

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00am, Wednesday 21 June 2023

Present:

Councillors Osler (Convener), Beal, Booth, Cameron (items 4.1-4.5, 4.8-4.9, 4.13-4.17 and 4.19, 5.1 and 6.1-6.2), Gardiner, Graham (substituting for Councillor Dalgleish) (items 4.1-4.19, 6.1-6.4 and 7.1-7.2), Hyslop, Jones, McNeese-Mechan, Mowat, and O'Neill (items 4.1-4.19 and 6.1-6.2).

1. Minutes

Decision

- 1) To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 1 March 2023 as a correct minute.
- 2) To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 26 April 2023 as a correct minute.
- 3) To approve the minute of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 10 May 2023 as a correct minute.

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:

Councillors Booth, O'Neill and Osler requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.6 – Flats 1 - 9 31A Chambers Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1HU – application no. 22/05381/FULSTL

Councillors Beal and Booth requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.10 – 22 Inglis Green Road, Edinburgh – application no. 22/02233/FUL

Councillor O'Neill requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.11 - The Meadows Public Park, Melville Drive, Edinburgh – application no. 23/01344/FUL

Councillor Booth requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.12 – 103 Newcraighall Road, Edinburgh (Land 445 Metres North of – application no. 22/03946/AMC

Councillor Booth requested a presentation in respect of Item 4.18 – The Water Tower, South Queensferry – application no. 23/00581/FULSTL

Requests for a hearing:

Ward Councillor McKenzie requested a presentation and hearing in relation to: Item 4.7 - 111 Dalry Road, Edinburgh, EH11 2DR – application no. 23/00568/FUL

Ward Councillor McKenzie also requested a presentation and hearing in relation to: Item 4.10 – 22 Inglis Green Road, Edinburgh – application no. 22/02233/FUL

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Margaret Graham declared a non-financial interest in item 5.1 - 229 Willowbrae Road, Edinburgh, as she had not taken part in the previous decision on this application 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. 35 Jock's Lodge, Edinburgh

The Chief Planning Officer had identified an application to be dealt with by means of a hearing for a student accommodation development including ground floor retail /commercial space (use Classes 1, 2, 3 or 4) with associated access, landscaping, open space, and drainage at 35 Jock's Lodge, Edinburgh - application no. 23/00008/FUL.

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

Planning permission was sought for the demolition of existing buildings on site and erection of student accommodation including ground floor commercial space, communal amenity space, outdoor amenity space, associated landscaping, car parking (two spaces), access to the site and ancillary facilities.

The student accommodation provided 191 rooms in total. The accommodation comprised nine cluster flats, each containing five, six or seven bedrooms with shared kitchen/ lounge facilities (providing 53 bed spaces), 129 studio rooms and nine accessible studio rooms. Cluster bedrooms were approximately 13.4 sqm, with additional communal space, studio rooms were approximately 18.4 sqm to 24 sqm and accessible studio rooms were approximately 22.7 sqm.

Internal amenity space was provided including an informal study/ lounge area, gym and laundry room at ground level, and common rooms on levels four, five and six of the building. Ancillary space was provided at ground floor level providing a reception area, office and bin storage area, and at lower ground floor level providing a plant room and cycle parking.

A commercial unit (planning permission was sought for use classes 1, 2, 3 and 4) measuring 263 sqm would be provided at ground floor level which would be positioned at the western end of the London Road elevation.

The proposed building was broadly V-shaped in form, branching out from the junction corner to form two new frontages along London Road and Smokey Brae. The London Road elevation would extend to seven storeys in height, dropping down to six storeys at the western end of the elevation to accommodate a roof terrace. The Smokey Brae

elevation stepped down immediately to six storeys at the corner, with a further step down in height to five storeys above ground at the northern gable elevation, and a lower ground level which would be accommodated via the change in site level. A second roof terrace would be incorporated at fifth floor level on the Smokey Brae elevation.

At ground floor level the building layout had been informed by the retention of the access pend into the rear of the site which would be used as an area of outdoor amenity space for use by residents. The commercial unit would be situated to the west of the pend and was accessed via a separate entrance onto London Road.

The ground floor layout included the main entrance and ancillary space, a student lounge, a gym, a laundry room and student accommodation. The building layout had been designed to allow the commercial unit, student lounge and main entrance to form an activated street frontage onto London Road.

The main entrance to the development would address the corner of London Road and Smokey Brae and would incorporate a ramped and stepped entrance. A dedicated access to the cycle parking area at lower ground level was provided onto Smokey Brae. Lifts were provided within the building providing accessibility for all.

Proposed materials included a mix of buff/ pale variegated facing brick, concrete cladding and banding, aluminium cladding and curtain walling. Windows and doors would be aluminium. Metal balustrades and fencing were also proposed. The specification of materials had not been agreed at this stage and would be approved via condition.

The proposal included a mix of blue/ green sedum roof treatments which would provide SUDS for the development. A blue roof was proposed on the commercial unit which would provide attenuation draining to permeable paving below. The main building would utilise a green roof for treatment and discharge via downpipes for treatment/ attenuation.

Usable external amenity space was provided in a rear courtyard area (161 sqm) and in the form of two roof terraces at fifth and sixth floor level (38 sqm and 36 sqm) respectively. Direct access to the external courtyard would be provided via the ground floor of the building and via the access pend onto London Road. An area of private open space (36 sqm) for use by the commercial unit operator would also be provided.

The courtyard area would have a mixture of hard and soft landscaping treatment. The courtyard would incorporate two levels, connected by seating steps and benches. It was proposed that seven trees will be planted within the courtyard area. The lower courtyard area would be accessible via a ramp access.

The roof terraces would comprise a mix of hard and soft landscaping treatment. Solid balustrading would be provided which would give a level of protection from the elements. Shrub and wildflower planting was proposed for the roof terraces which would complement species provided elsewhere on site.

A new area of public realm would be provided at the main entrance to the building. This will incorporate raised planters, integrated seating and a location for public art alongside a stepped and ramped access into the building.

The building was positioned directly onto the pavement edge along the London Road frontage and would be set in by around 0.5m from the pavement along the Smokey Brae

frontage. A strip of hard landscaping treatment would be provided along the building edge and at the entrance into the cycle storage area which would provide some additional space for pedestrian movement along Smokey Brae. An area of soft planting would also be provided around the entrance to the cycle storage area/ fire exit onto Smokey Brae.

