

Edinburgh Urban Design Panel: Second Progress Report

Planning Committee
11 August 2011

1 Purpose of report

- 1.1 To report on the work of the Edinburgh Urban Design Panel after two years of operation and to recommend to Committee that the Panel's remit and operation be continued in its present form.

2 Summary

- 2.1 The Panel has been operating for two years. It has quickly established its role in providing design advice on development proposals at the pre-application stage in the development management process. It has also contributed advice in the drafting of planning policies and guidance of urban design significance to the City. This report highlights progress to date and the results of the Panel's recent review of its activities.

3 Main report

Background

- 3.1 The Edinburgh Urban Design Panel was established by the Planning Committee as a key part of the Design Initiative's delivery programme. It aims to raise the quality of the built environment within the City of Edinburgh Council area.
- 3.2 The Panel was constituted with an agreed remit, function, roles of members, and principles of conduct. The Panel met for the first time in March 2009 to undertake design reviews of major development proposals and planning policies of urban design significance to the City.
- 3.3 Design review is a process of early engagement in development proposals and policy-making to improve the quality of place making activity. A key feature of the design review process is that it is conducted by an independent panel of expert practitioners with current experience in design and development. The Edinburgh Panel members are volunteers nominated by the organisations selected by Planning Committee to contribute their expertise to the design

review process. The Panel is chaired by the Development Management Manager of the Council's Planning Service and the secretariat role is provided by a design officer and technician from the Planning Service.

Annual review

- 3.4 It is part of the Panel's role to undertake a review of its effectiveness each year. The first progress report was made to Planning Committee in February 2010. At that stage, the membership, operational aspects and general awareness of the Panel were reviewed. Planning Committee agreed to add an additional organisation to the Panel's membership to represent transport and movement issues. This was implemented with the addition of the Transport Research Institute at Napier University. The agreement to invite a representative to attend from Edinburgh World Heritage where proposals are in, or likely to have a significant impact on, the World Heritage Site has been applied. All changes to operational procedures were implemented and opportunity has been taken in liaison with stakeholders to raise awareness of the Panel. Awareness has grown as more development proposals reviewed at pre-application stage by the Panel have reached the application stage and the Panel's advice is published alongside the reports to the Development Management Subcommittee.
- 3.5 A second year review workshop was held by Panel members in April 2011 and actions have been pursued over recent months. The workshop was facilitated by a senior officer of Architecture and Design Scotland. The agenda was agreed in advance with Panel members. Prior to the workshop, a survey was conducted of all participants at the Panel meetings in the period March 2009 to March 2011. They included all developers, architects and agents who had presented their draft proposals to the Panel and all planning officers who had introduced to the Panel the planning issues context for development proposals. The workshop included case studies of development proposals on which the Panel has provided design advice and which had subsequently been approved by the Development Management Subcommittee. This allowed Panel members to assess the extent of the Panel's influence on raising the quality of design.

Remit, functions, roles and procedures

- 3.6 The second year review concluded that the remit, function and roles were still appropriate and minor updates were made to the published guidance notes which have been consolidated for publication (Appendix 1). Procedures were not specifically addressed in this year's review but a few minor operational issues have been amended to address suggestions by Panel members.
- 3.7 The Panel members agreed that the general split of their design reviews between pre-application development proposals (80%) and draft planning policies and guidance (20%) was an appropriate balance in terms of their remit.
- 3.8 Awareness of the Panel's work and the importance of fresh ideas being contributed by the Panel members were reiterated by reference to the original procedures for the Panel's membership organisations. They were asked, where appropriate, to rotate the attendance of members, ideally from a pool of suitable voluntary experts. This gives the added benefit of raising awareness

of the Panel and the way it operates. Those membership organisations which have not established a pool in this respect have all been approached to reconsider how they choose their Panel member(s).

