

## Committee Minutes

---

### Planning Committee

Edinburgh, 27 November 2003

**Present:-** Councillors Davies (Convener), Child, Gilmore, The Hon David Guest, Hunter, Laing, Longstaff, Lowrie, Marshall (Vice-Convener), Munro, Murray, Ponton, Tritton and Wigglesworth.

**Also Present:-** Councillor Milligan.

#### 1 Minutes

##### 1.1 Planning Committee

###### Decision

The minutes of the Planning Committee of 2 and 29 October 2003 were approved as correct records.

##### 1.2 Development Quality Sub-Committee

###### Decision

The minutes of the Development Quality Sub-Committees of 24 September, 1, 8, 15, 22, 29 October, 5 and 12 November 2003 were approved as correct records.

##### 1.3 Record of Sub-Committee Visits

###### Decision

The Records of Visits by the Development Quality Sub-Committee of 25 September, 23 and 30 October 2003 were noted.

##### 1.4 Planning Committee Visits

###### Decision

The record of the visit by the Planning Committee on 30 October 2003 was noted.

## 2 Redhall House Development Brief

The Committee was presented with a draft development brief for Redhall House and its grounds, which had been prepared for consultation purposes.

### Decision

To approve the draft development brief for Redhall House and its grounds for consultation purposes.

(Reference – report no. PC/056/03-04/CD by the Director of City Development, submitted.)

## 3 Edinburgh Tram Project

The Planning Committee had previously noted progress on the emerging tram proposals; a review of the public consultation exercise and **tie's** response to matters raised and details of additional information to be submitted.

The Director of City Development reported on the finalised proposals for Lines 1 and 2 and reviewed the results of additional public consultation. The proposed routes would now be safeguarded for planning purposes. A draft Design Manual was proposed to provide a tool in achieving high quality design for the Tram Project. Issues of subsequent planning powers, public realm design and developer's contributions were also outlined.

Councillor Milligan was heard as a local ward member in regard to proposals in the Baird Drive area.

### Motion

Councillor Davies, seconded by Councillor Marshall moved that the Planning Committee –

- (a) support the routes and limits of deviation shown in the submitted A3 Plans, subject to the views expressed in the report by the Director of City Development relating to limits of deviation.
- (b) agree that the routes shown in the final plans, once agreed by Council, should be safeguarded for future transport purposes – the Finalised Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan 2003 should safeguard the land needed for the section of Line 2 from the city edge to Newbridge and the tram route from Newbridge to Kirkliston. The rest of the Line 2 route, and the whole of Line 1, should be safeguarded in the Edinburgh City Local Plan.
- (c) notes the Line 1 issues for further reports – Coltbridge Viaduct, Roseburn Bridge, Starbank Road and that these were likely to be dealt with at the prior approval stage.

- (d) notes the Line 2 issues for further reports – Baird Drive and Gogar Depot and that these were likely to be dealt with at the prior approval stage.
- (e) notes the way forward on public realm design work to achieve the objective of integrated design wall-to-wall, and that the Planning Committee will continue to be involved as design progresses.
- (f) notes that a further report on developer contributions will be brought to Committee in two cycles.
- (g) agrees the Draft Design Manual, that views of key parties be sought on the content and a Final Draft brought back to the next Committee and to note that it is intended that this should be finally agreed in whole or in part as supplementary planning guidance.
- (h) agrees that the draft procedure note should be discussed with Historic Scotland and ~~tie~~ and reported back to Committee with the Design Manual.
- (i) agrees that the Head of Planning and Strategy review the final documentation – particularly the Environmental Statements and the powers in the Bills – and provides a written confirmation to Council that the matters raised have been adequately addressed.
- (j) agrees that the views of key parties be sought on the draft Principles for Princes Street and Haymarket and a further report be brought back to Committee at an early date.
- (k) asks the officials to take account of the comments received from the West Edinburgh Residents Tram Action Group on the report.
- (l) thanks the planning function staff for their work on the project.

### **Amendment**

Councillor The Hon David Guest, seconded by Councillor Laing, moved as an amendment, in similar terms to the motion but that no recommendation be made in regard to the routes and limits of deviation prior to further consideration of this issue by the Council.

### **Voting**

The motion was carried by 7 votes to 5.

### **Decision**

- 1) To support the routes and limits of deviation in the submitted A3 Plans, subject to the views expressed in the report by the Director of City Development, relating to limits of deviation.

