

Development Management Sub-Committee Report

Wednesday 13 March 2024

**Application for Planning Permission
Middle Kinleith Farm, Harlaw Road, Currie.**

Proposal: Demolition of existing shed and barn and construction of two new dwellinghouses with associated roads, drainage and infrastructure.

**Item – Committee Decision
Application Number – 24/00127/FUL
Ward – B02 - Pentland Hills**

Reasons for Referral to Committee

The application has been referred to the Development Management Sub-Committee because 52 material support comments have been received and it is recommended for refusal. Consequently, under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, the application must be determined by the Development Management Sub-Committee.

Recommendation

It is recommended that this application be **Refused** subject to the details below.

Summary

The proposals do not comply with the National Planning Framework 4 (NPF 4) and Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) as a whole.

The residential development is contrary to Green Belt policy principles as it would fail to deliver sustainable and compact urban growth. It would be located out with an accessible, well connected urban environment. It is anticipated there would be a reliance on private car usage. The site is not located in a sustainable location and residential use here would not support local living.

It would not detract from the landscape quality or rural character of the area, re-uses brownfield land and is appropriately designed. However, these benefits do not outweigh the overall conflict with NPF4 or the LDP.

Overall, the material considerations support the presumption against granting planning permission.

SECTION A – Application Background

Site Description

The site is located to the south of Currie, on the northern side of Harlaw Road. It covers over 3,500 square metres of land. Originally, it formed part of a larger farm holding.

There are two main former agricultural buildings of functional appearance that remain on site - a cattle shed and an open sided barn. Other buildings associated with the farm have previously been removed. There is a downward slope evident from south to north.

To the west, are former farmhouse buildings converted into residential dwellings with one additional residential dwelling beyond this. To the east is series of historic farm cottages with a mix of housing. To the north are open fields and to the south a mix of open landscapes with some farm buildings/houses.

The site lies within the Green Belt and Pentlands Special Landscape Area as identified in the LDP. A local nature conservation site lies to the east in Poet's Glen which is bordered by dense woodlands.

Description of the Proposal

Two residential dwellings accommodating four bedrooms.

One dwelling would be located to the sites north-west corner replacing a former cattle shed. The existing building footprint is 426 m² whilst the proposed footprint would be approximately 387 m², with 446 m² floorspace. It would be approximately 5.6 m in height, 26.5 m in width and 22.4 m in depth. Additional habitable space will be accommodated at basement level.

An open sided barn to the south covering 212 m² would also be demolished to accommodate the second dwelling with a proposed footprint of approximately 266 m², with 306 m² floorspace. It will be approximately 6.4m in height, 23.2 m width and 23.7 m in depth.

Both dwellings would be one and a half storeys in height. The walls would mainly be timber clad with stone sections with dual pitched slate roofs. Large, glazed openings would face onto private garden space. Garages would accommodate one car parking space and three cycles per dwelling. These would front onto paved surfaces where an additional car parking space is detailed.

A new access road would be formed to the sites east which will connect to Harlaw Road. This area will be landscaped with range of soft planting detailed. Communal planting beds would also be formed between the two dwellings.

Supporting Information

- Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Design Statement
- Drainage information
- Planning Statement
- Surface water flow plans
- Transport Statement
- Tree report
- Visualisations

Relevant Site History

21/05193/FUL
Middle Kinleith Farm
Harlaw Road
Balerno
Creation of 3 dwelling houses (as amended).
Refused
5 April 2022

Other Relevant Site History

Site History:

11 August 2022 - Appeal against the refusal of planning application 21/05193/FUL for three dwellings dismissed - appeal reference PPA-230-2378

Land immediately east of application site:

3 August 2000 - Planning permission granted for restoration and conversion to one dwelling house - application reference: 00/01630/FUL.

28 May 1997 - Planning permission granted to alter farmhouse to form two houses - application reference: 97/00103/FUL.

Pre-Application process

Pre-application discussions took place on this application.

Consultation Engagement

Transport Planning

Archaeology

Flood Planning

Refer to Appendix 1 for a summary of the consultation response.

Publicity and Public Engagement

Date of Neighbour Notification: 19 January 2024

Date of Renotification of Neighbour Notification: Not Applicable

Press Publication Date(s): Not Applicable

Site Notices Date(s): Not Applicable

Number of Contributors: 55

Section B - Assessment

Determining Issues

This report will consider the proposed development under Sections 24, 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (the 1997 Act):

Having regard to the legal requirement of Section 24(3), in the event of any policy incompatibility between National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) & Edinburgh Local Development Plan 2016 (LDP) the newer policy shall prevail.