Effectiveness of design review

- 3.9 In the period to June 2011, the Panel has conducted 43 design reviews offering design advice on 35 draft development proposals and the remainder on planning policies and guidance. Appendix 2 shows the subjects and the stage each had reached by end June 2011.
- 3.10 The survey of participants (applicants, architects, agents and planning officers) at Panel meetings revealed a high level of satisfaction with the manner in which the design reviews were conducted, the usefulness of the Panel's design advice and the written report. Specific comments were gathered in relation to each project so that the Panel could reflect on the specific issues of the development proposals. This proved to be a very helpful exercise in evaluating the value added by the Panel, given the frankness of the respondents. It is significant that 90% of the applicants believed that the design review process would influence the progress of their project.
- 3.11 The review workshop concluded that the Panel's reports, offering a summary of the design review discussion and the key points of advice on the development proposals or policy, could be more precise with clarity of weight to be ascribed to any particular issue and the rationale clearly articulated. This would assist subsequent evaluation of how the applicant has addressed the Panel's design advice in the finalised proposals. In many respects this is comparable to pre-application community engagement and the requirement for applicants to address how issues raised at this stage were addressed in finalising their development proposals. A more structured approach is being adopted in Panel discussions and the importance of Panel members endorsing the draft reports is being emphasised.
- 3.12 From the case studies used in the workshop, it was concluded that the influence which the Panel's design review can have on proposals is heavily dependent on the timing of the review relative to the preparation of final proposals. Experience has led to invitations to design teams to present to the Panel earlier in their design programme. This allows more time to take account of the Panel's design advice before proposals are finalised.
- 3.13 The review workshop also examined how the Panel's design advice is addressed in the planning application report to the Development Management Subcommittee. Committee members' own request that the Panel's advice be referred to in the pre-application section of the text, that it be appended to each relevant report and that issues should be addressed in the assessment section were seen to be appropriate. Since the workshop, training sessions have been held for all Planning case officers to share the review findings, identify how they can raise awareness of the Panel's role amongst the applicant community and to emphasise the importance of using the Panel's reports in negotiations with applicants prior to and following submission of a planning application. Officers were also reminded that the assessment section of committee reports should

assist Committee members' understanding of how the design advice was addressed by the applicant.

- 3.14 Finally, the Panel members considered whether the practice of not reviewing proposals again at a later stage was appropriate. The remit firmly places the Panel's role as providing pre-application design advice with the follow-on undertaken by planning officers as part of the process of negotiating changes prior to and after the submission of the planning application. There are resource and time implications given that the Panel's capacity is constrained by meeting at most once per month and reviewing up to three proposals at any meeting. To introduce a process of second design review would reduce the total number of new proposals that could be considered. It is also important to remember that Panel members are volunteering their time to participate. One suggestion made by some Panel members is to create a smaller subset of Panel members to review proposals later in the process. However, this is considered to weaken the broad perspective that the Panel's constituted membership gives to the design review process and could impact on the credibility of the Panel's design advice.
- 3.15 The Panel is now receiving a regular update on progress with development proposals where they contributed design advice but no formal reconsideration is recommended. There is the ability to take revised proposals back for the Panel to consider where an application has been refused or a significantly new proposal emerges. This has happened for development proposals at Baileyfield. Also, it is planned to programme design reviews by the Panel of development sites which received planning permission prior to the Panel being created but have not been implemented and for which new development proposals are now at pre-application stage. The issue will be monitored over the current year and the results shared with Panel members in the next annual review.

4 Financial Implications

- 4.1 There are no new financial implications arising from this report.

5 Equalities Impact

- 5.1 There is no relationship between the matters described in this report and the public sector general equality duty.
- 5.2 There is no direct equalities impact arising from this report.

6 Environmental Impact

- 6.1 The Panel's design review process makes a beneficial contribution to the aims of improving the quality of the City's environment. There are no adverse environmental impacts associated with this report.