The principal pedestrian access to the building was provided on the corner of London Road and Smokey Brae as noted above.

Pedestrian and vehicular access was provided into the site from London Road, via the existing access road which would be incorporated as a pend access, to the internal courtyard area and the separate parking area which was located outwith the site boundary to the north. A further resident's access into the building would be provided on Smokey Brae. This would provide direct access to the cycle parking area at lower ground floor level, taking account for the change in level of Smokey Brae which sloped down from south to north.

The cycle parking provision would comprise 192 spaces which would be arranged as follows;

- 29 standard Sheffield stands which provided 58 single tier spaces.
- 19 custom Sheffield stands for non-standard bikes which provided 38 single tier spaces
- 48 two-tier storage spaces which provided 96 spaces in a two-tier format.

Five Sheffield stands would also be provided in the rear courtyard area for visitor cycle parking. Electric cycle charging infrastructure would be provided inside the internal cycle storage area.

The applicant had also expressed a commitment to provide ten fold up bikes which would be available free of charge for student rental.

Two car parking spaces were provided in the rear courtyard area of the site, accessed via the pend. These parking spaces would be limited for use for staff/ delivery and loading/ unloading. One of the spaces would be fully accessible and would incorporate an EV charging point.

Sustainable energy generation was proposed at the development through the use of air source heat pumps for domestic hot water. Communal areas would have heat pumps for local heating and cooling. The building would be thermally modelled to show compliance and betterment of current Scottish Technical Building Standards section 6 in relation to achieving carbon reduction. A BREEAM pre-assessment had been undertaken for the proposed development which concluded that the proposed development should achieve an "excellent" rating once completed.

During the assessment process the applicant had amended the proposed development scheme in response to feedback from officers and comments raised during the public consultation process.

The following changes were made to the revised scheme;

External changes to the building;

- A minor amendment had been made to the red line boundary along the site's northern edge, reducing the overall site area to 1,670 sq m.
- An increase in the building footprint, extending the north wing of the building to the north by an additional distance of 4m to the north.
- A reduction in height of the building by one storey along the Smokey Brae elevation and terrace height lowered by an additional storey height to increase the step down at roof level on the north wing of the building
- introduction of feature patterned brickwork to soften the massing at the corner junction.

Changes to the landscape/ public realm

- Amendments to the access/ landscape arrangements to the main entrance to increase the space available for public realm and provide seating and soft landscaping in the area
 - Amendments to the configuration of the internal courtyard area Internal changes to the building
- Internal changes to the layout of all upper floors to accommodate the amendments to the floorplan.
- Increase in the size of the cycle storage area at lower ground floor level to accommodate a varied mix of cycle storage options.
- Removal of the lower ground floor games room and relocation and reduction in the size of the amenity gym area to accommodate increased cycle parking provision to meet EDG cycle parking requirements.

Supporting Information

- Pre application consultation (PAC) report;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Design and Statement Addendum
- Planning Statement;
- Planning Statement Addendum (NPF4 Update)
- Daylight and Sunlight Amenity Report
- Verified Assessment Views Report
- Transport Statement
- Drainage Strategy Report
- Study of Need
- Student Management Plan
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Mechanical Services Strategy Report
- Local Business Survey
- Higher Education Economic Report

- Heritage Statement
- Geo-environmental Investigation Report
- Ecological Appraisal
- Bat Survey
- Air Quality Impact Assessment
- S1 Sustainability form
- Sunlight Assessment addendum

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(b) Jock's Lodge Action Group

Shane Donnellan addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Jock's Lodge Action Group. Mr Donnellan indicated that they set up the action group in response to the considerable public concern about the proposals. One key concern was the height of the proposed development, in relation to the surrounding area. This would be in breach of LDP Policies Des 1 and Des 4. The developer had acknowledged this and had amended the proposals accordingly, however, the recent provisions by the applicants did not much reduce the height. The proposals also reduced the light and privacy of the nearby residents. Despite the situation of the building, the proposed development was in line with the Apex building, however, this height was not a good benchmark to the height of the proposed building. The juxtaposition of the building was incompatible with existing character of the neighbouring buildings in breach of LDP Policy Des 4, and in breach of LDP Policy Hou 3 as the new building would detract from the setting of listed buildings. The existing buildings and stone built public house, which had historical significance, which would be destroyed if the proposals went ahead.

Kirsty Patterson addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Jock's Lodge Action Group. Ms Patterson indicated that the Council planned to build homes on the site of the new Meadowbank Centre. This proposal would see the loss of 4 currently operating businesses and two retail spaces. LDP Policy Ret 10 focused on the alternative use of shop units buildings. However, this building would see a reduction of businesses and replace them with one hospitality unit. The policy also stated that planning would be determined if there was justification to retain units in shop use. Given the number of new residents, the destruction of retail units would be detrimental to the area for future generations. As individual units, there was potential for new businesses to reinvigorate the community and the right business could inspire community identity in line with the council's own 20-minute neighborhood objectives. The recent regeneration of the Red Sandstone on Leith Walk demonstrated that an area in apparent decline could flourish.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(c) Boxroom Investments Limited

Mr Gennaro Cortellessa addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Boxroom Investments Limited. Mr Cortellessa explained that he was owner of the Ball Room Sports Bar, which was in close proximity to the new development and its car park. They were a family run business, which contributed to the local economy and also sponsored local football teams. He was not against the development, had but concerns which had to be addressed, to safeguard his property, access and the daily running of the business. He had submitted two objections, however, none of his concerns had been addressed. The proposals included building over the existing access pend into the service yard. There were significant concerns that delivery vehicles would not be able to access his business, contrary to LDP Policy Env 9 and any traffic driving into his car park would have problems. The proposed entrance to the new pend did not meet minimum height requirements for vehicles. He had asked that the pend height be increased, and reducing entry in this development would cause long term damage for his business. The noise impact assessment did not sufficiently address matters and there might be complaints against his business from future residents. The design of the proposed development would make it difficult for development of the site in the future, due to its situation. The proposals would have windows overlooking site, which would limit development of his site in future, and which was contrary to LDP Policy Des 2.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(d) Orian Pub Company Ltd.

