

## Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00 am, Wednesday, 3 September 2014

### Present

Councillors Perry (Convener), Howat (Vice-Convener), Bagshaw, Blacklock, Brock, Cairns, Child, Dixon, Heslop, McVey, Milligan, Mowat, Robson, Rose and Ross.

### 1. Napier University Craighouse Campus, Edinburgh

---

The Sub-Committee had agreed to hold a hearing for consideration of the following three applications at Napier University Craighouse Campus, Craighouse Road, Edinburgh:

1. Proposed change of use and conversion of existing buildings from university campus to residential, construction of new build residential with ancillary development, public realm, utilities infrastructure, access roads, car parking, landscaping - Application no. 12/04007/SCH3;
2. Proposed conversion of existing listed buildings at New Craig, Queen's Craig, East Craig, Bevan Villa, South Craig, Craighouse Lodge, Old Craighouse to form residential properties, including extension at South Craig and demolition of Boiler House (as amended) - Application no. 12/04007/LBC;
3. Demolition of Learning Resource Centre (LRC) Building - Application no. 12/04007/CON

The Acting Head of Planning and Building Standards reported on the applications for planning permission, listed building and conservation area consents. He gave details of the proposals and the planning considerations included and concluded that while the proposals were contrary to numerous policies, the application was for an enabling development and it had been demonstrated that the proposed quantum of development was the minimum necessary to fund the long term future use of the category A listed buildings and the surrounding landscape. The significance of the public benefits, which crucially not only ensured the long term future of these buildings but retained public access to this historic place to the benefit of the wider community, outweighed the more moderate disbenefits of allowing development contrary to policy. There were no other material considerations and recommended that planning permission, listed building and conservation area consents be granted.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/1770000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/1770000)

**(a) David Owen and Nick Honhold – Craiglockhart Community Council**

David Owen and Nick Honhold, on behalf of Craiglockhart Community Council, advised that their objections were consistent with the previous objections from the Craiglockhart community that had been voiced at previous consultations. Nick Honhold stressed that the application was detrimental to the environment, setting and community of Craiglockhart and that these objections had been voiced by the majority of local residents in the area. Nick Honhold outlined the physical visual impact the application would have and the detrimental nature of the development to the surrounding environment in Craiglockhart. It was highlighted that alternative uses had not been put forward or examined and that the minimum level of development that was proposed and the levels of profit for the developer had not been fully scrutinised. A graphical representation showing the size of the buildings was presented and compared to the existing buildings on the site. A number of environmental issues were highlighted including issues that would affect bats, badgers, grasslands and birds negatively.

In conclusion it was asked that the members take into consideration the views of the residents of the area, the environmental issues that the development would have and the physical impact the buildings would have next to the listed buildings and requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/5158000](http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/5158000)

**(b) Mairianna Clyde – Merchiston Community Council**

Mairianna Clyde, on behalf of the Merchiston Community Council, advised that the application was unsympathetic in design to the surrounding area, highlighted the impact on landscape and setting in the area and stated the development contravened a number of English Heritage and City of Edinburgh Council planning policies. The presentation went on to describe the importance of greenspaces within a city and the benefits these spaces can bring to a community. The speaker demonstrated the high density of properties in the area and the importance of Craighouse place in acting as a greenspace for the local community with the associated physical and mental health benefits. Graphics of the plans were shown and it was demonstrated how this conflicted with the environment and design of the landscape.

In conclusion it was stated that in their opinion the application had a detrimental effect to the area, was contrary to a number of planning policies and that a more suitable community proposal existed and requested that the applications should be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/6211000](http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/6211000)

**(c) Goff Cantley and Andrew Richards – Morningside Community Council**

Goff Cantley and Andrew Richards, Morningside Community Council advised that there was an overwhelming rejection of the proposed application from the Morningside community. The presentation highlighted the special protections that Craighouse was subject to. Goff Cantley stated that development of the existing buildings on the site transformed into residential or mixed use accommodations would be welcomed in an effort to preserve the listed buildings, over new build on the site was overwhelmingly opposed. Andrew Richards presented a community proposal that was being prepared for the site

In conclusion they advised that in their opinion the applications should be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/6901000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/6901000)

**(d) Councillor Andrew Burns – Ward Councillor**

Councillor Burns, Ward Councillor for the Fountainbridge and Craiglockhart area advised that while significant changes had been made to the two previous plans not enough changes had been made to approve scheme three. It was noted that the proposed new build was greater in mass than all the listed buildings on site. Councillor Burns brought the Committee's attention to the financial review and deficit appraisal carried out by Estates Services. The presentation re-iterated Scottish policy for planning with regard to 'enabling development' and stressed that this development did not meet that criteria.

