors and the Resident’s Association on the impact on the High Street of Davidson Mains. They did not object to housing, it was the type of residence and building that they had concerns for. She was dubious that this was well served by a number of bus routes as the village was trying to hold on to their current bus services. She took the point of people being allowed to age locally, but there were a number of care homes in a short travelling

distance from this site. This was wrong use of this site. Finally, the proposed parking was inadequate, as a considerable amount of transport, from staff and visitors would come to this area. It was unlikely that 9 parking spaces would meet this demand. There was a willingness for housing in this area, but it had to be the right kind of housing in this community.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(d) Applicants and Applicant's Agent

Derek Scott (Derek Scott Planning), Mr. Sean Black (Lindemann Healthcare) and Mr. Stuart Dallas (Planform Architects) were heard in support of the application.

Derek Scott indicated that the members had already received a presentation from the Planning Officer, Mr. Simon Wasser, who he would like to thank for his cooperation and guidance, prior to, and during the progression of the application. Mr. Wasser's presentation and report provided a very comprehensive, professional and thorough assessment of the application proposals.

Lindemann Healthcare, a local company, were one of the City's leading care providers. They had developed and operated several high quality care homes in the City, including Lorimer House in Juniper, Green, Thorburn Manor in Colinton and Morningside Manor in Morningside. All three care homes provided for a variety of forms of care, including dementia, respite, palliative, convalescence and nursing. All of these would be provided within the facility proposed and the current application at Davidson Mains.

A number of parties who had objected to the application had raised concerns that the site would be better developed for housing purposes, than for a care home facility, claiming, firstly, that there was already a sufficient number of care homes in the area and secondly, that new housing would make a better contribution to the vitality of Davidson's Mains Local Centre than the proposed Care Home.

The Council's Local Development Plan was apparently silent on the need or otherwise, for additional care home facilities in the City. Contrary to what some of the objectors had claimed, the applicants were of the view that there was a need for new facilities and for a variety of reasons. Firstly, there was a rapidly ageing population. The proportion of the City's population falling within the 60 to 74 age group was projected to increase by approximately 21%, in the next 20 years, with the proportion of those aged 75 and over projected to increase by almost 62%, in the same period. It was a simple matter of fact that an ageing population led to a demand for more care home bed spaces. Secondly, it was established practice in the care home industry to assess the demand for bed-spaces in city locations of this nature, on the basis of a three-mile catchment area. Based on a statistical evaluation of the area's population and age profile, there was, at present, a requirement for 1,127 care home bed spaces.

There were currently 21 care homes within the catchment area which had been

described, of an offering of 1,070 yet bed spaces, resulting in a quantitative shortfall of some 49 spaces. The situation with the ageing population would be even worse by the time this care home, if approved, was developed. The demand and supply of care home bed-spaces could not, however, be considered purely on a quantitative basis, there were also qualitative issues.

The Care Inspectorate, the body responsible for the registration and overseeing of care homes in Scotland, began a review of its design standards for care home facilities, following the Covid Pandemic. Many of the new standards which had subsequently emerged, took on board the difficult lessons learned from the pandemic, with a particular and notable focus on infection control.

Of the 21 care homes currently existing in the catchment area described, five of these, with an offering of almost 100 beds were built in the 1980's, and six of almost 300 and 20 beds were built in the 1990's. The room sizes, nursing stations, communal areas, corridors and associated operational design standards, in these older care homes, arose from outdated guidelines and practices existing at the time they were built or created. These facilities would not and did not meet current standards. There were, for example, over 80 bedrooms, forming part of the existing stock, which did not have en-suite facilities and almost 330 bedrooms with no wetroom facilities, without which new care home facilities would not today be given the required registration to operate, from the inspectorate. The lesson to be taken from all of this was that there were simply not enough care home bed spaces, from either a quantitative or qualitative perspectives, within the catchment area. There would be an ongoing need to create new compliant stock, not just now, but for many years to come. Whilst the application being considered today would not solve all the challenges the City faced in bringing its care home stock up to current standards, it would make a contribution to the shortfall and a very worthwhile one at that.

The second issue he would like to respond to revolved around the views expressed by some objectors that the development of housing on the site, would make a better contribution to the vitality of the local centre in Davidson Mains, than the proposed Care Home. Firstly, and this was critically important, the application site was not zoned for housing purposes in either the adopted Local Development Plan or in the proposed Local Development Plan. In fact, he did not believe it was even promoted for such purposes in the Local Development Plan.

It appeared in both plans as white land and not zoned for any specific type of development or purpose, there was an underlying presumption in favour of development, given its brownfield status and nature. Following on from that key consideration, the test that should be applied in the determination of this application today was not whether housing was a better or more appropriate use of the care home, or indeed vice versa. It was whether the use of the site for the development of a care home facility was an acceptable one when assessed on its own merits.

When discussing the subject of housing, it was worth adding that residents, when

moving into a care home of the nature proposed, generally freed up other under-occupied houses and in the process contributed in that way to the supply of a more efficient use of established housing stock. Existing and emerging Local Development Plans were again, as earlier stated, silent on the parameters to be used, in the assessment of applications for care home facilities. Many local authorities provided guidance and a central theme, and for those who did, indicated that there was an overriding desire to locate care homes in close proximity to facilities and services and in locations that were well served by public transport.