Planning Committee  
27 November 2003

- 2) To agree that the routes shown in the final plans, once agreed by Council, should be safeguarded for future transport purposes – the Finalised Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan 2003 should safeguard the land needed for the section of Line 2 from the city edge to Newbridge and the tram route from Newbridge to Kirkliston. The rest of the Line 2 route, and the whole of Line 1, should be safeguarded in the Edinburgh City Local Plan.
- 3) To note the Line 1 issues for further reports – Coltbridge Viaduct, Roseburn Bridge, Starbank Road and that these were likely to be dealt with at the prior approval stage.
- 4) To note the Line 2 issues for further reports – Baird Drive and Gogar Depot and that these were likely to be dealt with at the prior approval stage.
- 5) To note the way forward on public realm design work to achieve the objective of integrated design wall-to-wall, and that the Planning Committee will continue to be involved as design progresses.
- 6) To note that a further report on developer contributions will be brought to Committee in two cycles.
- 7) To agree the Draft Design Manual, that views of key parties be sought on the content and a Final Draft brought back to the next Committee and to note that it is intended that this should be finally agreed in whole or in part as supplementary planning guidance.
- 8) To agree that the draft procedure note should be discussed with Historic Scotland and **tie** and reported back to Committee with the Design Manual.
- 9) To agree that the Head of Planning and Strategy review the final documentation – particularly the Environmental Statements and the powers in the Bills – and provides a written confirmation to Council that the matters raised have been adequately addressed.
- 10) To agree that the views of key parties are sought on the draft Principles for Princes Street and Haymarket and a further report be brought back to Committee at an early date.
- 11) To ask the officials to take account of the comments received from the West Edinburgh Residents Tram Action Group on the report.
- 12) To thank the planning function staff for their work on the project.

**Declaration of Interest**

Councillor Child declared a non-financial interest in this item as she had been appointed by the Council to the Board of Transport Initiatives Edinburgh (**tie**).

(References – Planning Committee 7 August (item 4), 2 October (item 4); report no. PC/057/03-04/CD by the Director of City Development, submitted.)

#### **4 Environmental Conditions**

The Development Quality Sub-Committee had asked the Head of Planning and Strategy to report on the enforcement of conditions imposed on planning permissions.

Approval was sought of a review of environmental conditions and proposed amendments to procedures to provide better protection of neighbours amenity.

##### **Decision**

- 1) To agree the contents of the report and reaffirm that applications for commercial uses in close proximity to residential uses will not be determined until the authority is satisfied that satisfactory standards of residential amenity can be retained.
- 2) To ask the Director of City Development to submit a monitoring report on the revised procedures at an appropriate stage.

(Reference – Development Quality Sub-Committee 7 February 2001 (item 1); report no. PC/058/03-04/CD by the Director of City Development, submitted.)

#### **5 Banners – Unauthorised Signage in the City Centre**

The Council had granted delegated powers to the Head of Planning and Strategy to serve Enforcement Notices in respect of unauthorised banners in the New Town for a period of six months.

Approval was sought to extend authority to serve Enforcement Notices in respect of unauthorised banners for a further six month period and across a wider area of the City Centre.

##### **Decision**

To recommend to the Council that it agrees an extension of delegation to the Head of Planning and Strategy to serve Enforcement Notices in respect of unauthorised banners to cover the entire City Centre for a further six month period.

(Reference – Council 26 June 2003 (Act of Council 33); report no. PC/059/03-04/CD by the Director of City Development, submitted.)

## **6 Non-Statutory Guidelines – Replacement Windows and Doors**

The Committee had previously approved guidelines on window alterations and on door alterations in listed buildings and conservation areas.

A new revised and amalgamated version of the guidelines was submitted.

### **Decision**

To approve the revised guideline as a draft for consultation.

(Reference – Planning Committee 14 January 1999 (item 5); 30 January 2001 (item 12); report no. PC/060/03-04/CD by the Director of City Development, submitted.)

## **7 Non-Statutory Guidelines – Commercial Frontages**

The Committee had previously approved an extended Development Quality Guideline on Commercial Frontages as a draft for consultation.

The draft guideline amalgamated all the existing Development Quality Guidelines related to shop front alterations into a single document. The Committee was presented with the results of the consultation exercise.

### **Decision**

To approve the finalised version of the Non-Statutory Guideline on Commercial Frontages.

(Reference – Planning Committee 3 April (item 6); report no. PC/061/03-04/CD by the Director of City Development, submitted.)

## **8 Revision of Street Naming Charter**

The Committee had noted the findings of a Best Value Review of the Licensing/Street Naming Services.

A report updating and revising the Street Naming Service Charter was submitted.

### **Decision**

- 1) To agree the revisions to the Street Naming Service Charter as detailed in the Director's report.

- 2) To request a further report on revised service standards for street name plates in association with programme reviews of the Planning Service Charters.

(Reference – Planning Committee 27 March 2001 (item 11), 28 November 2002 (item 5); report no. PC/062/03-04/CD by the Director of City Development, submitted.)

## **9 Craigmillar Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal**

The Committee had previously approved the draft Character Appraisal for the Craigmillar Park Conservation Area.

The outcome of the consultation exercise was now detailed.

### **Decision**

To approve the Craigmillar Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

(Reference – Planning Committee 12 June 2003 (item 17); report no. PC/063/03-04/CD by the Director of City Development, submitted.)

## **10 Appearance of Containers**

The Development Control Sub-Committee had asked for a report on the necessity for signage on the footway side of communal refuse containers situated on roadways.

The revised use of flashings and signs on domestic containers was now detailed.

### **Decision**

- 1) To note the contents of the report by the Director of City Development.
- 2) To ask the Director to report further on the desirability and possibility of alternative colours for containers.

(Reference – Development Quality Sub-Committee 1 October 2003 (item 1); report no. PC/064/03-4/CD by the Director of City Development, submitted.)