7 Conclusions

- 7.1 The second year review of the Edinburgh Urban Design Panel has confirmed that it is operating efficiently and that it is proving to be influential in raising the quality of design in development proposals and in related planning policies.
- 7.2 Most of the issues raised in the Panel's own review workshop have been addressed and the issue of revisiting development proposals will be monitored over the current year and reconsidered in the next annual review.

8 Recommendations

- 8.1 It is recommended that Committee
- a) notes the progress made by the Edinburgh Urban Design Panel and the outcomes of its second annual review;
 - b) agrees that the Panel continue in its present membership form and with its current remit and operational procedures; and
 - c) records its appreciation of the voluntary contribution made by existing Panel members to the design review process.

Dave Anderson
Director of City Development

Appendices	1 The Edinburgh Urban Design Panel: Remit, functions, roles and procedures 2 Summary report of Edinburgh Urban Design Panel Reviews 2009-2011
Contact/tel/Email	David R Leslie 529 3948 d.leslie@edinburgh.gov.uk
Wards affected	All
Single Outcome Agreement	Supports National Outcome 10: We live in well-designed, sustainable places where we are able to access the amenities and services we need Supports National Outcome 12: We value and enjoy our built and natural environment and protect it and enhance it for future generations. Supports Local Outcome: Edinburgh is a thriving, growing city with a high quality of life and environment and a prosperous economy Supports Local Outcome: The development of a quality built and natural environment is supported.

Background
Papers

- 1 Report by the Director of City Development to the Planning Committee, "Edinburgh Urban Design Panel: Progress Report", 25 February 2010, Agenda item 22.
- 2 Report by the Director of City Development to the Planning Committee, "The Design Initiative: Programme", 2 October 2008, Agenda item 14.



**The Edinburgh Urban Design Panel
Remit, Functions, Roles and Procedures**

11
August
2011

About the Edinburgh Urban Design Panel



The Edinburgh Urban Design Panel was conceived as part of the City of Edinburgh Council's Design Initiative. It is one of a range of measures which are aimed at raising both the quality of the built environment in Edinburgh and the profile of design. It is an important ingredient in the pre-application process for major development proposals in the city.

Why have design reviews?

A high quality of urban design is a key objective for the Planning process. Design review also recognises design is a complex matter which can benefit from informed advice at an early stage.

What are the aims of Edinburgh's Panel?

To contribute constructive advice which can be used by design teams, planners and developers to develop proposals in a positive way, to impart advice on relevant Council policy and guidance and to provide a focus for projects significant to the city.

Who are the Panel members?

The members are drawn from a range of organisations with particular expertise to offer to the design review process. See the stakeholders and contacts page for full details.

How does the Panel operate?

The Panel is chaired by David Leslie, Development Management Manager at the Council, with a role to

Introduction
This report relates to the development of the former Royal Terrace site in Edinburgh.
This is the first time that the proposals have been reviewed by the Panel.
No declarations of interest were made by any panel members in relation to the scheme.
This report should be read in conjunction with the pre-meeting papers which provide an overview, context, concept, plans, sections and 3D visualisations of the scheme.
Andrew Trigger provided an overview of the planning considerations as noted in the Planning Issues Paper.
Robert Evans and Jeremy Scott presented the proposal. Refer to the pre-meeting presentation papers.
A PAN notice has been lodged and two community consultation events have taken place. It is envisaged that a PPP Application will be lodged at the end of February 2011.
The Panel and is not attributable to any one individual. The members are represented at the panel.



decide on projects to be presented and to facilitate discussion during meetings at the City Chambers. After introduction from the relevant Planning Officer the developer's project team gives a short presentation of their proposals and then answers a series of questions from the Panel members who, with the project team present, then identify key issues for comment, the aim being to reach a group consensus. A design review report is drafted and circulated to Panel members for validation before being issued to the project team within two weeks of the meeting. The report and presentation material are not made public until a planning ap-



plication for the project is received.

What impact will the Panel have?