Andrew Currie addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee. Mr Currie explained that he was Director of Orian Pub Company Ltd, owner of Limelight Bar at 15 Jocks Lodge and indicated that he supported the application. This development would change the community for the better, provide quality homes for students, inject new life into the area and provide a new venue. For 16 years, Limelight had been at the heart of the community, providing various activities. Over the years, they had maintained a good relationship with licencing officer and provided a safe drinking environment. They had remained consistent when times were difficult, but needed to change to meet local demands. It was increasingly difficult to maintain a pub business in the current setting. Many of the current units were vacant and this development would secure their future. Some of the community had objected, but he disagreed with their objections. The architectural design was modern, of good quality and in harmony with the character of the area. This development would rejuvenate their community and the influx of students would help the local economy. By embracing this development, they could secure a sustainable business model. Post-covid the hospitality industry had faced huge challenges and it was necessary to survive and thrive in the long term. The City was changing, Universities and Colleges could help with this change and this development fitted in with this. By embracing this development, they would continue to serve as a vital venue and social hub, promote good practices and social inclusion, for the benefit of the community.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(e) Samantha Robertson

Samantha Robertson addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee. Ms Robertson indicated that she was the owner of a local business at Jock's Lodge. She supported the development, as the plans represented an opportunity to replace run-down buildings with good quality student accommodation, providing a food and drink facility and some commercial units. The Scheme would complement the redevelopment in Meadowbank and help increase footfall. Some of the community was sceptical, but the current building was not commercially viable. She had run her business for 15 years, businesses had come and go because of the lack of footfall and there had also been a constant battle against crime. This would change with the smart new buildings and influx of vibrant young people. The proposed building was modern, of good quality, consistent with the streetscape and did not affect the lighting on the nearby tenements. Many of the nearby buildings were vacant, or on short term basis, making the site unsuitable for businesses. The students would not conflict with the existing residents and would actually benefit the community. The City had always been a University City and considering the lack of student accommodation, this development would free up property for young professionals. The views of the wider community were mixed, but without change, local businesses could not grow. The development represented a new opportunity to breathe new life into the area and she thought that progress was always beneficial.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(f) Caledonian Heritable Ltd

Graeme Arnott addressed the Development Management Sub-Committee on behalf of Caledonian Heritable Ltd. Mr Arnott indicated that he was a flat owner, having lived in the flat for a number of years as well as being involved with the pub. The Limelight Bar had survived because it had been converted to a bar that was more contemporary, but it had no kitchen and could not provide food. The development would allow Mr Currie's operation to bring an up to date offering. Jocks Lodge Unit had seen a mixed range of operators over the years and they all had issues to deal with. They would continue to struggle, given the age of the building and the offering they could bring. Regarding some of the comments that had been made, new developments often brought opposition. However, there had been many student developments throughout the city. With regards to the Berry Suite at the top of Abbey Hill, this was an old dance hall, but it was now a landmark as an entry into Abbey Hill. This development would give a similar situation to Jocks Lodge. From a student perspective, there were good transport links and plenty of amenities. He would commend the application to members as it was clear that the number of units on site was currently a "hot potch" of properties, they had not

had consistent tenants, partly because the units were old and dilapidated and could not be brought up to standard. He then read out a statement from Walter's Perspective which was representing Star Bars.

"So again, following a chequered and a very difficult trading history and a detailed review of the sustainability of our Jocks Lodge Pub, we identified the Valhouse Company the Willow for disposal. The site in its current condition is not being viable for us, hence we decided to actively sell. After entering into the contract to sell to Alumno, we offered the current tenant, the Willow, a temporary management agreement at a discounted rent. It was made clear that this was on a short-term basis only and it's not a viable long term option. We are very pleased to announce we have relocated the Willow to Musselburgh, which is successfully operating at this new site. We fully support Alumno's development and feel it will make a positive contribution to the area and local community."

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(g) Statement from Shaukat Ali

Andrew Currie then read statement out from Mr Shaukat Ali, who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr Ali had owned the convenience store for about 40 years and he had given him this statement to read on his behalf.

"He had proudly served the community in that time and would continue to do so in the years to come. I know that many members of the community have raised concerns about the proposals and are worried about the loss of commercial space in their local centre amongst other things. However, in my 40 years running the Shaukat Convenience Store I have seen several businesses come and go across the road, with many short-lived businesses occupying their increasingly rundown units. Consequently, it is clear to me that these are unfortunately not viable as shops or commercial premises and that positive change could help rejuvenate this stretch of the High Street. The proposal for a new food and drink venue will provide a modern facility for the whole community to enjoy and the increased footfall from students will benefit both my business and others in the area. The vital new businesses brought to the area by almost 200 students could help rejuvenate Jocks Lodge as a local centre. Furthermore, the proposed changes to Smokey Brae/Restalrig Road will help improve a stretch of road that is often dark and unsafe. I hope that other members of the community will in time, embrace these proposals and welcome the positive changes that they will bring to the area. Students are a vital part of Edinburgh's varied community and should be embraced. Thank you for your time and apologies that I cannot attend in person today."

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(h) Ward Councillors Aston, Staniforth and Whyte

Councillor Aston addressed the Sub-Committee, indicating that the proposal was to grant planning permission, but members should consider the arguments put forward

about the deficiency of the application. It was not the case that the existing units were not fit for purpose, however, the report accepted that assertion. There were 2 pubs on the site and both were doing very well, but the proposals would mean that there would only be one pub and a student common room instead of 6 commercial units. The proposals would mean a considerable reduction in square meterage to the extent of losing more than one third of the commercial floor space. It should be asked how did this not then weaken the designated local centre. This was in breach of LDP Policy Ret 5 and NPF4 Policy 15, relating to local living as well as undermining 20-minute neighbourhoods. This development scheme also undermined Jock's Lodge local centre viability. He welcomed the acknowledgment of the historic nature of the site. However, the nearby buildings were listed and the proposals would harm their setting. The proposals would be in breach of LDP Policy Env 3. The proposed structure would dominate the junction from all four approaches. The proposals would be in breach of LDP Policies Des 1 and Des 4 and would cause the canyoning of the eastern part of the development. There were three main issues of concern, which were the effect on the local centre, scale and massing and the impact on listed buildings. Additionally, there were over 1300 objections and the members should refuse this application.