Do the proposals comply with the development plan?

If the proposals do comply with the development plan, are there any compelling material considerations for not approving them?

If the proposals do not comply with the development plan, are there any compelling material considerations for approving them?

In the assessment of material considerations this report will consider:

- equalities and human rights
- public representations and
- any other identified material considerations.

Assessment

To address these determining issues, it needs to be considered whether:

a) The proposals comply with the development plan?

National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) was adopted by the Scottish Ministers on 13 February 2023 and forms part of the Council's Development Plan. NPF4 policies supports the planning and delivery of Sustainable Places, Liveable Places and Productive Places and are the key policies against which proposals for development are assessed. Several policies in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) are superseded by equivalent and alternative policies within NPF4.

The relevant policies to be considered are:

- NPF4 Sustainable Place Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9,
- NPF4 Liveable Place Policies 14, 15, 16, 17, 22,
- LDP Developer contributions policy Del 1
- LDP Design policies Des 1, Des 3, Des 4, Des 5,
- LDP Environment policy Env 10, Env 12, Env 21
- LDP Housing policy Hou 1, Hou 3, Hou 4,
- LDP Transport policy Tra 2, Tra 3,

The non-statutory Guidance for Development in the Countryside and Green Belt is a material consideration that is relevant when considering NPF 4 policy 8.

Principle

LDP policy Hou 1 (Housing Development) part 1 states priority will be given to the delivery of houses on allocated sites, designated areas for mix of uses or regeneration or other suitable sites in the urban area.

Part 2 states green belt proposals maybe granted permission where there is an identified deficit in the housing land supply. Where this is identified one criterion includes developments contribution to the principles of sustainable development.

The site is not allocated or designated for any purpose set out in part 1 of this policy whilst there is no identified deficit in housing land supply.

The sites detached, rural location and its characteristics with no designated footways or cycleways mainly support private car use. The reporters appeal decision to refuse previous planning application 21/05193/FUL for three dwellings stated the site was 'not conveniently - or even moderately inconveniently - located to reach such services' (public transport, shops etc).

These circumstances are largely unchanged, and this development similarly does not contribute to principles of sustainable development. The proposal is therefore contrary to LDP policy Hou 1.

Green Belt

NPF4 policy 8 (Green Belts) part i) states in summary that residential development proposals within a designated green belt will only be supported where associated with a worker in primary industry, intensify an established use (eg. extensions) or replace an existing home.

Part ii) outlines further requirements including why a Green Belt location is essential, how its purpose is not undermined, its compatibility (in terms of countryside, landscape character and design) and that there will be no significant long-term impacts on environmental quality.

LDP policy Env 10 also outline criteria where development may be permitted. To comply, development proposals must meet one of four criteria (a to d) and not detract from the areas' landscape quality or rural character.

Criteria a) relates to development where a countryside location is essential. Criteria b) relates to the change of use of an existing building, c) to development relating to an existing use or building(s) (extensions, ancillary development or intensification) and d) to replacing a building where the use is unchanged.

The non-statutory Development in the Countryside and Green Belt also set out the circumstance where new houses may be justified. Exceptional planning reasons include reuse of brownfield land and gap sites within existing clusters of dwellings.

It has not been evidenced the dwelling will be constructed for primary workers. As new, residential units the development would not intensify an established use. The dwellings would not replace an existing home. Part i) of NPF4 policy 8 is therefore not met.

A green belt or countryside location is not essential for residential use. The development would not involve the conversion of an existing building and a new use is proposed. Part ii) of NPF 4 policy 8 and criteria a) to d) of LDP policy Env 10 are therefore not met.

The development through replacing aged functional agricultural buildings with residential dwellings would change the character of the land. The dwellings long, narrow footprints would help reduce their mass from local views. Their one-and-half storey height would appear in proportion with dwellings nearby. The simple pitched form with slate roofs and timber clad walls would appear compatible with this rural context. In this regard, the development would not detract from the areas' rural character or landscape quality.