Policy 15 of NPF4, on the subject of local living and 20-minute neighbourhoods, referred to the importance of providing local access to, and he quoted: “affordable and accessible housing options, the ability to age in place and housing diversity”. Policy 16 stated that homes for older people, including care homes, would be supported, where there was an identified gap in provision which he thought they had demonstrated. The Care Inspectorate to whom he had made reference to previously, acknowledged in its design standards, that he quoted: “a well-connected care home that was well integrated into the community, could have a positive impact on people's wellbeing, experience and help tackle isolation and loneliness.

The application site was, from operational and logistical perspectives, ideally located for a care home facility. It would be positioned at the heart of the community within the local centre, it benefited from excellent public transport links, and it would contribute towards Davidson Mains role as the beating heart of the surrounding 20-minute neighbourhood.

Local shops and other facilities would benefit from the patronage drive from residents within the Care Home, from staff working in it and from those visiting friends and relatives. In that respect, it would add to the vitality and vibrancy of the local centre, rather than detract from it, and as such, should be considered as an acceptable use within it, compliant with the Local Development Plan.

Having established the need for, and the suitability of, the location for the care home proposed, he would like to speak briefly about the facility, but with the intention of not duplicating, to any great degree, the substantial amount of ground already covered on the subject this morning.

A 48-bed care home had been proposed on the site. That would be the minimum number of bed-spaces required to operate a facility from this location. The home would be provided with a range of facilities, including a public cafe, hairdressing salon, cinema and activity room. It would contain five small groups of living households within a three-storey building. The height of the building took its cue from the height of the North Bar on Main Street, to which it related to and fully respected.

Whilst the building was, with the exception of the Tesco Supermarket to the north, of a larger scale or mass to the immediately surrounding properties, it was set some 20 metres back from Main Street, and because of that and other considerations, it would

appear subservient to and respectful to the existing buildings. Vertical breaks and careful articulation and the facades would also break up the elevations into smaller units, appropriate to the residential context and, in the process, add interest to those elevations.

Key references of architectural form and uses of material had also been interpreted in a contemporary manner, in reflection of the local surrounding context. They believed that they had a building, the design of which had been developed, in collaboration and partnership, with the Planning Department over many months. That was, firstly befitting of its location, secondly, which would contribute to rather than detract from the architectural character and appearance of their area, and thirdly, one which could be accommodated on the site without adverse impact on adjoining users.

There's one other point that he would briefly like to comment on. It had been claimed earlier that there were insufficient car parking facilities to service the proposed care home. As Mr. Wasser outlined, the Council's parking standards permitted a maximum, not minimum, of 10 spaces to be provided in association with a care home of this nature. They originally proposed ten, but were requested to reduce that to nine, during the progression of the application. Operationally, their client has no difficulty with the number of spaces proposed, be that nine or ten.

As far as cycle spaces were concerned, council standards required a minimum of one per 15 rooms, or expressed otherwise as a minimum of four spaces for the entire facility. They had proposed 12, in order to enhance the sustainability credentials of the overall proposal and he was happy to answer any questions on that point later.

All of the issues, other issues raised by third parties, had been addressed by Mr. Wasser earlier in his report and his presentation, or in the response to the question he had received. However, if members had any concerns or queries about anything contained in the application submissions, if they disagreed with anything in the Committee Report, or if they had concerns that the report had failed to address any issues, which they considered to be pertinent to the determination of the application, please raise these with the applicant and provide them with an opportunity to respond to them before making their decision.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

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 additional informative that the applicant should submit a plan showing additional cycle parking in the form of Sheffield Racks (or other suitable rack to be agreed with the Planning Authority) within the application site boundary.

- 3) An additional informative that the applicant should explore options regarding the installation of water butts for grey water within the application site.

(References – Development Management Sub-Committee of 1 March 2023 (item 4), the report by the Chief Planning Officer, submitted.)

4. 6 Bankhead Crossway South, Edinburgh

Details were provided of an application for planning permission for change of use from warehouse to a swimming pool to train babies and children at 6 Bankhead Crossway South, Edinburgh - application no. 22/05278/FUL.

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

Motion

To **CONTINUE** consideration of the application to provide more information on the level of demand for this industrial unit.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Amendment

To **REFUSE** the request for continuation and determine the application at the current meeting of the Sub-Committee.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Cameron

Voting

For the motion: - 8 votes

For the amendment: - 3 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Booth, Dalgleish, Hyslop, Jones, McNeese-Mechan, Mowat, O'Neil and Osler.)

(For the amendment: Councillors Beal, Cameron and Gardiner.)

Decision

To **CONTINUE** consideration of the application to provide more information on the level of demand for this industrial unit.

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

5. 139 Leith Walk (At Land to East Of), Edinburgh

At its meeting of 8 February 2023, the Development Management Sub-Committee agreed to continue consideration of application 22/01563/FUL - 139 Leith Walk (At Land to East of), Edinburgh, to allow for a hearing.

The application for planning permission was for the proposed demolition of the existing warehouse building and construction of Sui Generis flatted dwellings including mainstream, affordable and student accommodation with a ground floor commercial unit and associated infrastructure, landscaping, and a reconfiguration of the existing car park at 139 Leith Walk (At Land to East of), Edinburgh - application no. 22/01563/FUL.