Councillor Whyte addressed the Sub-Committee, explaining that he was familiar with the area and these units were retail units in a fragile area and he was less persuaded by the arguments of retention of these, in terms of economy. The local residents were concerned about the local economy and the historic nature of the site. This development had caused considerable concern in the local community. Scheme 2 has improved the scheme as there was better frontage and the new proposals dealt with some of the massing issues. A fundamental question was if this was the right site for student housing? He was concerned about the report claiming that the building was only a 30-minute walk from the nearest campus, but this was only to teach student teachers, which was only a small part of their activities. The walking and cycling routes to most university sites were much longer than specified and there was a lack of bus links. Apparently, there would not be over concentration of students, however, this was not a university area and the proposals would represent yet another type of development. This would change the nature of the community and the proposals did not comply with the 20-minute neighbourhood policy. The developers had done a good job, working through the various stages and had dealt with some of the issues around the commercial units and massing, but the local community thought that this was probably not a good site for student accommodation.

Councillor Staniforth addressed the Sub-Committee. He referred to policies, NPF4 14 and LDP Des 1 and Des 4 and indicated that this application should be refused as it was detrimental to the character of the area, to its historical character and to the modernity and future of the area. He thought that the report was flawed as it ignored the fact that the character of the area was the character of that junction. The very tall buildings opposite this site on London Road were an anomaly. Planners had previously ensured that the junction was a liminal space. In a well-designed high-density city, there was a need for certain type of spaces for citizens. This would be ruined if the authority were to create a tall, imposing building on another corner, which would detract from the openness of the junction, destroying the character of the junction at Jocks Lodge. The

report suggested that tall buildings represented the character of the area, however, the character of this junction was not for tall imposing buildings. Furthermore, the safety for pedestrians and cyclists was helped by having this existing open space. Approval of this application would mean damaging the overall character of the area, and the character of the area in which the listed building were located. However, focusing especially on the current character of the area, the character of the junction would be ruined by this development. The developers had tried to mitigate this, but the structure was excessively large and the height and massing were excessive.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

(i) Applicants and Applicant's Agent

Colin Lavety (Stantec), David Campbell (Alumno), Paul Stallan (Stallan Brand) and Kenny Hunter (Artist) were heard in support of the application.

Colin Lavety thanked the Sub-Committee for the opportunity to address the meeting. He indicated that he was the Planning Director at Stantec and the agent for the application. Joining him today was David Campbell, Paul Stallan and Kenny Hunter. In addition, they had other members of a project team here today who could help answer any questions from members after they made their presentation, but he would pass on to David Campbell first, to say a bit more about Alumno.

David Campbell indicated that he was the founder and Managing Director of Alumno. He wanted to give a brief overview of the company. They were established in 2006, formed part of the Places for People Group, so were one of the largest landlords in the UK. They were a property development and regeneration company with a specialist focus on place-making. They were a long-term investor in communities, and they specialised in the design and development of high quality, modern accommodation for students.

Working both independently and in partnership with universities and colleges, they had a genuine focus on the design and built quality of their developments and had won a number of significant industry awards, including Property Week Developer of the Year in 2020/21.

Projects in Scotland included a project in Aberdeen, St Andrews and Hyndland House in Glasgow, which was ranked the number one student accommodation in Glasgow in 2020/21. They had also delivered in excess of 8,000 beds nationally, with a wide range of stakeholder involvement and they had worked with a wide range of local authorities, universities and colleges. This project engaged with local renowned artist Kenny Hunter, to develop a significant bespoke artwork, which would enhance and celebrate the historic heritage of the site.

Colin Lavety indicated that they had heard earlier a comment that there has been a lack of engagement with locals and from the outset, they would stress that they would

disagree. Members should note that this proposal had been developed over the last few years. Consultation was undertaken during Covid, when obviously there were quite serious health concerns. But they had very much taken an extensive and robust process, which exceeded the minimum at the time.

People were probably aware there was a website which they held a lot longer than was required. As soon as restrictions started to be lifted, they started to do face-to-face events. They carried out a face-to-face event, purely at the request of local people. They attended one of the local fairs at a weekend, with several teams meetings and had discussions with other members. So they felt that had engaged and his own team had responded to several hundred e-mails, direct responses to locals, who asked questions that ranged from two paragraphs to five pages long. So, there had been a huge amount of information shared with local people.

Despite the high volume of objections which, they had heard about, they would emphasise, as has been heard, there was a significant body of support as shown, by the 316 material letters of support submitted. They had worked tirelessly in collaboration with officers and believed that the plans were robust, deliverable and represented a significant opportunity to reinvigorate this gateway into the city,

It had been obvious from the very start of the process, that there were three overarching areas of focus, and he thought that the planning officer had covered a lot of these in their presentation. These were the principle of development, the need and demand side and delivering an appropriate, high quality design solution. Paul Stallan would cover the third point later. He would touch on the first two points now.

In terms of principle, the Council's LDP encouraged well designed, compact urban growth that was sustainable and allowed for 20-minute neighborhood principles to be delivered. Their proposals were compatible with these principles, as well as policy priorities in terms of sustainability, transport, materials, use, climate change and the development of brownfield land.

Whilst it was acknowledged that existing buildings would be demolished, as heard earlier, these buildings were not in good physical condition, they made no contribution architecturally to the local aesthetic and were not considered to be a viable business in the long term, by the respective landowners. Accordingly, a "do nothing" approach may result in some or all of these businesses closing down, bearing in mind that half of them were not operational at the moment and the site would probably come under future pressure for redevelopment, or of being developed in a piecemeal fashion.

The proposal to redevelop the site for a single mixed-use building, which was cohesive over the long term, was therefore considered to be preferable. The proposal not only represented a chance to contribute towards unmet need for student accommodation but also to re-develop an undefined corner providing a highly sustainable and well-designed new development. On that basis, they considered the principles well established, something which had been already confirmed in the

committee report.

Turning to need, which was the leading justification, they were aware this was a huge issue in Edinburgh and a lot of other cities. The number of students continued to grow and rise year on year. Facing this issue head on, they had got to the point of doing three separate reports on needs, on the impact on higher education, the economy and a local business survey to make sure that the case also had a robust evidence base.