The Planning system has changed, placing greater emphasis on addressing issues earlier in the process. The Panel is a component of this change, contributing to improved transparency, inclusive engagement and shared exploration of design issues with key consultees.

How many reviews has the Panel carried out?

Between its inception March 2009 and May 2011, the Panel carried out 41 reviews. Of these reviews, 33 were of development proposals with the



remainder of planning guidance.

How often does it meet?

Meetings are held monthly on dates agreed by the Panel in the City Chambers.

Timescales for individual reviews may vary depending on the scale and complexity of the proposals considered, however, typically 1 hour is allowed per review.

It is expected that each panel meeting will consider 2 or 3 proposals.

Remit, Functions and Roles

Remit

The Edinburgh Urban Design Panel aims to raise the quality of the built environment within the City of Edinburgh Council area. In achieving this aim, the Panel will:

- 1 provide constructive and timely design advice which can be used by design teams, planners and, or developers to develop their proposals in a positive way;
- 2 provide design advice which is well reasoned and aims to be objective.
- 3 provide design advice on development proposals of a significant or complex nature and council policy and guidance with design significance;
- 4 provide design advice on projects which would set new standards.
- 5 provide design advice on building types which, if repeated, would have a cumulative impact

Functions

The Edinburgh Urban Design Panel will:

- 6 be provided with formatted information in advance of any meeting of the Panel to allow a full understanding of the design issues raised by their proposals;
- 7 at the Panel meeting, be presented with the design aspects of proposals in as concise and comprehensive a manner possible.
- 8 seek to reach consensus on the advice to be provided and explain the rationale for this;
- 9 provide written advice which summarises the discussion held at the Panel meeting;
- 10 allow advice to be viewed by the public once a planning application has been made.

Roles

The Edinburgh Urban Design Panel members will:

- 11 provide advice which draws on their professional knowledge and / or experience;
- 12 advise their respective organisations of the Panel's views;
- 13 adhere to the principles of conduct for the Edinburgh Urban Design Panel;
- 14 expect honesty and openness from all presenters to the Panel;
- 15 expect an undertaking from presenters to consider, reflect and take into account the advice provided in the development of the design;
- 16 on a yearly basis, take part in a review of the effectiveness of the Panel and make any changes as necessary in light of this.



Procedures for the Panel's membership organisations

The panel members will:

- provide constructive advice which can be used by architects, planners and, or developers to develop their proposals in a positive way;
- provide advice which is well reasoned and which aims to be objective;
- provide advice which draws on their professional competence and / or experience
- seek to reach consensus on the advice to be provided and explain the rationale for this;
- ensure they are available to comment on or approve the design review report.
- allow advice to be viewed by the public once a planning application has been made;
- as Panel members advise their respective organisations of the Panel's views;
- adhere to the Principles of Conduct for the Edinburgh Urban Design Panel.



Architecture and Design Scotland will:

- ensure that 1 member of their professional staff or 1 of their Design Review Panel members can attend each Panel meeting;

- Ensure their representative will provide advice which could reasonably be expected to be reflective of the views of A+DS albeit without prejudice to any later view of A+DS;



The Cockburn Association will:

- ensure that 1 member of their professional staff or board can attend each Panel meeting;
- ensure their representative will provide advice which could reasonably be expected to be reflective of the views of the Cockburn Association albeit without prejudice to any later view of the Cockburn Association.



The Edinburgh Architectural Association will:

- establish a small pool of their members from which panel members can be drawn and ensure that 3 of their members can attend each Panel meeting;
- refresh approximately a third of this pool on a yearly basis to ensure that there is a degree of continuity which is balanced by new voices being brought to the panel;

- ensure that panel members are well respected within their profession, have a track record in achieving high quality design and are able to communicate effectively and objectively their view on design matters.