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The proposal was for:

(i) The demolition of an existing vacant single-storey warehouse building located on the northwestern part of the site;

(ii) The erection of four buildings (blocks A, B, C and an ancillary block as delineated on application drawings) on the site as follows:

Block A, an affordable housing block containing 27 affordable flats, positioned in the northwestern part of the site. It was aligned east-west and has a north-south orientation. The north elevation of that block fronts onto the principal east-west orientated active travel route connecting Leith Walk and Halmyre Street. This block was 5 storeys in height and had a flat roof that was a 'blue roof' that also incorporated photovoltaic panels.

Block B, containing a mixture of student accommodation and commercial units (any use within class 1 (shops), class 2 (financial, professional and other services), class 4 (business) and class 10 (non-residential institutions) (block B), positioned roughly in the middle of the site. It integrally attached to the east of the affordable block. It was aligned north-south and had an east-west orientation. There was a two-storey pend running east-west through the block through which there could potentially be vehicular access to the NHS car park and access to the rear gardens and bin store of the affordable units within the northern arm. The layout did not delineate changes to the layout of the car park that would permit vehicles to access and egress the car park from the pend. The applicant had title to only part of the NHS car park. The three commercial units were situated on the southern end of the block at ground floor level. This block was 6-storeys in height and had a flat roof that is a 'blue roof' that also incorporated photovoltaic panels.

Block C, a built to rent flatted block located on the south-eastern part of the site, adjacent to the south of the Halmyre Street access. It contained 27 mainstream Build to rent flats. It was 5-storeys in height with maisonette flats on the fourth floor. It was rectangular in footprint and was orientated east and west. It had a mostly pitched roof with a small area of flat roof to the west.

An ancillary building adjacent to the north of the student accommodation block and associated with that block. It contained a cycle store, a lounge and a gym. It was aligned east-south and was single aspect and orientated south onto the principal east-west active travel route.

(iii) The reconfiguration of the existing NHS car park, including the reduction in the number of parking spaces from 65 to 31 spaces and the installation of 4 electric vehicle charging points.

The design of the proposed 4 blocks was relatively contemporary. Their external walls were finished in a combination of three colours of brick. Pitched roof sections were finished in grey metal and flat roof sections are utilised to attenuate water and slow surface water run-off rates. Elevational treatment was relatively contemporary and included wide openings at ground floor level. The framing of windows and external doors were grey in colour.

The accommodation proposed was as follows:

- Affordable Flats - (27 in total) comprising 8 one bed units (30%), 13 two bed units (48%) and 6 three bed units (22%):
- Private BTR - (build to rent) Flats (27 flats) comprising 5 one bed units (18%), 16 two bed units (60%) and 6 three bed units (22%).
- Student accommodation - (230 managed student beds) comprising 215 studio units including 10 wheelchair accessible studio units (93%) and 15 cluster units (7%).
- 3 Commercial Units for use for uses within Classes 1, 2, 4 or 10 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992 - comprising at total of 139 square metres floorspace.

Of the mainstream residential units 46% (25 units) were single aspect; 13% (7 units) had a private garden; 33% (18 units) had a balcony; and 100% had access to shared amenity space.

Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access would be off Halmyre Street to the east, leading directly to a proposed one-way loop road designed as a shared surface primarily functioning as a cycleway/footway, but it also was designed for use by refuse vehicles/emergency vehicles. This shared surface connected to a proposed east-west orientated cycleway/footway accessed off and existing access lane lying between Nos.113 and 117 Leith Walk (Domino Lane). There was no vehicular access off Leith Walk from the vennel known as Domino Lane. It was surfaced in a combination of grey block pavements and setts.

A pedestrian and cycle access to the site to/from Manderston Street was to be provided under one of the former railway arches. This route was not designed for vehicular access.

A total of six parking spaces were proposed, which were adjacent to the east of the Private Build for rent block. They were all accessible parking spaces and equipped with electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

In total there were 366 cycle parking spaces across the site, 62 (17%) of which were single tier Sheffield stands. 95% of the cycle parking was within a secure building, the remaining 5% was either short-stay visitor parking (uncovered) or for use for cycle parking by a cycle hire scheme. The cycle parking was as follows:

Affordable block (block A) –

34 two tier Falco stands (internal store), 22 Sheffield stands for standard bikes (internal store), 4 stands for non-standard bikes (internal store) 10 visitor/future cycle hire scheme adjacent to Block A on `Domino Lane' (External) - Total = 60 spaces + 10 visitor spaces.

Student accommodation block (block B) –

The cycle store was separated from the main building and located to the northern boundary within a secure building housing 226 two tier Falco stands (internal store) and 4 stood for non-standard bikes (internal store) - Total = 230 spaces.

Private BTR block (block C) –

6 short stay/visitor spaces on the east elevation (external), 34 two-tier stands (internal store) plus 20 Sheffield stands (internal and external). There was an enclosed bike store to the southeast of the block with 4 Sheffield stands plus 6 spaces for non-standard bikes. - Total = 60 + 6 visitor.

In addition to this the applicant states that they would be willing to incorporate e-bike charging points within the bike stores.

Separate bin stores were provided for the student accommodation, affordable housing, and the mainstream flatted dwellings, with the full provision and range of bin types in each store. The bin stores were located within the buildings except for the affordable flats, which is within a detached bin store.

Communal open space for the affordable flats was located to the south and west of the building and extends to 353 square metres. Private gardens were provided for three ground floor affordable flats.