They were also aware that there were recent precedents across Edinburgh, in terms of what became an overconcentration of students. This had been touched on during questions earlier. Their own evidence submitted in support of the application concluded that this proposal would take the concentration up to 10.1% within the wards, but just 8.9% within a 1-mile radius of the site. This percentage fell well below the indicative threshold of 50%, which Council guidance stated would be considered excessive. When this was compared to some of the student housing proposals which had been approved across the city, some of which exceeded 40% concentration of students, it was clear that if this application was approved, there would not be an over concentration of students in this part of Edinburgh.

Added to this, they received regular reports about the shortfall UK wide. To be clear, there was a huge shortfall in rooms, but also a huge need for accommodation, which of course helped to free up mainstream housing stock for families and other groups who needed it. As shown by some of the headlines on the presentation, aside from local impacts in this part of Edinburgh, there was currently a city-wide deficit of over 27,000 beds. Even if all the schemes in the pipeline were to come forward, this would still rise up to 32,000 and beyond, within the next year and a half.

On that basis, there was clear evidence that there was a need for student accommodation in Edinburgh. To touch on the economic benefit of such development, students were forecast to spend more than £1.4 billion per year with only £650 million being off-campus expenditure. Looking more locally at Jock's Lodge, they anticipated that local businesses would benefit significantly from increased footfall and the 191 students and that would amount to spending of more than £900,000 per year in the local area on foods, personal goods and entertainment.

Paul Stallan indicated that Edinburgh's timescape was a work of art. It was open plan and a spatial masterpiece. However, as one progressed east to Jock's Lodge, the perfection of the city in terms of its urbanism, broke down. Historical study showed that the form was still in transition from 1850, to 1950, to 2050. Now, it was possible to see a location which was changed from century to century. The architecture of this location was mixed, was a layer cake of historical development, from Victorian, to interwar, to late modern.

It was possible to see from the presentation that the context continued to change with Meadowbank, the morphology of this part of the city, again changing and developing. A photo of the existing site showed the openness and the gap in terms of a plan, this

would have been an urban gateway and a more defined corner. It could be seen, and has been cited earlier, the condition of existing architecture. There was nothing from Historic Environment Scotland's perspective, anything of worth, in terms of the architecture. It was more about the meaning and the memory of the place.

Aerial photographs confirmed that in the north-east corner, that was morphology, which was foreign, there was a type of architecture which created an additional street form. What they were promoting was effectively the completion of a traditional city with an active ground floor and street - an urban block with a frontage.

It was possible to see that the ensemble of buildings was very much traditional in the sense that there was a church, the Willowbrae Church, which framed a vista as one came along London Road. So, they would complete the narrative of that historical part of the city to complete a more considered urbanism.

Through sketch design, through model-making and through detailed design and working with the planning officers and listening to the community, they had developed an architecture with character, warmth, human proportions and they had evolved the scheme and iterated the scheme through the last two years of the process. They had reduced the height, chiseled at the gables, had articulated and had created an architecture of real quirkiness at points, and also some classicism on to London Road.

The architecture again responded to the comments that the Cockburn Society made in relation to the scale of Smoky Bay. They reduced that, had modelled it and they thought that it was an appropriate sort of gateway gable that announced itself on that that elevation. It was possible to see from the diagrams that the architecture was very simple. In fact, the diagrams essentially completed themselves. It was a simple tenement construction on a corner, to define and create a more legible urban architecture in this point in the city.

The visualizations and verified views gave the impression of an architecture which was contemporary, there was an art deco element to it which picked up in St Andrews House for the "long west" on London Road. It also had a certain classicism, so it was a contemporary building which spoke to the past.

In terms of the plans, it was very simple with an active ground floor of a traditional sense, in terms of high street architecture, with rooms above. For the rooms, there was a mix of accommodation from accessible rooms, to cluster rooms, to studio rooms, to respond to different student needs. In terms of the basement, there was a significant basement which was dedicated to active travel, where 192 students, with 192 parking spaces for bikes and re-charging. Regarding the quality of the rooms that were provided, they were second to none, they were very elegant and well-fitted accommodation. In terms of the ground floor, the interiors were first-class, they had some great designers who were UK renowned, working on the interior fit out.

In terms of courtyard, there were places for contemplation and spaces for study. It was

a space that would be safe, overlooked, animated for activity and the gym and the laundry would open out on to it. The new restaurant again has a space for outdoor eating, so it would be an active and animated space.

Again, it was possible to see the scale and size of provision of the unit that was provided. They had heard from some of the people involved, in terms of local businesses. In terms of the architecture, it was unapologetically modern, contemporary, looking into an interior, which was full of life and gave something back to the street. They felt confident that this would be a stylish and popular destination, which gave something back to a part of the street, which was currently not in good shape. Again, they emphasised their commitment to active travel and the connections that they were making back to the universities, in terms of travel distance.

Kenny Hunter indicated that he was a sculptor, with over 25 years' experience on public realm projects. He taught part-time at Edinburgh College of Art and he lived four bus stops away from Jock's Lodge on Milton Road. He was here today to outline a four points arts strategy that has been developed by Stantec, Alumno, Stellan Brand and himself. This wide-ranging and site-specific strategy would, he believed, offer significant benefits to both the building and the community at large.

Points 1 and 2 were proposals for a period of related artworks. This would be a figure of sculpture that could potentially be recessed at a high level on the corner of the building for prominence and visibility, and a text work, potentially sited on a gable end wall. Both of these artworks would relate to the social history of Jock's Lodge as a site of transition, which was evident through its original use as an inn and first place to change horses on the Edinburgh to London Stagecoach. Also, the name of Smokey Brae referred to the area's former use as a railyard and station that historically occupied the site. To this day, the East Coast Mainline still ran along the back of the site, linking the capital to Scotland and England.

So, the sculpture he wanted to propose would be that of a traveller. This subject not only connected with this heritage he had outlined, but also spoke to the new use as a temporary home for young people who had relocated to Jocks Lodge from other parts of Scotland, Britain and the world. This move to a new city was for them, not only a physical change, but could also accelerate their transition into adulthood.