ESALA

Edinburgh School of Architecture & Landscape Architecture

The Edinburgh School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture will:

- ensure that 1 member of their academic staff can attend each Panel meeting;
- use academic experience and knowledge to contribute effectively on design matters;
- while ensuring confidentiality, use general findings of reviews in teaching.



Edinburgh World Heritage will:

- attend meetings where projects to be reviewed are in the World Heritage Site or are likely to have a significant impact upon it
- ensure that 1 member of their professional staff can attend such Panel meetings;
- ensure their representative will provide advice

which could reasonably be expected to be reflective of the views of Edinburgh World Heritage albeit without prejudice to any later view of Edinburgh World Heritage

Landscape Institute
Scotland

The Landscape Institute Scotland will:

- establish a small pool of their members from which panel members can be drawn and ensure that 1 of their members can attend each Panel meeting;
- refresh approximately a third of this pool on a yearly basis to ensure that there is a degree of continuity which is balanced by new voices being brought to the Panel;
- ensure that Panel members are well respected within their profession, have a track record in achieving high quality design and are able to communicate effectively and objectively their view on design matters.

HISTORIC SCOTLAND

Historic Scotland will:

- ensure that 1 member of their professional staff can attend each Panel meeting;
- ensure their representative will provide advice which could reasonably be expected to be

reflective of the views of Historic Scotland albeit without prejudice to any later view of Historic Scotland;

- provide advice about any relevant matters relating to the historic environment affected by development.



Lothian and Borders Police will:

- ensure that 1 member of their Police liaison service can attend each Panel meeting;
- ensure their representative will provide advice which could reasonably be expected to be reflective of the views of Lothian and Borders Police albeit without prejudice to any later view of Lothian and Borders Police;
- provide advice about any relevant matters relating to building security affected by the urban design of the development;



The RTPI in Scotland will:

- establish a small pool of their members from which a Panel member can be drawn and ensure that 1 of their members can attend each Panel meeting;

- ensure that Panel members are well respected within their profession, have a track record in achieving high quality design and are able to communicate effectively and objectively their view on design matters.



The School of the Built Environment at Heriot Watt University will:

- ensure that 1 member of their academic staff can attend each Panel meeting;
- use academic experience and knowledge to contribute effectively on design matters;
- while ensuring confidentiality, use general findings of reviews in teaching.



The Transport Research Institute at Napier University will:

- ensure that 1 member of their academic staff can attend each Panel meeting;
- use academic experience and knowledge to contribute effectively on design matters;
- while ensuring confidentiality, use general findings of reviews in teaching.

Procedures for Council Officials

The chair will:

- be a staff member of the Council's Planning service.
- provide a facilitatory role to focus the Panel's discussion upon providing advice upon the proposals being reviewed;
- decide on the proposals to be reviewed;
- invite architects, planners and developers to present revised proposals if a subsequent review is considered likely to have significant benefit to the design development;
- advise presenters to ensure that they are providing relevant information for review;
- broadly set out the themes raised in the discussion and indicate the extent to which it is considered action is required;
- arrange external contacts with organisations, including the media;
- provide feedback on how projects have developed since being reviewed by the Panel.

The secretariat will:

- be a staff member of the Council's Planning service;
- arrange the Panel's meeting places and times;
- liaise with architects, planners and developers

to establish the type of information that should be provided prior to the panel meeting and for the panel meeting;

- request presenters to provide issues papers on their proposals 8 days in advance of the panel meeting to ensure that this information can be issued to Panel members one week in advance;
- ensure a short summary of the planning issues surrounding the proposals if necessary is provided;
- sum up the detailed findings of the review and seek a consensus on the weight to be ascribed to any issues if necessary;
- prepare and issue a draft Panel report 3 working days after the Panel meeting to ensure that agreement can be reached upon it within 2 weeks of the Panel's meeting;
- Include in the written advice any declarations of interest that have been made and any decisions relating to such declarations;
- amend the draft report to reflect any additional comments made by Panel members;
- advise the chair on matters of remit, functions, roles and procedures;
- on behalf of the Panel, issue the formal advice of the panel to the architects, developers and

planners;

- ensure the Panel's website is kept up to date.