The intent of NPF 4 policy 8 is to encourage, promote and facilitate compact urban growth. To use land around towns and cities sustainably. As per the above, the site is not in a sustainable location. It is located near a small number of dwellings only with similarly access to a range of services. The proposal therefore has the potential to undermine the purpose of the green belt as it fails to deliver compact, sustainable urban growth.

In regard to the non-statutory guidance, it is acknowledged the proposal would re-use brownfield land. However, the site is not a clearly defined gap site with large open field to its north and south. The degree of conformity with this part of guidance does not outweigh the conflict with principle Green Belt policies NPF 4 policy 8 and LDP policy Env 10.

Sustainable, Rural Homes

NPF 4 policy 9 (Brownfield, vacant and derelict land, and empty buildings) intent refers to encouraging reuse of brownfield, vacant or derelict land and empty buildings.

NPF 4 policy 15 (Local Living and 20 minute neighbourhoods) intent is to encourage, promote and facilitate the 'place principle'. Create connected and compact neighbourhoods where daily needs are in reasonable distance through use of sustainable transport.

NPF 4 policy 16 (Quality Homes) part f) refers to proposals for new homes on land not allocated for housing in the LDP will only be supported in limited circumstances including where consistent with plan spatial strategy, local living and 20-minute neighbourhoods.

NPF 4 policy 17 (Rural Homes) intent it is to encourage, promote and facilitate the delivery of more high quality, affordable and sustainable rural homes in the right locations.

Part a) includes criteria where homes in rural areas will be supported. These include sites allocated for housing in the LDP or reuse of brownfield land where return to a natural state has not or will not happen without intervention.

Part b) refers to how development for new homes in rural areas will contribute to local living, local housing need, economic considerations, and transport needs of the development as appropriate for the rural location.

The proposal would deliver two new rural homes of high-quality design on an unused brownfield land in a poor state. The site would also require intervention to return it to a natural state as the existing agricultural buildings and hardstanding would require to be demolished. The proposals therefore partly accord with policy 9 and 17 a).

Furthermore, it is acknowledged that Harlaw Road immediately south of the site is part of the 'Bonaly and Bonaly link' core path. However, this road is not continuously lit and has no designated foot ways or cycle ways. It would be an approximate 25-minute walk or over 10-minute cycle to some services and public transport links in Currie. In these circumstances its usability to meet daily needs by a range of sustainable transport would be restricted and reliance on cars would still be likely.

This level of accessibility is consistent with the sites more rural location, and it is acknowledged there is residential use nearby. The site being beside existing homes which the proposal would add to. There would be a small associated economic benefit from new occupier's use of shops and services.

However, this area is out with a defined urban environment. There is no immediate local access to a range of amenities therefore new homes here do not support the policy considerations of local living. Furthermore, there is no identified local housing need.

The proposal therefore fails to contribute towards creating a connected neighbourhood, achieving compact growth or encouraging sustainable rural homes in the 'right location'. It is inconsistent with the plan spatial strategy as new homes in this location are not supported in the LDP.

Overall, the proposal is therefore contrary to NPF 4 policy 15, 16 and 17.

Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation

NPF 4 policy 1 (Tackling the climate and nature crises) states when considering all development significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises.

NPF 4 policy 2 (Climate mitigation and adaptation) intent refers to development minimising emissions and adapting to current and future impact of climate change.

The S1 sustainability form details the features included with the development such as photovoltaic panels, ground source heat pumps and south-facing glazing to maximise solar gain.

Sustainable materials would be used and provision of recycling facilities within each garage. A range of new planting and grassed area would be provided on-site which will help biodiversity.

The proposal includes measures to help mitigate impacts of climate change therefore does not conflict with NPF4 policy 1 and 2.

Ecology

NPF4 policy 3 (Biodiversity) requires that proposals for local development include appropriate measures to conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity, in accordance with national and local guidance.

NPF 4 policy 4 (Natural Places) intent refers to protecting, restoring and enhancing natural assets making best use of nature-based solutions.

Part d) states development proposals that affect a local nature conservation site will only be supported where its quality or integrity is not significantly adversely affected, or these effects are outweighed.

Part f) states development proposals likely to have an adverse effect on protected species will only be supported where the proposal meet relevant statutory tests.

A range of new planting and grassed areas would replace existing hardstanding across the site which would provide new opportunities for enhanced biodiversity in line with NPF 4 policy 3.