At the junction of London Road and Smokey Brae, above the entrance to the building, there could be a still figure cast in concrete. She would stand on the threshold with her luggage,

To conclude, he would mention two other points. The two points in the strategy, apart from two artworks, would be to commission new artworks from recent EC graduates to go inside the interior of the building. Finally, a historic police box which was on site currently, would be relocated and used as a bookable space for events exhibitions which could be run by community groups, charities and startups and artists.

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

Motion

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Des 1, Des 4, Des 5, Ret 5 and NPF4 Policies 7(c) and 14, and section 59 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Booth.

Amendment

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 Mowat, seconded by Councillor Jones.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

- For the motion: - 7 votes
- For the amendment: - 4 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Beal, Booth, Gardiner, Graham, Hyslop, O'Neill and Osler.

For the amendment: Councillors Cameron, Jones, McNeese-Mechan and Mowat.)

Decision

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Des 1, Des 4, Des 5, Ret 5 and NPF4 Policies 7(c) and 14, and section 59 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997.

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

4. 124 Salamander Street, 1-3 Salamander Yards, South Leith, Edinburgh

The Chief Planning Officer had identified an application to be dealt with by means of a hearing for a planning application for proposals which comprised a 5 - 6 storey building providing 99 residential apartments with associated access, parking & landscape (as amended) at 124 Salamander Street, 1 - 3 Salamander Yards, South Leith, Edinburgh - application no. 22/03430/FUL.

(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer

The application proposed the demolition of all existing buildings on the site, and the erection of a new mixed use development comprising of residential accommodation and commercial uses. A total of 99 residential units were proposed of which 64 would be open market and 35 (35%) were classed as affordable housing which would be pepper-potted throughout the development.

The breakdown in unit sizes across all tenures proposed were;

One bed units - 38 (38 %)

Two bed units - 41 (42 %) T

Three bed units - 20 (20 %)

The new building would be U-shaped with six storeys to the frontage with Salamander Street, dropping to five storeys at Leith Links. Two commercial units were proposed at ground floor level facing Salamander Street. Proposed materials included a predominantly red brick front to Salamander Street with the two five storey side blocks would be finished in buff brick. The building would have a flat roof with balconies located throughout the development.

The proposed commercial units will feature full height glazing and face onto Salamander Street. The combined area of the units is approximately 230.8 square metres.

Proposed landscaping would consist of private gardens to ground floor units, and a large communal area enclosed within the block.

The proposals included 18 car parking spaces and four motorcycle parking spaces. One of the car parking spaces would be designated as wheelchair accessible while the proposed parking arrangement would include four twin EV charging points. In addition, 220 secure external cycle parking spaces were proposed as well as 44 non-standard internal cycle stores. These would be provided at the ground floor of the accommodation or within dedicated external storage.

Supporting documents

The following documents had been provided to support the application:

- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Pre-Application Consultation Report
- Daylight & Sunlight Assessment
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Transport Statement
- Sustainability Statement
- Air Quality Impact Assessment
- Odour Statement (Within Design & Access Statement)
- SUDs
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Sustainability Form
- Tree Constraints Plan
- Landscape & Visual Appraisal

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

There were no contributions received from local bodies, objectors or ward members.

(b) Applicants and Applicant's Agent

Craig Tait of 7N Architects was heard in support of the application.

Craig Tait explained that he represented 7N Architects and would speak on behalf of the applicant, Prudent Homes, and also for themselves as designers for the project. He wanted to speak in support of the scheme, because they believed in the quality of what was being proposed. They were excited about the opportunity that the project presented, not just as a development in its own right, but as an opportunity to re-characterise Salamander Street.

The development was located on 124 Salamander Street and 1-3 Salamander Yards and was within a mixed use residential wide regeneration area, which includes the Rope Works Master Plan, immediately to the west and the rear highlighted on the the diagram. The site was located within the Waterfront Major New Development Area. City Plan 2030 supported high quality, mixed-use development within this zone. By optimising the potential of the site, the proposals helped CEC, to deliver new homes and the project contributed to the emerging residential character of the area.

Following the principles of NPF4, the proposals re-use of brownfield land, enabled biodiversity gain and supported sustainable transport solutions. It also promoted compact urban growth and the creation of new livable places.

The site, as existed, was occupied with low rise commercial units, with surface parking and service yards and these contributed little to the surrounding streetscape. Two out of three of the current units were vacant. Their proposal sought to re-characterise the site and deliver a flagship development which improved the local environment and the quality of the area.

As the planning officer explained, the proposals were arranged in a U-shaped form which reinstated the street edges to Salamander Street and Salamander Yards, and presented an open, landscaped courtyard to the south. Apartments were quite simply arranged around four circulation cores, accessed from the east, north and west, and vehicle access was provided to the east from Salamander Street. Two commercial units were proposed at ground floor level to address Salamander Street and a landscaped courtyard and a new street-facing pocket park, provided environmental improvements and delivered net biodiversity gain. Planting species for the development were being specially selected to contribute to the absorption of pollutants from the road.

The proposals were being considered as part of a wider mixed use residential master plan, in order that the design was appropriate to the future context of the place. Highlighted in the presentation was indicative massing, suggesting how the future of the street may develop. In line with surrounding developments, it was anticipated that Salamander Street would develop as a series of five to six storey perimeter blocks and

they envisaged green links being located intermittently between buildings, to provide light and air to the street.

The proposals had additionally been designed to anticipate the Leith Connections Programme, which were indicatively shown in the presentation. Reference was made to the proposals being put forward by the applicant and the future connections programme which saw new cycle ways, new Copenhagen Crossings at road junctions and the creation of the new pocket park which was shown on the presentation. That tapped into that idea of a much wider public realm improvement within the area.

The proposals would deliver 99 apartments and accommodation as assigned in an approximate 40/40 split. Looking ahead to the implementation of City Plan 2030, their client was proposing 35% affordable housing, which went well beyond current requirements.

All apartment sizes were designed in line with Edinburgh Design Guidance and flats had been designed as modern, open-plan arrangements, which benefited from private external amenity spaces. The development prioritised sustainable transport, which reflected the site's proximity to the Restalrig Cycle Path. Cycle storage was provided in line with current policy, including provision for 20%, non-standard spaces and a mix of both low level and two-tier cycle storage. The development delivered 18 car parking spaces, one of which was accessible and that was equivalent to 18% of the overall unit numbers.