Communal private open space for the student accommodation block was located to the south of the block and extended to 246 square metres (10.25 square metres per flat). Private gardens were provided for three of the ground floor private flats.

The principal public open space was located roughly in the middle of the site between blocks B and C. It had an area of 426 square metres.

The student accommodation had a communal garden located on the west side of the building, which extended to 68 square metres. Policy Hou 3 did not apply to student accommodation because students often included internal amenity such as gyms, communal lounges, and study areas.

A greenspace for public use had been proposed in the centre of the site which extended to 426 square metres. Further areas of public open space in the form of green and civic space were proposed to the north of the site along the principal east-west active travel route.

The landscaping would be a mix of hard and soft with trees and plants chosen to encourage biodiversity. Large, slow growing trees were proposed throughout the site and an appropriate soil depth of at least 700mm had been detailed by the applicant. There were no clashes between the tree root areas and proposed or existing below ground infrastructure.

A hybrid of below and above ground SUDs features was proposed, including rain gardens, blue roofs, permeable paving, open SUDS basins and localised cellular storage.

Five bird boxes, six bat boxes and two bee boxes were proposed throughout the site, both within landscaped areas on trees and on the proposed buildings.

Supporting Documents:

The following documents have been submitted in support of the application:

- Planning Statement;
- Pre-application Consultation Report;
- Affordable Housing Statement;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Transport Assessment;
- Flood Risk and Drainage Impact Assessment;
- Student Management Plan
- Daylight and Sunlight Analysis;
- S1 Sustainability Statement;
- Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Report;
- Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA);

- Built Heritage & Townscape Visual Impact Assessment;
- Desk Based Archaeological and Heritage Report;
- Noise Impact Assessment;
- Air Quality Statement;
- Affordable Housing Statement;
- Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and Bat Survey;

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 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 indicated that the Community Council had already objected twice to this application, there had been substantial changes by the applicant and the Community Council's second objection was in response to this. The proposal was at odds with the Halmyre Street Areas Brief, as it proposed over 200 student beds and only a limited number of residential flats. It also fell below minimum daylight requirements. Edinburgh Urban Design Panel had strong concerns, about the level of student accommodation, land use, layout, height, materials and security. The proposal was at odds with student housing guidance, would unbalance to the community and would not contribute to a sense of place. There would be a lack of safety, commercial units, the proposed student gym and lounge location would harm existing businesses in the arches and would adversely affect air quality and noise. It failed to be tenure neutral, the proposed affordable housing block would have no accessible parking and failed to meet all housing needs. It was highly unlikely that if it was no longer required for students, then the accommodation could be converted to residential use. The Community Council said that the development on Iona Street had been handled on a much higher lever and the Sub-Committee should listen more to people's views.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(c) Sandra-Anne Marshall

Sandra-Anne Marshall addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee. Ms Marshall stated that she had visited the local businesses in the area. She shared the concerns of the previous speaker about the height of the buildings, as the local businesses also had concerns. Also, she thought that there were already an excessive number of students in the area and there should be more of a mix. It had been suggested that, on the other side of the road, there could be integrated accommodation. This would lessen the differences and helped foster mutual respect. What was also of concern was the proposed access from a rather small road to Halmyre Street and the possible effect it might have on the Bingo Hall and the Arches. Opposite, there was a housing association building for retired residents, who had got used to the Bingo Hall and the Arches. This proposed walkway would also create noise issues. These were

her main objections. Additionally, the Tram Works were nearly complete and the community in Leith had experienced nearly 20 years of disruption. The Authority should spend more time on the Development Plan and give the residents time to get used to the existing situation. Ms Marshall argued that, after all of the work that has taken place in the last 15 years, it would be beneficial to do something like that, which would give the community something they could own, care about and take pride in.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(d) David Walliker

David Walliker addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee. Mr Walliker indicated that local residents were not against development, but were against this proposal. The Arches and Bingo Hall were covered by their conservation status. A previous appeal for development in this area, had been rejected by the Reporter as it would affect the character of the Leith Walk Conservation Area. There were concerns regarding massing, height, amenity to light and the effect on the character of the conservation area. The development also compromised the character of the urban hinterland area and the mixed building character at the rear of Leith Walk. The development probably did not fulfil the specifications of the Scottish Planning Act of 1997. A previous House of Lords ruling stated that character and appearance should be unharmed, however, for this proposal, this was not the case. This proposal had been overwhelmingly rejected in the consultation 3 years ago. The position of some of the proposed windows and doors would cause privacy issues. Additionally, the height of the block would reduce sunshine over the Bingo Hall. The combined effect of this would have a serious effect on amenity. There were three elements, which were “boxing in”, loss of light and overshadowing. Additionally, LDP Policy Des 5 was probably not fulfilled. Finally, there would be very high site line, combined with a boxing in situation. The new block would be overly visible, be of excessive height and would adversely affect the conservation area.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(e) Ward Councillor Rae