Planning officials should:

- ensure architects, developers and consultant planners are made aware of the potential for their project to be reviewed;
- provide a pre meeting paper which sets out the planning context for the proposal being considered. This should highlight in particular any relevant design policies or issues;
- ensure that this is provided no later than 8 days in advance of the meeting;
- provide a concise presentation on the planning issues and note that this should normally last for no more than 5 minutes;
- remain for the duration of the Panel's discussion to hear the views expressed;
- encourage the design team to consider, reflect and take into account the advice provided in the development of the design;
- ensure that the Panel's report is added to the public record of the planning application;
- Set out how the Panel's comments have been addressed in any relevant planning report.

Procedures for presenters

To ensure that Panel members have a full understanding of the design issues raised by their proposals, architects, consultant planners and developers should:

- provide pdf versions of A3 landscape format booklets which illustrate the design concept and, to scale, context, plans, sections, elevations. In addition, other relevant material such as 3 dimensional views alongside a concise narrative should be provided. This should be set out in accordance with the pro forma;
- provide a summary of the project information including, names of clients, consultants, key players and consultees, estimated project cost

and procurement method, and size of site;

- ensure that this visual and written information is provided no later than 8 days in advance of the meeting;
- note that the Council cannot accept emails greater than 3MB in size and allow for delivery of CD copies of the information if it is not possible to email it by 1 week in advance of the meeting;
- provide at the Panel meeting hard copies of folded scale drawings at a size no greater than A1 which clearly illustrate the proposals and surrounding context;

- provide a concise presentation using Power-Point which sets out the rationale for the design including its concept and development in an appropriate timescale and note that for most presentations, this will be around **10 minutes**;
- remain for the duration of the Panel's discussion to hear the views expressed;
- consider, reflect and take into account the advice provided in the development of the design;
- provide a statement with the planning application on how the advice provided by the Panel has been addressed.

Definitions

Significant Development: This is considered to be development which is significant because of its scale or location. For example a tenement infill in the city centre or on an arterial route may be considered major because of its prominence whereas a development of a similar scale in an industrial area may not. Significant development may also be that which involves a significant departure from the development plan / finalised plan or that which raises issues not adequately covered by the development plan / finalised plan. If the degree of public interest in a proposal is likely to be substantial, this would

indicate that the proposal would be significant. Discretion will be used by the secretariat in selecting such proposals for review.

Complex Development: This is considered to be development which has complex issues surrounding it such sensitivity due to location or a complex programme of functional requirements, for example a school. Discretion will be used by the secretariat in selecting such proposals for review.

Projects which set new standards: These are considered to include projects which create a new

typology of building or architecture or one which is usual to the Edinburgh context. Discretion will be used by the secretariat in selecting such proposals for review.

Building types which, if repeated, would have a cumulative impact: These are considered to include projects which, individually may not have a significant impact on the quality of the built environment, however if large numbers of them are built could have a significant impact.

Summary report of Edinburgh Urban Design Panel Reviews 2009, 2010 + 2011

29 Jun 11

Total number of meetings to 24 May 11	23	% of reviews	% of development proposals	% of applications
Total number of reviews	43			
Total number of development proposals	35	81.4%		
Total number of PANS Submitted	24	55.8%	68.6%	
Total number of planning applications submitted	22	51.2%	62.9%	
Total number of applications pending consideration	2	4.7%	5.7%	9.1%
Total number of planning applications determined	20	46.5%	57.1%	90.9%
Total number of applications granted	13	30.2%	37.1%	59.1%
Total number of applications refused	2	4.7%	5.7%	9.1%
Total number of applications pending decision	5	11.6%	14.3%	22.7%
Guidance	8	18.6%		