The proposed amenity areas highlighted in the presentation were fully compliant with CEC policy. This was equivalent to 11.6 square metres per flat, which was over and above policy minimum requirement of 10 square metres. In addition, they were proposing approximately 250 square metres of publicly accessible amenity within the Pocket Park.

In terms of proposals for the building elevations, they had put forward a very simple but refined pallet of robust, attractive materials. Consideration has been given to the context and character of Leith as a whole, while seeking to create a strong identity for the development which provided a sense of place to the street.

Basically, in summary, they believed that the proposals were in line with policy and offered the opportunity for a flagship development for this area, facilitating the re-use of brownfield land, enabling biodiversity, net gain from compact, urban growth and ultimately delivering a high-quality place to live.

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

[Development Management Sub-Committee - Wednesday 21 June 2023, 10:00am - City of Edinburgh Council Webcasts \(public-i.tv\)](#)

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 requiring the applicant to investigate the potential to include City Car Club spaces within the development.

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

5. 12-18 Lower Gilmore Place, Edinburgh

Details were provided of an application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of purpose-built student accommodation with associated landscaping and cycle parking (as amended) at 12 -18 Lower Gilmore Place, Edinburgh - application no. 22/06109/FUL.

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

Motion

- 1) To **GRANT** planning permission subject:
 - (a) To the conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
 - (b) An additional condition that the applicant examined the provision of cycle parking provision that was more in keeping with council policies and be more creative to allow greater usage of space.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Booth.

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Des 1, Des 10(a) and the Non-Statutory Guidance on student housing.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Graham.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion: - 4 votes

For the amendment: - 5 votes

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

For the amendment: Councillors Booth, Gardiner, Graham, Hyslop, and Mowat.)

Decision

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Des 1, Des 10(a) and the Non-Statutory Guidance on student housing.

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

6. 31A (Flats 1-9) Chambers Street, Edinburgh

Details were provided of an application for change of use of the entire property at 31A Chambers Street for use a short term let accommodation including 9 apartments operated and managed as one unit with independent / main door access from the street at 31A (Flats 1 – 9) Chambers Street, Edinburgh – application no. 22/05381/FULSTL.

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

Motion

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 and NPF4 Policy 30 (e)(ii).

- moved by Councillor O'Neill, seconded by Councillor Osler.

Amendment

To **GRANT** planning permission:

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Beal.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion: - 6 votes

For the amendment: - 3 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Gardiner, Graham, Hyslop, Jones, O'Neill and Osler.

For the amendment: Councillors Beal, McNeese-Mechan and Mowat.)

(Abstention – Councillor Booth)

Decision

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 and NPF4 Policy 30 (e)(ii).

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

7. 22 Inglis Green Road, Edinburgh

Details were provided of an application for mixed-use residential and commercial development with associated landscape, parking, and infrastructure (as amended) at 22 Inglis Green Road, Edinburgh - application no. 22/02233/FUL.

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

A vote was taken for or against on whether to continue consideration of the application for a hearing.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For Continuation - 5 votes

Against Continuation - 5 votes

(For Continuation: Councillors Beal, Jones, McNeese-Mechan, Mowat and Osler.

(Against Continuation: Councillors Booth, Gardiner, Graham, Hyslop and O'Neill.)

Voting

For continuation: - 5 votes

Against continuation: - 5 votes

Casting Vote

In the division, 5 members having voted for continuation and 5 members against continuation, the Convener gave her casting vote for continuation.

Decision

To **CONTINUE** consideration of the application for a hearing.

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

8. The Water Tower, South Queensferry

Details were provided of an application for change of use from residential to commercial short term let at The Water Tower, South Queensferry - application no. 23/00581/FULSTL.

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 McNeese-Mechan.

Amendment

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to NPF4 Policy 30(e)(ii).

- moved by Councillor Booth seconded by Councillor Gardiner.

Voting

For the motion: - 3 votes

For the amendment: - 7 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Jones, McNeese-Mechan and Osler.

(For the amendment: Councillors Beal, Booth, Gardiner, Graham, Hyslop, Mowat and O'Neill.)

Decision

To **REFUSE** planning permission as the proposals were contrary to NPF4 Policy 30(e)(ii).