Councillor Rae addressed the Sub-Committee. She referred to the statement from Councillor Caldwell, which had been circulated and indicated that her views on this were very similar. The Halmrye Place Brief stated clearly that affordable housing was key to Leith Walk. This had not been followed here. Guidelines stated that 50 % of a site, larger than one quarter of a hectare, should be for housing and this had not taken place, so it would fail to meet the requirements of the Brief. This was a breach of best practice guidance, there had been serious compromises made at the expense of affordable housing in favour of student housing, and only 37% of the flats were dual aspect. This would adversely affect lighting levels and the North-East facing flats would be excessively cold. Leith Walk was the most densely populated ward in the City, with a

high percentage of student housing. Previous developments of a lesser high scale had been refused. Because of the increase in population, the local services or facilities would be inadequate. In Leith Walk, the community was very independent, community based and well organised, with a team of experts. In this case, the developers had missed a chance to talk to the community and ignored local expertise, which itself was regretful. Dialogue would have been a better way forward, rather than ignoring the wishes of the community. There was only 13% social housing in this ward and approximately 9,000 people on the waiting list. The Council did not build enough social housing and built too much student housing. The Sub-Committee should consider how this proposal did not work with the Place Brief, did not meet the needs of the community and should therefore be rejected.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(f) Submission from Councillor Caldwell

The Sub-Committee considered a written submission from Councillor Caldwell. (he had made a transparency statement, as he was a member of Leith Central Community Council when the initial objection was filed.) Councillor Caldwell indicated that the Halmyre Place Brief gave a clear mandate for affordable housing, however, the proposal compromised those principles and unfairly impacted the residents. There were some positives aspects which included affordable housing which went up from 18 to 27 flats (52 beds), student housing which went from 235 beds to 230 beds and transport links had been provided. However, this did not address the following concerns.

There were compromises to affordable housing. This included an uneven mix of housing and student housing. Quality of life compromises had been made to affordable housing to accommodate PBSA. Only 37% of flats were dual aspect, which would compromise the privacy of residential flats and the affordable housing element contained unreasonable compromises to accommodate the PBSA element. The impact on the wider area had not been addressed. The scale of the student development had not been considered in the context of impact on local amenities. Regarding lighting, there would be considerable impact on 129 Leith Walk.

If this application was approved, potential conditions must be considered. This would include moving building block A, which would be a few metres away from existing buildings, an agreement of a portion of Section 75 funding for partial repairs or resurfacing after the works are completed, liaison with Road Operations to ensure residents were not detrimentally affected by increased heavy traffic and finally, the consultation response from the Communities and Families Department rightly requested that a sum of £4,275 per flat went towards Leith Academy.

(g) Applicants

Ross Manson (Manson Planning), Bruce Weir (CW Properties) and Lindsay Manson

(Manson) were heard in support of the application.

Bruce Weir indicated that the MacKay family, were also Edinburgh-based and were the owners of the land. MacKays purchased the land 30 years ago and at that time it was actually larger than the current application site. However, Inchkeith House was sold to the NHS and Allender House was let to the NHS who operated a clinic in this location. The warehouse was let to the Scottish Government for file storage and when the lease came to an end, the warehouse was used by the charity, Project 42, on a rent-free basis for three years, until it moved to Ocean Terminal. Some more land was sold to allow the development of the housing association block on Halmyre Street.

It was important to note that the MacKays, therefore, had a good, solid understanding of the area and had worked well with a number of occupiers and neighbours over this 30-year period. When he approached the Mackays in 2018, they made it very clear that they wanted to retain their ownership in this location and did not want to just sell out. At that point, it was clear that they had a desire to re-develop the site with their main stipulation that they wanted to develop residential flats, that they could operate themselves as a build to rent development. Something that could be developed for the long term, but with a view to providing a service to the community and providing a facility that would be well-operated and managed to the highest standards by the family.

Due to this requirement, it was essential that anything else developed on the site was compatible and therefore the applicant's student partners and affordable housing partners had been handpicked. This was to ensure that the three operating blocks would be managed to a high standard and for the benefit of everyone that lived there, as well as those that travelled through the site. It was important to note, therefore, that the Mackays had a vested interest in making this the most pleasant of places to live and to ensure the longevity and the success of the overall development.

When the applicant started the process five years ago, they had no idea that they would have such long delays in taking their proposals forward, but for a variety of reasons they now reflected on these delays favourably. The Place Brief process had allowed them to positively engage with their surrounding neighbours and they now had a layout that allowed connectivity and open space that would work well with other proposals that may come forward. The applicant had engaged well with the NHS on their building, on their car park, Edinburgh Council Estates Department, on the former Tram Depot and Longstone on the Bingo Hall.

The applicant had also liaised with some of the businesses in Leith Arches and had met on site with other residents, such as Mr. Walliker. Whilst not everyone would be happy to see change in the area, they had taken the time to engage properly, listened to concerns and adapted their proposals to take account of what they believed were genuine concerns, all whilst trying to meet a place brief requirements and three separate operator requirements.

When they altered the proposals, taking account of many of the objections, there were only 43 objections to a revised proposal. The majority of the remaining objections were

focused on the fact that a number of people did not want further students in the area. It was not thought that this was a genuine reason to object, and it was important to note the Place Brief acknowledged student accommodation as being an acceptable use on the site.

Five years on, the Place Brief had brought the applicant to this point whereby they could read through the 16 pages of that document which they had done many times and felt that they had complied and engaged. If this application was approved today, it would ensure that they would be the catalyst for the regeneration of the site, the surrounding sites, if appropriate, and for connectivity in this area, to be enhanced for the benefit of all.