Date of Panel Review	Description of presentation	PAN reference	Planning App ref	Status	Development proposal (Y/N)
11 Mar 09	Baileyfield Block C ^{*1}		09/01029/FUL	Application Refused	Y
	Baileyfield Block D ^{*1}		09/01029/FUL	Application Refused	Y
15 Apr 09	Edinburgh Standards for Urban Design				N
	EICC Extension		09/01314/FUL	Application Granted	Y
13 May 09	21st Century Council Homes - Gracemount Masterplan		09/01588/PPP	Application Granted	Y
	Belford Road		09/01803/FUL	Application Refused	Y
24 Jun 09	Exchange 2				N
	Revised Daylighting, Sunlight and Privacy Guidance				N
23 Sep 09	Royal Victoria Hospital	09/01537/PAN	09/02936/FUL	Application Granted	Y
	Gogar Intermodal Station	09/01784/PAN	09/02589/FUL	Application Granted	Y
28 Oct 09	Royal Hospital for Sick Children	09/03140/PAN			Y
	21st Century Council Homes - Pennywell Masterplan	10/02652/PAN	10/01273/PPP	Application Granted	Y
25 Nov 09	Portobello High School	10/01051/PAN	10/02830/FUL	Application Granted	Y
	Edinburgh Urban Design Panel - "Taking Stock"				N
27 Jan 10	Haymarket - Urban Design Framework				N
	Primark	09/03291/PAN	10/01123/FUL	Application Granted	Y
27 Jan 10	Sugarhouse Close	09/02911/PAN	10/00746/FUL	Application Granted	Y
24 Feb 10	Granton Sur Mer	10/00606/PAN			Y
	21st Century Council Homes - North Sighthill	09/03060/PAN	10/00953/PPP	Application Granted	Y
24 Mar 10	Brunswick Road	10/00544/PAN			Y
	Festival Theatre	10/00253/PAN	10/01478/FUL	Application Granted	Y
	Haymarket Station		10/02430/LBC	Application Granted	Y
28 Apr 10	Haymarket Goods Yard Site	10/01414/PAN	10/02373/FUL	Application granted	Y
	Affordable Housing Policy				N
26 May 10	Craigmillar Neighbourhood Office and Library		10/01938/FUL	Application Granted	Y
	Open Space Strategy				N
23 Jun 10	Project Export Masterplan		10/02955/PPP	Pending Decision	Y
21 Jul 10	Baileyfield	10/01733/PAN			Y
	Affordable Housing update				N
25 Aug 10	James Gillespie's High School	11/00540/PAN			Y
27 Oct 10	Newcraighall North + East ²	10/01515/PAN	10/03449/PPP	Pending Decision	Y
		10/02059/PAN	10/03506/PPP	Pending Decision	Y

Date of Panel Review	Description of presentation	PAN reference	Planning App ref	Status	Development proposal (Y/N)
24 Nov 10	Trinity Park Development	10/02951/PAN	11/00387/FUL	Pending Decision	Y
	Fountainbridge Student Housing	10/02832/PAN	11/00123/FUL	Pending Decision	Y
26 Jan 11	Agilent Technologies	10/03590/PAN	11/00995/PPP	Pending Consideration	Y
	Ellersly Road	11/00027/PAN			Y
23 Feb 11	Holyrood Road	10/00686/PAN			Y
	Area Development Framework - Leith and Waterfront				N
30 Mar 11	Cairntows Park	11/00946/PAN			Y
	Fettes College Extension	10/03595/PAN			Y
	The Gyle		11/01584/FUL	Pending Consideration	Y
04 May 11	21st Century Homes for Edinburgh - Design Guide				Y
29 Jun 11	Edinburgh International Business Gateway				Y
	Pitsligo Road	11/01386/PAN			Y

Notes

*1 There was 1 Baileyfield application for a site with 2 Edinburgh Urban Design Panel reports

*2 There were 2 Newcraighall applications for a site with 1 Edinburgh Urban Design Panel report