However, no Preliminary Ecology Appraisal has been submitted. The previous appeal decision on-site included effect on nature conservation as a reason for refusal in the absence of surveys on this area being submitted. Furthermore, the reporter stated that the sites characteristics with neglected land or buildings frequently being suitable habitats for species.

Whilst the policy context through the adoption of NPF 4 now differs, there has similarly been no evidence submitted to demonstrate there would not be conflict with the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 and Directive 92/43/EEC.

The proposal therefore conflicts with NPF policy 4 f).

Trees

LDP policy Env 12 (Trees) states development will not be permitted with damaging impacts on trees worthy of retention unless necessary for good arboricultural reasons.

The submitted tree report states a sycamore tree (category B) and an ash tree (category C) would be removed as part of the proposals. The sycamore tree in particular is worthy of retention as a semi mature tree in good condition. However, a range of new planting is proposed across the site which would be appropriate degree of mitigation for this tree loss.

Overall, an infringement of LDP policy Env 12 is therefore appropriate in this instance.

Design, Quality and Place

NPF4 policy 14 supports development proposals that are designed to improve the quality of an area and are consistent with the six qualities of successful places. These qualities include a place being healthy, pleasant, connected, distinctive, sustainable, and adaptable.

LDP policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context) refers to development creating or contributing to a sense of place based on positive characteristics of the surrounding area.

LDP policy Des 3 (Development Design) refers to development incorporating existing characteristics and features worthy of retention on site and surrounding area.

LDP policy Des 4 (Development Design - Impact on Setting) sets out criteria for development to have a positive impact on the character of the wider townscape and landscape.

The new dwellings would take cues from the local architecture with their one and a half storey scale, simple pitched form and long narrow footprint similar to building in the vicinity. Traditional materials of stone and slate would match existing buildings. Extensive use of modern timber clad walls would appear distinctive yet in keeping with the sites rural, wooded context.

As aged, farm buildings of functional design demolition of the existing buildings on-site is acceptable. The proposal would largely retain features worthy of retention on-site such as groupings of trees and additional planting would help create a pleasant environment for occupiers.

In regard to the place qualities of policy 14, to a small extent the addition of two permanent homes on unused land with outlook from glazed openings would help the general safety of the area from greater surveillance. This would help create a healthy place. In regard to adaptability, other uses for the buildings have not specifically been outlined however only the current proposal can be assessed under this planning application. Given the sites detached rural location largely dependent on car use the proposal would not support delivery of a sustainable or connected place.

Overall, the proposal complies with relevant LDP design policies however does not fully comply with NPF 4 policy 14.

Special Landscape Area

NPF4 policy 4 d) states development proposals that affect a designated landscape area will only be supported where its qualities or integrities or not significantly adversely affected or the adverse effects are outweighed.

The site is located within the Pentlands Special Landscape Area (SLA). As shown in submitted visuals the new dwellings have a similar extent of visibility as the existing agricultural buildings. Their scale, form and design would appear in keeping with its rural landscape.

The tree loss is proportionally small and would not impact on the overall quality or integrity of this SLA.

The proposal does not conflict with NPF 4 policy 4 d).

Amenity

LDP policy Des 5 (Development Design - Amenity) requires development proposals to demonstrate that future occupiers will have acceptable levels of amenity.

LDP Policy Hou 3 (Private Green Space in Housing Development) requires developments to provide adequate provision for green space to meet the needs of future residents.

The EDG states for three bedrooms or more, dwellings should have a minimum floor space of 91 m².

Future Occupiers

The dwellings would have a good internal floor space in excess of the minimum space standards.

Adequate levels of outlook and light would be achieved internally from the size, orientation of windows and space retained to other buildings. Large, south-facing garden spaces would provide good quality external amenity space. The dwellings would be sufficiently spaced from all neighbouring properties that adequate levels of privacy will be achieved.

Overall, an acceptable living environment would be achieved for future occupiers. The proposal complies with LDP policy Des 5 and Hou 3.

Neighbouring Occupiers

LDP policy Des 5 also requires development proposals to not have an adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring developments in relation to noise, daylight, sunlight, privacy or immediate outlook.

The dwellings would retain 14 to 15 m at their closest point to properties to the west. The orientation of windows would generally avoid direct overlooking between openings. In tandem with the distances retained this would prevent any material impact on privacy.