Ross Manson indicated that he was the planning consultant for the applicant. They were here today with a recommendation for the approval of this planning application and they had been on this journey since 2018.

The number of people that had engaged with this project in some shape or form was astonishing, and it had taken a vast amount of work and coordination from everyone and that included the Planning Department. He understood that some might be concerned about the potential risk of creating unbalanced communities by introducing purpose-built student accommodation. However, it was important to note that students also brought benefits, such as local spending, cultural diversity, age diversity, job security and overall economic stimulation.

That being said, new accommodation must be balanced with other forms of housing to mitigate the risk of creating imbalanced communities. In this proposal, the applicant had taken this into account by including flatted accommodation, with a high proportion of on-site affordable housing. In fact, the proposal had 45% housing and 55% student accommodation, with the proportion of affordable housing on the site, increasing to 50%, following feedback from the community.

The City of Edinburgh Council Student Housing Guidance stated that where student concentrations exceeded 50% in a locality, there was a greater potential for an imbalanced community. The applicant's analysis of three localities showed the concentration of students, including the proposal, was nowhere near the 50% stated in the guidance. The immediate centre zone was the smallest locality and had, therefore, the most sensitive and response responsive to new development.

The immediate centre zone would have a student concentration of only 26%. The inclusion of both private and affordable housing in this proposal had effectively mitigated the potential of an imbalance and kept the concentration of students within acceptable levels. Given that the locality had a low concentration of students and the proposal also delivered a high percentage of on-site affordable housing, the applicant felt the proposed mix was justified.

The Student Housing Guidance was introduced to balance the concentration and spread

new-build student accommodation throughout the City. This was one reason why Leith had seen more student housing applications in recent times. The tram corridor was another. Soon enough, students would be able to get the tram from Leith Walk directly to Edinburgh Napier. As part of the planning process and the preparation of the Place Brief, the applicant had collaborated with the adjoining landowners, the applicant, City of Edinburgh Council and Longstone Capital, who were all the stakeholders in the Place Brief.

The Council and Longstone Capital had shared plans with the applicants, showing that both sites could be re-developed for housing in the future. The applicant had been working with the Place Brief Stakeholders to ensure the Place Brief, as envisaged by Edinburgh Council, could be delivered. This meant the applicants had coordinated plans and strategies across all three brownfield sites. Working together, the Stakeholders could deliver the overall Place B strategy and make this quadrant of Leith a welcoming and appealing place to live, work and enjoy.

In conclusion, whilst the applicants were aware of the objections raised in connection with the student accommodation aspect, they believed the low concentration of students in the area and the high proportion of affordable housing proposed, met the requirements of the Place Brief and LDP Policy Hou 8.

Lindsay Manson indicated that he was the Architect and Planning Consultant for the project and as previously reported, they started in 2018. He had a short presentation with a few slides. He was going to communicate the key points for the proposal and he would describe the design approach for the scheme.

To set the scene, their goals at the outset were there to support a clear understanding of the rich industrial past and architectural heritage, both surrounding the site and within the site. Their approach was to ensure that the elements of the Council Place Brief and the community requirements were integrated within the masterplan.

There were many constraints and design challenges within the brief. That had, through continual scheme evolution, betterment and close collaboration with the Council's Design and Planning Officers, allowed the applicant to create the optimum scheme. The slide referred to, was the outline of the site and the backdrop of Edinburgh Castle and the City. In the foreground, was the main red sandstone railway arches, setting that mixed architectural character. They had tenement reform, the Bingo Hall and the listed buildings on Leith Walk and Smiths Place.

One of their early prioritised design goals was to ensure that the new pedestrian routes going through the site were meaningful, creating an attractive and safe place to be and quite importantly connecting with the adjacent urban grain. The image being displayed showed one of these new active spaces in the foreground, overlooked by the student entrance in the centre and by the affordable homes blocks, sitting adjacent and behind the residential units, running along Leith Walk. The new lanes were also overlooked by single storey student gym and amenity block, tucked behind characterful railway arches.

The site at present, was a single storey industrial unit, was underdeveloped and was blocking out opportunity of creating a coherent neighborhood. The Place Brief classified the site as backland. The applicant's new buildings had been designed around new articulated open spaces. The new blocks were purposely varied in shape and form and colour, or contributing to the surrounding Leith character, which could be seen on the current image of some of the two new spaces which had been referred to. One was the existing NHS car park, refreshed, landscaped and integrated with the Master Plan. One was the new central public open spaces, adjacent to the active pedestrian route, running south to north, towards the railway arches.

Private gardens, active frontages, sunny public spaces all contributed to the sense of a new community, with both the adjacent Place Brief Sites and the existing urban grain. The image displayed clearly showed also the historic architectural character of Leith. It was dynamic, varied and it was uplifting. The applicant had adopted that Leith imagery in the geometry of the new buildings with varied roof forms, sensitive change materials and different block heights. The proposed blocks merged with, and complemented, the existing urban grain.

The Place Brief referred to the Bingo Hall and that was what had been done, there are no references absolutely to the height of the Bingo Hall. The Place Brief in a community called for an appropriate built form that integrated into the surrounding area and recognised the architectural character and heritage. The applicant thought they had done this in a manner that would anchor the built form and its new community into the heart of Leith.