In conclusion Councillor Burns requested that application no. 12/04007/LBC and application no. 12/04007/SCH3 be refused. Councillor Burns lodged no objection to the demolition of Learning Resource Centre (LRC) Building - application no. 12/04007/CON.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/9008000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/9008000)

**(e) Rosy Barnes – Friends of Craighouse**

Rosy Barnes, on behalf of Friends of Craighouse spoke against the application. The presentation began with a short video showing the Craighouse community and setting of the proposed development. The presentation listed the importance of Craighouse in the context of the seven hills of Edinburgh. A list of the policies of both the Scottish Government and City of Edinburgh Council that the proposed development contravened was shown. The uniqueness of the Craighouse site was stressed and the detrimental impact the proposed plans would have on the site were outlined. The criteria for 'enabling development' was discussed and criticism of the practice raised. It was advised that the proposed plans did not meet the criteria for 'enabling development'. A lack of assessment for the conservation deficit was stated and no English Heritage guidelines applied to the financial case. The importance of

greenspaces to the area and wider city was discussed along with the importance of trees within the area. The lack of a submitted maintenance plan from the developer was brought to the Committees attention. The uniqueness of the site was stated and the negative impact the development would have on the area was reiterate.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/9612000](http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/9612000)

**(f) Marion Williams – Cockburn Association**

Marion Williams from the Cockburn Association referenced that Edinburgh Skyline study and its praise of Craighouse. The presentation remarked that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the area and would be detrimental to the area. The ‘enabling development’ guidelines by the English Heritage Trust was highlighted. The possibility of a £500,000 grant from Heritage Scotland was raised. It was stated that commercial development would still be financially viable without the additional buildings. Questions were raised over the robustness of the developer’s figures and whether these should be the figures used for the ‘enabling development’ case.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/10807000](http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/10807000)

**(g) Ewan Leitch - Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland**

Ewan Leitch from the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland accepted that there was scope for development within the sight however remarked that the current proposal was detrimental and not suitable for the landscape of the area. The novelty of ‘enabling development’ being used in planning within Edinburgh was raised. The architecture and impact on the site was criticised.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/11194000](http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/11194000)

**(h) Betty Barber – Craiglea Proprietors Association**

Betty Barber from the Craiglea Proprietors Association remarked the great interest of Craiglee in the area after Napier had sold the estate and it was the majority of Craiglea residents opinion that the proposed plan in scheme three was favourable to the area. The presentation stressed the importance of having people and families back in the Craighouse area. Numerous criminal incidents were listed and security concerns

raised. It was recognised that scheme three would bring conservation to the listed buildings and investment to the area.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be granted.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/11443000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/11443000)

**(i) Ian Murray – MP Edinburgh South Constituency**

Ian Murray MP remarked on the high level of public opposition to the development. Education, access and transport issues were raised and the extra burden that would be placed on the local services. The report was referenced and the number of detrimental issues it brought up. The presentation stated that there was no affordable housing in the proposed development and highlighted this as a departure of the affordable housing policies and was not combatable with the ‘enabling development’ case. Public trust in the planning system was raised and the function of local democracy within Edinburgh.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/13155000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/13155000)

**(j) Jim Eadie – MSP Edinburgh Southern**

Jim Eadie MSP, advised on the level of feedback he had received from local residents opposed to the development and opposed to the idea that the ‘enabling development’ case held up to scrutiny. The number of new builds on the proposed site was questioned as being excessive for a minimal development of new builds. Previous minimum build numbers from the last two schemes was referenced and the increase in greenspace was brought into doubt. Alternative uses for the site were discussed including a community ownership model. The presentation ended on four main points of opposition; that the enabling case had not been made; that planning and policy guidelines had not been met; that there were alternative uses for the site that are viable and the loss of greenspace as being too high a price to pay.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/13534000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/13534000)