(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 Balfour Beatty Investments Ltd. for Proposal of Application at 140 Causewayside, Edinburgh, EH9 1PR.</p>	<p>Demolition of the existing buildings on site and the erection of a purpose-built student accommodation development and ancillary uses at 140 Causewayside, Edinburgh – application no. 23/02186/PAN</p>	<p>To notes the key issues at this stage.</p>
<p>4.2 – Report for forthcoming application by Miller Homes & Roseberry Estates for Proposal of Application Notice at land at Turnhouse Road, Edinburgh.</p>	<p>Proposed residential development with associated drainage, landscape and infrastructure works at Land to the south of Turnhouse Road (south of Turnhouse Golf Club), Edinburgh – application no. 23/01816/PAN</p>	<p>To note the key issues at this stage.</p>
<p>4.3 – Report for forthcoming application by Cruden Homes Ltd. for Proposal of Application Notice at Site 250 Metres East Of 11 West Shore Road, Edinburgh.</p>	<p>Residential led development of mixed tenure (social rent, mid-market rent and private sale), associated landscape and infrastructure; including commercial space and mobility hub facilities, site enabling works for proposed primary school and energy centre – application no. 23/02215/PAN.</p>	<p>To notes the key issues at this stage.</p>
<p>4.4 – 25 Argyle Crescent, Edinburgh (At Land 16 Metres Southeast of)</p>	<p>Erection of 2x new build, 3 storey, semi-detached townhouses on gap site (as amended) - application no. 23/00897/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>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>4.5 - Bonnington House, Bonnington, Wilkieston</p>	<p>Proposed development of a gallery and micro distillery (including integrated dunnage) formed around a new orientation building providing staff and visitor facilities, cafe, and ancillary gift shop, landscaping, parking and ancillary works (as amended) - application no. 23/00509/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>4.6 - Flats 1 - 9 31A Chambers Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1HU</p>	<p>Change of use of the entire property at 31A Chambers Street for use a short term let accommodation including 9 apartments operated and managed as one unit with independent / main door access from the street – application no. 22/05381/FULSTL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 7 and NPF4 Policy 30 (e)(ii) (On a division.)</p>
<p>4.7 – 111 Dalry Road, Edinburgh, EH11 2DR</p>	<p>Change of use to from Class 1 to Class 3 after amalgamation of No. 109 and No. 111 (as amended) - application no. 23/00568/FUL</p>	<p>1) To REFUSE the request for a hearing. 2) 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>4.8 – George Square Gardens, 62 George Square, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Edinburgh Festival Fringe 2023 venue site comprising two performance venues, box offices, bars, food traders and ancillary offices and storage - application no. 23/01353/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>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>4.9 – 10 - 14 Haymarket Terrace, Edinburgh, EH12 5JZ</p>	<p>Sub-divide the property and change use of No. 14 from Class 1 (retail) to (Sui Generis) to open an immersive magic experience for a small number of guests at a time, with refreshments and participation in a live entertainment experience - application no. 23/00808/FUL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.10 – 22 Inglis Green Road, Edinburgh, EH14 2HZ</p>	<p>Mixed-use residential and commercial development with associated landscape, parking, and infrastructure (as amended) - application no. 22/02233/FUL</p>	<p>To CONTINUE consideration of the application for a hearing. (On a division.)</p>
<p>4.11 – The Meadows Public Park, Melville Drive, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Edinburgh Festival Fringe venues site comprising two performance venues, a box office, bars, food traders and ancillary offices and storage - application no. 23/01344/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>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>4.12 – 103 Newcraighall Road, Edinburgh (Land 445 Metres North of)</p>	<p>Approval of matters specified in conditions 1 in part, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 in part, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15 of planning permission 16/04122/PPP for the erection of 676 dwellings including affordable housing, local centre comprising class 1, 2, 3, 4, 10 and 11 and associated access, landscaping, open space, and infrastructure - application no. 22/03946/AMC</p>	<p>To APPROVE matters specified in conditions, 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 condition that notwithstanding what is shown on the approved plans, details of cycle parking for the residential development to achieve greater accessibility, taking account of Council policy and the Cycle Parking Factsheet, to be submitted to and approved by the Council, as planning Authority.
<p>4.13 – Elizabeth House, 31 Royal Elizabeth Yard, Kirkliston</p>	<p>Application for hazardous substance consent for a new whisky maturation warehousing site - application no. 22/05925/HSC</p>	<p>To GRANT hazardous substance consent subject to the conditions and reasons, as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>4.14 – 1 Scotstoun House, South Queensferry, EH30 9SE</p>	<p>Redevelopment of Scotstoun House including conversion and extension of existing buildings to residential use, part-demolition of office extension, and erection of new build residential development with associated infrastructure, landscaping, access and parking. (as amended) – application no. 21/04755/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>4.15 – 22-23 Teviot Place, Edinburgh (Proposed Temporary Festival Venue 40 Metres North of)</p>	<p>Edinburgh Festival Fringe venue site comprising one performance venue, bar, toilets and ancillary offices and storage. The site also functions as a queuing area for venues in University of Edinburgh buildings surrounding the site - application no. 23/01346/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>4.16 – Teviot Place, Bristo Square, Edinburgh (Proposed Fringe Festival Venue Site)</p>	<p>Edinburgh Festival Fringe venue site comprising a bar and ancillary storage. The site also functions as a queuing area for venues in University of Edinburgh buildings surrounding the site - application no. 23/01350/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>4.17 – Teviot Place, Bristo Square, Edinburgh (Proposed Fringe Festival Venue Site)</p>	<p>Edinburgh Festival Fringe venue site comprising a box office, bars, food trader's toilets and ancillary offices and storage. The site also functions as a queuing area for venues in University of Edinburgh buildings surrounding the site. The area will also be used for University of Edinburgh graduations - application no. 23/01354/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>4.18 – The Water Tower, South Queensferry, EH30 9TS</p>	<p>Change of use from residential to commercial short term let - application no. 23/00581/FULSTL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission as the proposals were contrary to NPF4 Policy 30(e)(ii). (On a division)</p>
<p>4.19 – 22 Young Street North Lane, Edinburgh</p>	<p>Change of use with alterations from office to form 3x short term let visitor accommodation - application no. 22/04402/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>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>5.1 – 229 Willowbrae Road, Edinburgh, EH8 7ND</p>	<p>A residential development consisting of 48 apartments with a commercial unit at ground level - application no. 22/02740/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>6.1 - Jock's Lodge, Edinburgh, EH8 7AA - application no. 23/00008/FUL</p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Service Director – Legal and Assurance</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>6.2 - 35 Jock's Lodge, Edinburgh, EH8 7AA</p>	<p>Student accommodation development including ground floor retail /commercial space (use Classes 1, 2, 3 or 4) with associated access, landscaping, open space, and drainage - application no. 23/00008/FUL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Des 1, Des 4, Des 5, Ret 5 and NPF4 Policies 7(c) and 14, and section 59 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997. (On a division)</p>
<p>6.3 - 124 Salamander Street, 1 - 3 Salamander Yards, South Leith, Edinburgh – application no. 22/03430FUL</p>	<p>Protocol Note by the Service Director – Legal and Assurance</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>6.4 - 124 Salamander Street, 1 - 3 Salamander Yards, South Leith, Edinburgh</p>	<p>The proposals comprise a 5 - 6 storey building providing 99 residential apartments with associated access, parking & landscape (as amended) - application no. 22/03430/FUL</p>	<p>To GRANT planning permission subject to:</p> <p>(1) The conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p> <p>(2) An additional informative requiring the applicant to investigate the potential to include City Car Club spaces within the development.</p>
<p>7.1 – 6 Bankhead Broadway, Edinburgh, EH11 4DB</p>	<p>Change of use from use as a warehouse to form a swimming pool to teach babies and tots - application no. 23/02062/FUL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in section C of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</p>
<p>7.2 – 12 -18 Lower Gilmore Place, Edinburgh, EH3 9NY</p>	<p>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of purpose-built student accommodation with associated landscaping and cycle parking (as amended) - application no. 22/06109/FUL</p>	<p>To REFUSE planning permission as the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan Policies Des 1, Des 10(a) and the Non-Statutory Guidance on student housing.</p> <p>(On a division.)</p>