Looking east towards Easter Road, it was possible to truly understand the required Place Brief Master Planning for the overall site and the true meaning of the new active transport routes through the site. One of the key new spaces in the development was the creation of a civic space along the New Lane that connected the centre of the site to Leith Walk. The applicant had ensured that the height, scale and density in this area was much reduced, their new single storey amenity block matched the scale of the existing workshop adjacent to the arches.

Similar built form etiquette had been created, a new affordable homes block, adjacent to the rear of the Leith Walk tenements and a new 18-metre wide private garden, had been designed in this area. The next series of images related to how the proposed active travel routes connected to the outer urban grain surrounding the site, in particular the connection to Pilrig Park and core path 7. It also clearly showed how the new routes, within the site, would link with the adjacent Council residential sites to the south and the adjacent Bingo Hall site to the east, both future-proofed and integrated within the Master Plan.

One of the key design parameters was to ensure that a very high percentage of active frontages, overlooking the public spaces and pedestrian routes through the site. Viewing around the blocks on the image, this showed the extent of the ground floor

activity, with student entrance areas, affordable and built-to-rent front doors and gardens, small commercial units, all interspersed with active lifestyles of bike routes and active open space. He meant to indicate that on one of the images, there was an extract from the Place Brief, which was a diagram, which was the synergy between the Master Plan and the Place Brief, in terms of geometric form plan form.

He noted earlier that their goal was to adhere closely to design layout and the aspirations of the Place Brief, making reference to that synergy, which could be seen from the image displayed. The new buildings were generally continuous in the frontage, with specific areas of geometric form. Their composition and proportions were tenemental in character, the public open spaces and private, garden spaces were well delineated, safe and, in this instance, overlooked by the commercial units. The spaces were varied in geometric form and use. They believed they would be uplifting, livable spaces, that would encourage interaction and that sense of Leith character.

Their design approach would ensure the creation of dynamic spaces and the built form variety would always relate to the usable and meaningful spaces between the buildings. Place-making had been at the core of his thinking.

In conclusion, they believed that the scheme could be award-winning, exemplary and be a valuable addition to the least built formats and its emerging dynamic. They could make this a livable, sustainable and productive quadrant, that would optimise a brownfield site, reduce urban sprawl and maximise the potential to deliver a housing-led scheme.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 26 April 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

Motion

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

- 1) The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) An additional informative that the applicant should submit a plan showing greater compliance with the Council's Cycle Factsheet (C7) for all blocks within the site.
- 3) An additional informative that the applicant should explore the use of the proposed commercial units for a suitable community use.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposal was contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Des 1, Des 5 (part a), Hou 8 (part b), Tra 3 and Tra 4 and NPF4 (part 7d).

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Beal

Voting

For the motion: - 6 votes

For the amendment: - 5 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Cameron, Gardiner, Hyslop, Jones, Mowat and Osler.

For the amendment: Councillors Beal, Booth, Dalgleish, McNeese-Mechan and O'Neil.)

Decision

To **GRANT** planning permission subject to:

- 1) The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
- 2) An additional informative that the applicant should submit a plan showing greater compliance with the Council's Cycle Factsheet (C7) for all blocks within the site.
- 3) An additional informative that the applicant should explore the use of the proposed commercial units for a suitable community use.

(References – Development Management Sub-Committee of 8 February 2023 (item 2), report by the Chief Planning Officer, submitted.)

6. 44 Biggar Road, Edinburgh

Details were provided of a Section 42 application seeking to reword condition 7 attached to planning permission ref. 12/00758/FUL, to allow the sale of convenience goods from 248sqm gross sales floorspace at the site at 44 Biggar Road, Edinburgh - application no. 22/04184/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 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Mowat.

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposal was contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Ret 6.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Gardiner.

Voting

For the motion: - 8 votes

For the amendment: - 3 votes

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

For the amendment: Councillors Booth, Gardiner, and O'Neil.)