**(k) Alison Johnston – MSP Lothian**

Alison Johnston highlighted the importance of Craighouse as being identified as one of only eight areas of greenspace significance. Remarked on the large number of proposed homes and how this would not conserve or enhance the area. Alternatives to the application were mentioned referencing the community proposal stated earlier in the hearing. The policies that the development contravened were outlined and the environmental impact on wildlife and trees was mentioned. Proof that this was the minimum amount of development was requested and community focussed alternatives were encouraged to be explored.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/13870000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/13870000)

**(l) Councillor William Gray Muir - Sundial Properties**

William Gray Muir representing Sundial Properties addressed the Committee with Andrew Munis - Montagu Evans and Richard Kevan - Wardell Armstrong. The experience in listed buildings restoration and conversion in which Sundial Properties had was highlighted and the significance of the site mentioned. The origins and history of the site was described and the active consent from 2007 stated. Challenges of the site were outlined including costs and practicalities. A key set of principals were listed which guided the development; the importance of the listed buildings; the landscape; public access needed to be central and quality of development not going after the lowest common denominator. The large amount of competing interests from key stakeholders was mentioned. The state of the buildings was described and the various levels of deterioration within the interiors. The importance of conserving these buildings was stressed. The developer described the number of changes across the two previous schemes and advised that this scheme was masterplan 48. Graphical representation photos of the site were provided to show the development in scale and context. The benefit to greenspace and the surrounding woodland was stated, along with commitments to improving the flooding problem in the area, and contributions to education and transport.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be granted.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/17412000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/17412000)

**(m) Councillor Melanie Maine – Ward Councillor**

Councillor Maine advised on the history of public access to the site. The criteria for 'enabling development' was described and its unsuitability for this development. Alternative proposals were outlined from community bids to alternative buyers. The minimum level of development was questioned and concerns were raised that this land and site would become private. The lack of a maintenance plan was highlighted as an issue and legal points were made within regard to public access to the land.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/21672000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/21672000)

**(n) Councillor Paul Godzik – Ward Councillor**

Councillor Godzik praised the improvement from the previous schemes however advised that he still had some concerns. The importance of the site was highlighted and the enabling case questioned. The harm to the heritage site was outlined and the purpose of the new proposals criticised.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/22474000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/22474000)

**(o) Councillor Mark McInnes – Ward Councillor**

Councillor McInnes questioned whether the policy breaches had gone too far. Highlighted the large number of policy breaches and the large number of detrimental impacts highlighted in the planning report. Councillor McInnes asked whether this was the best option for the site.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/22233000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/22233000)

**(p) Councillor David Key – Ward Councillor**

Councillor Key discussed the tests that planning officers apply to application to conclude whether they should be granted or refused. Councillor Key referred to the owners duty to conserve the listed buildings. The planning report was referenced and the large number of policy breaches that the report mentions. The strength of the enabling case was questioned and the developer's figures brought into question. Alternative uses were listed and a positive emphasis put on the community proposal previously heard. The democratic process was questioned and the high level of public opposition stated.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/22538000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/22538000)

**(q) Councillor Gavin Corbett – Ward Councillor**

Councillor Corbett highlighted the large number of policies contravened and questioned the enabling case. The minimum amount of development was criticised as not being accurate and offering a large profit to the developer. The alternative uses were outlined as viable alternatives with alternative business models.

In conclusion it was requested that the applications be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start\\_time/22940000](http://www.edinburgh.public-tv/core/share/open/webcast/0/0/560/145532/145532/webcast/start_time/22940000)

**Motion**

To grant all three applications subject to conditions, informatives, a legal agreement and notification to Scottish Ministers as detailed in the reports by the Acting Head of Planning and Building Standards.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Dixon

**Amendment**

- 1) To indicate the Sub-Committees intention to refuse all three applications for reasons that the proposal did not constitute an enabling development and due to the unacceptable breaches of the polices outlined in the report by the Acting Head of Planning.
- 2) The Acting Head of Planning and Building Standards to report further on the detail of the reasons for refusal

- moved by Councillor Howat, seconded by Councillor Bagshaw.

**Voting**

For the motion - 9 votes  
For the amendment - 6 votes

**Decision**

To grant all three applications subject to conditions, informatives, a legal agreement and notification to Scottish Ministers as detailed in the reports by the Acting Head of Planning and Building Standards.

(Reference – reports by the Acting Head of Planning and Building Standards, submitted.)