Closer distances of just over 7 m would be retained from new openings to garden spaces to this side. An appropriate boundary treatment could adequately screen outlook of this adjacent land. Full details of this would have been sought by condition if the proposal was acceptable overall.

To the east, significantly larger distances would be retained to the nearest residential property which will prevent any adverse amenity impacts.

No daylight or sunlight information has been submitted. However, the retained distances outlined above in tandem with the one-and-a half storey scale of the houses would prevent any material impact on shade cast on adjacent gardens or impact on light to neighbours' windows.

In regard to noise, the residential use is the same as uses nearby and it is not anticipated the addition of two houses would lead to any significant impact on this aspect. There are statutory provisions under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 should a noise nuisance be reported from the site.

Overall, the proposal complies with LDP policy Des 5.

Transport

Car Parking

LDP policy Tra 2 states that car parking provision should comply with and not exceed the levels set out in Council guidance.

The site is identified as within Zone 3 of the Edinburgh Design Guidance Parking Standards where residential properties should have a maximum car parking provision of 1 space per dwelling.

Two car parking spaces are proposed per dwelling which exceeds the maximum car parking standards contrary to LDP policy Tra 2. However, this arrangement is reasonably characteristic of the immediate area. This infringement of policy and guidance is not considered to justify a reason for refusal in isolation.

Cycle Parking

LDP policy Tra 3 states cycle parking and storage provision should comply with the standards set out in Council guidance.

The EDG standards state properties in this zone should have a minimum of 3 cycle spaces for dwellings with 4 habitable rooms or more.

In addition, principles of the Council's cycle parking factsheet include that provision should include 20 % non-standard bicycles.

Three cycle spaces have been included within each garage which complies with EDG standards. Whilst no non-standard provision has been detailed here there would be adequate space to accommodate this.

Overall, the proposal complies with LDP policy Tra 3 and the non-statutory guidance.

Contaminated Land

NPF 4 policy 9 (Brownfield, vacant / derelict land and empty buildings) part c) states where land is known or suspected to be unstable or contaminated proposals will demonstrate the land can be made safe and suitable for the proposed new use.

LDP policy Env 22 (Pollution and Air, Water and Soil Quality) states, amongst other criteria, that permission will be granted where there will be no significant adverse effect on soil quality, ground stability and appropriate mitigation can be provided.

There is the potential that the site may have contaminated the ground through previous agricultural use.

Should the proposal have been acceptable overall, a condition would therefore have been recommended for submission of a site survey prior to commencement of works. This is in order to ensure the ground is safe and stable for residential use in accordance with NPF 4 policy 9 c) and LDP policy Env 22.

Flooding

NPF 4 policy 22 (Flood risk and water management) intent refers to strengthening resilience to flood risk by promoting avoidance as a first principle and the vulnerability of existing and future development to flooding.

LDP policy Env 21 (Flood Protection) states that planning permission will not be granted for development that would increase flood risk or be at risk of flooding itself.

The submitted drainage strategy has been reviewed by CEC Flood Planning and further information has been sought in regard to surface water discharge via infiltration. In addition, that a surface water management checklist and certification be submitted in line with flood planning guidance.

As identified on SEPA online flood maps, the site is located in an area with no specific river, coastal or surface water flood risk. Given this context, further detail on this matter could have been imposed by condition should the proposal have been acceptable overall. To ensure surface water is managed correctly.

Archaeology

NPF4 Policy 7 o) states that non-designated historic environment assets, places and their setting should be protected and preserved in situ wherever feasible.

The City Archaeologist has been consulted on the proposals and has stated the site is located within an area of historic and archaeological significance, from the historic construction of Middle Kinleith Farm (prior to 1812) and 18th century Mount Parnassus weavers' cottages. A condition has therefore been recommended regarding a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be submitted, in order to safeguard potential archaeological remains.

This condition would have been imposed should the proposal have been acceptable overall.

Scottish Water

The applicant would require separate consent from Scottish Water out with this planning application. Should the proposal have been acceptable overall an informative would have been applied in respect to this.

Waste Services

The applicant would require separate agreement with Waste Planning. Should the proposal have been acceptable overall an informative would have been applied in respect to this.

Developer Contributions

No contributions have been identified for the proposal.

Conclusion in relation to the Development Plan

The proposals do not comply with the National Planning Framework 4 and Edinburgh Local Development Plan as a whole.