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 – Report for forthcoming application by the City of Edinburgh Council for Proposal of Application Notice at Trinity Academy, 1 Craighall Avenue, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Redevelopment of existing Trinity Academy and associated works including alteration of listed buildings (including retention and adaptation of the Victorian building and removal of 1950s /60s extensions), removal of all other existing buildings, and replacement with new school building as extension to the Victorian building and associated new landscaped outdoor areas. Associated buildings including temporary decant buildings on edge of site, relocation of services, alterations to boundary walls, new external works, and site access - application no. 23/01057/PAN</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To note the key issues at this stage. 2) The applicant to provide more detail on the interim works, to confirm where was the decant to the school was going and when consultation would take place for that. 3) To note that there was good cycle and pedestrian permeability throughout the site, this should be continued and this should be included in the report.
<p>4.2 – 44 Biggar Road, Edinburgh, EH10 7BJ</p>	<p>Section 42 application seeking to reword condition 7 attached to planning permission ref. 12/00758/FUL, to allow the sale of convenience goods from 248sqm gross sales floorspace at the site - application no. 22/04184/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.</p> <p>(on a division)</p>
<p>4.3 – 2 & 4 Canning Street Lane, Edinburgh, EH3 8ER</p>	<p>Change of use from residential to serviced apartments (sui-generis) - application no. 22/04304/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 – 1 East Rigg Farm, Balerno, EH14 7JR</p>	<p>Erect 3x holiday huts and associated works - application no. 22/06141/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>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>4.5 – 159 Fountainbridge, Edinburgh (Site At Former)</p>	<p>Approval of matters specified in conditions 1 (a-m) and (i)-(v), 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, of PPP application ref: 19/03097/PPP, relating to plots W1-W4 including residential/commercial/retail units; detail of height, massing, ground floor levels, design of external features and materials including public realm, pedestrian and cycle access arrangements, treatment to adopted roads or footways, car parking venting, servicing, surface water and drainage, lighting, waste management and hard and soft landscaping details (as amended) - application no. 22/04045/AMC</p>	<p>To APPROVE matters specified in conditions subject to the conditions, reasons, informatives and a memorandum of agreement as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer, and an additional informative that the applicant shall explore the provision of cycle parking in order to decrease the provision of two-tier racks and increase the provision of non-standard bike racks across the site.</p>
<p>4.6 - 10 Gilmerton Station Road, Edinburgh (At Land 292 Metres West Of)</p>	<p>Proposed residential development, including bike/bin stores, associated infrastructure, access, landscaping and engineering works - application no. 22/02912/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>
<p>4.7 - 5B Hope Terrace, Edinburgh, EH9 2AP</p>	<p>Erect dwelling - application no. 22/06107/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.</p>
<p>4.8 - 4 Oversman Road (Land 160 Metres Northeast Of), Edinburgh</p>	<p>Proposed development of three detached business and industrial units, including trade counter (use Classes 4, 5 and 6) and Sui Generis car showroom with associated access, car parking and landscaping - application no. 22/05666/PPP</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.</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
4.9 - Ravelston Dykes Road	Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order No. 202.	To CONFIRM Tree Preservation Order No. 202
4.10 - 4 Sunbury Street, Edinburgh, EH4 3BU	Retrospective change of use from residential to short term let (Sui-Generis) - application no. 22/04981/FULSTL	To REFUSE planning permission subject to the reasons as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
5.1 - 7-7 A Newcraighall Road, Edinburgh, EH15 3HH	Residential development (as amended) - application no. 21/02559/PPP	To AGREE to a further six-month extension to the period to conclude the legal agreement which will enable the planning permission to be released for this application.
5.2 - 10 Orchard Brae, Edinburgh, EH4 1PF	Proposed residential and office development comprising the change of use, extension and alteration of the existing office building to form residential accommodation and office/co-working space, demolition of the existing rear extension and erection of a new build residential development; with associated active travel routes, open space, parking and other infrastructure (as amended) - application no. 21/06512/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons, informatives, a legal agreement and NPF4 considerations as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
5.3 - 28 St Andrew Square, Edinburgh, EH2 1AF	Proposed internal and external alterations to existing office building (class 4) to include removal of current extension and the provision of a new rear and rooftop extension, including cycle parking and associated facilities (as amended) - application no. 21/04282/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions, reasons, informatives, a legal agreement and a stopping up order, as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>6.1 - 43 Main Street, Edinburgh, EH4 5BZ - application no. 22/04940/FUL</p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Service Director – Legal and Assurance</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>6.2 - 43 Main Street, Edinburgh, EH4 5BZ</p>	<p>48 bed care home at Main Street, Davidson's Mains, Edinburgh - application no. 22/04940/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 additional informative that the applicant shall submit a plan showing additional cycle parking in the form of Sheffield Racks (or other suitable rack to be agreed with the Planning Authority) within the application site boundary. 3) An additional informative that the applicant shall explore options regarding the installation of water butts for grey water within the application site. <p>Note: Transport officers to send email to members to clarify whether the 20% accessible spaces applied to what they were delivering or the minimum requirement.</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>6.3 - 139 Leith Walk, Edinburgh (At Land to East of) - application no. 22/01563/FUL</p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Service Director – Legal and Assurance</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>6.4 - 139 Leith Walk, Edinburgh (At Land to East of)</p>	<p>Demolition of the existing warehouse building and construction of Sui Generis flatted dwellings including mainstream, affordable and student accommodation with a ground floor commercial unit and associated infrastructure, landscaping, and a reconfiguration of the existing car park - application no. 22/01563/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer. 2) An additional informative that the applicant shall submit a plan showing greater compliance with the Council's Cycle Factsheet (C7) for all blocks within the site. 3) An additional informative that the applicant shall explore the use of the proposed commercial units for a suitable community use. <p>(On a division.)</p>
<p>7.1 - 6 Bankhead Crossway South, Edinburgh, EH11 4EZ</p>	<p>Change of Use from warehouse to a swimming pool to train babies and children - application no. 22/05278/FUL</p>	<p>To CONTINUE consideration of the application to provide more information on the level of demand for this industrial unit.</p> <p>(on a division.)</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>7.2 - Bonnington Mains Quarry (At Land 177 Metres West of), Cliftonhall Road, Newbridge</p>	<p>Development of field for ancillary quarrying operations - application no. 22/02513/FUL</p>	<p>To CONTINUE consideration of the application for a site visit and hearing.</p>
<p>7.3 - Bonnington Mains Quarry (At Land 177 Metres West of), Cliftonhall Road, Newbridge</p>	<p>Extraction of Quartz-Dolerite and erection of plant and ancillary structure (Section 42 Application to vary conditions 2, 13, 15, 16 and 18 of Planning Permission 17/05930/FUL) - application no. 22/02514/FUL</p>	<p>To CONTINUE consideration of the application for a site visit and hearing.</p>