The residential development is contrary to Green Belt policy principles as it will fail to deliver sustainable and compact urban growth. It would be located out with an accessible, well connected urban environment. It is anticipated there would be a reliance on private car usage. The site is not located in a sustainable location and residential use here would not support local living.

b) There are any other material considerations which must be addressed?

The following material planning considerations have been identified:

Emerging policy context

On 30 November 2022 the Planning Committee approved the Schedule 4 summaries and responses to Representations made, to be submitted with the Proposed City Plan 2030 and its supporting documents for Examination in terms of Section 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997. At this time little weight can be attached to it as a material consideration in the determination of this application.

Equalities and human rights

Due regard has been given to section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010. No impacts have been identified.

Consideration has been given to human rights. No impacts have been identified through the assessment and no comments have been received in relation to human rights.

Public representations

A summary of the representations is provided below:

support

material considerations

Use

- Positive community impact through delivery of homes and re-use of gap site
- Economic benefits

These considerations have been addressed through section b) Sustainable, rural homes.

Design

- Appropriate, compatible design with positive impact on area
- Positive re-use of site in poor state

These considerations have been addressed through section b) Design.

Amenity

- Enhanced surveillance: Addressed in section a) Design.

Environment

- Delivery of energy efficient homes: Addressed through section b) Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation

Transport

- Minimal traffic impact: Addressed in section a) Transport.

objection

material considerations

- No ecological information submitted: Addressed in section a) Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation
- Potential adverse impact on water services: Addressed through Section a) Scottish Water.

non-material considerations

- Temporary construction impacts
- Positive reputation of builder
- Benefits for family as future occupiers
- Electricity and private water supply

These matters cannot be considered or controlled as part of this planning application. The applicant may require additional consents out with the requirement of this planning application.

Conclusion in relation to identified material considerations.

The material considerations support refusal of the planning application.

Overall conclusion

The proposals do not comply with the National Planning Framework 4 (NPF 4) and Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) as a whole.

The residential development is contrary to Green Belt policy principles as it would fail to deliver sustainable and compact urban growth. It would be located out with an accessible, well connected urban environment. It is anticipated there would be a reliance on private car usage. The site is not located in a sustainable location and residential use here would not support local living.

It would not detract from the landscape quality or rural character of the area, re-uses brownfield land and is appropriately designed. However, these benefits do not outweigh the overall conflict with NPF4 or the LDP.

Overall, the material considerations support the presumption against granting planning permission.

Section C - Conditions/Reasons/Informatives

The recommendation is subject to the following.

Reason for Refusal: -

1. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4 policy 8 (Green belt) as it does not meet the relevant criteria for residential development in this green belt location and will fail to deliver compact, sustainable urban growth.
2. The proposal is contrary to LDP policy Env 10 (Green belt & Countryside) as it does not meet criteria a) to d) for development in this green belt location.
3. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4 policy 15 (Local Living and 20 minute neighbourhoods) as the proposal does not contribute towards local living as the dwellings would not have good local access to range of sustainable modes of transport, local facilities or services.

4. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4 policy 16 (Quality Homes) part f) as the dwellings would be located on land not allocated for housing in the LDP, are inconsistent with the plan spatial strategy, local living and 20-minute neighbourhood principles.
5. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4 policy 17 (Rural Homes) overall, as the proposals would fail to deliver sustainable rural homes in the right location.
6. The proposal is contrary to NPF 4 policy f) (Natural Places) as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse effect on species protected by legislation.

Background Reading/External References

To view details of the application go to the [Planning Portal](#)

Further Information - Local Development Plan

Date Registered: 16 January 2024

Drawing Numbers/Scheme

01-03, 05-06, 08-09, 11-18

Scheme 1

David Givan
Chief Planning Officer
PLACE
The City of Edinburgh Council

Contact: Lewis McWilliam, Planning Officer
E-mail: lewis.mcwilliam@edinburgh.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Summary of Consultation Responses

NAME: Transport Planning
COMMENT: No objections.
DATE: 21 February 2024

NAME: Archaeology
COMMENT: No objections subject to condition.
DATE: 25 January 2024

NAME: Flood Planning
COMMENT: Further information sought in regard to surface water management.
DATE: 7 February 2024

The full consultation response can be viewed on the [Planning & Building Standards Portal](#).

Location Plan



© Crown Copyright and database right 2014. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey License number 100023420