

Development Management Sub Committee

Wednesday 3 June 2015

**Application for Planning Permission 14/05155/FUL
At 12 Merchiston Place, Edinburgh, EH10 4NR
Demolish existing stone building and erect two new blocks
to form four dwellings in total and erection of an electricity
sub-station to the north-east corner.**

Item number	9.1(a)
Report number	
Wards	A10 - Meadows/Morningside

Summary

The housing proposals are contrary to policies: Env5 - Demolition in Conservation Areas; Env6 - Development in Conservation Areas; Env12 - Tree Protection; Env16 - Protected Species; and Des3 - Development Design. The proposals are also contrary to non-statutory guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, and Edinburgh Design Guidance (in relation to position of buildings on site and garden size). As a consequence of not meeting the aforementioned policies and guidance the proposal does not comply with policy Hou1 (d).

The sub-station element is considered contrary to policies: Hou 8 - Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas; Env6 - Development in Conservation Areas; and to non-statutory guidelines on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

The proposals are unacceptable for these reasons and no other issues outweigh this conclusion.

Outcome of previous Committee

This application was previously considered by Committee on 25.03.2015.

The application was presented to Committee on 25 March 2015 and was continued for a site visit.

This took place on 26 May 2015.

Links

[Policies and guidance for this application](#)

LPC, CITD3, CITD4, CITE4, CITE5, CITE6, CITE12, CITOS3, CITH1, CITH3, CITH4, CITT4, CITT5, CITT6, NSG, NSLBCA, NSHOU, NSGD02,

Report

Application for Planning Permission 14/05155/FUL At 12 Merchiston Place, Edinburgh, EH10 4NR Demolish existing stone building and erect two new blocks to form four dwellings in total and erection of an electricity sub-station to the north-east corner.

Recommendations

1.1 It is recommended that this application be Refused for the reasons below.

Background

2.1 Site description

The site extends to 1100sqm and contains an unlisted stone-built villa designed by the Edinburgh architect David Rhind. The building remains largely intact and in its original condition. It faces east, into the rear of tenements on Bruntsfield Place, which have been built on its former front garden. It is set well back from Merchiston Place, which now constitutes its only access, and is screened by a high stone boundary wall to that side. Garaging has been built against the boundary wall on the west and north sides. One garage against the north wall contains a local electricity sub-station.

The site is unique in the area due to the strong dominance of the mature and healthy lime trees along its frontage, giving the site a strong landscape character. A less formal line of trees also extends southwards along the western half of the site.

The villa is currently vacant but was last used as a student union but is currently vacant.

This application site is located within the Merchiston and Greenhill Conservation Area.

2.2 Site History

A parallel application for Conservation Area Consent is also under consideration (Reference: 14/05156/CON).

Main report

3.1 Description Of The Proposal

The application proposes demolition of the stone-built 19th century villa, demolition of peripheral garages and clearance of all trees on site, and the construction of two blocks, each containing two semi-detached houses, facing northwards to Merchiston Place, creating four villas in total. Each property contains seven apartments.

The eastern pair is asymmetrical, two storeys in height, and smaller than the western pair. Each dwelling has 260sqm of floor area, with a footprint of around 95sqm. This block notionally includes the rebuilding of the facade of the existing villa as the frontage of this block.

The western block is designed as a mirrored pair, two storey and attic in height, each around 290sqm of floor area (subject to inconsistent scales from drawing to drawing). Ground coverage on each of these two plots is stated as 105sqm.

Each house has a single parking space accessed through the existing high boundary wall, with no turning area provided. Vehicles would reverse onto the carriageway.

Small rear garden areas are provided, varying in depth from 1m to 10m due to the angled boundary, and averaging around 6m deep.

Drawings were amended and supplemented during the course of the application, to clarify that the proposal includes construction of a new electricity sub-station to the north-east, replacing an existing substation enclosed within one of the garage units. This is to be of proprietary glass-reinforced plastic (GRP) modular format. The sub-station stands forward of the adjacent tenement, adjacent to a low wall.

Supporting Statements

A Design and Access Statement and Tree Condition Report were submitted with the application. These papers are available to view on the Planning and Building Standards online services.

3.2 Determining Issues

Do the proposals harm the character or appearance of the conservation area? If they do, there is a strong presumption against granting of permission.

Do the proposals comply with the development plan?

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

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

3.3 Assessment

To address these determining issues, the Committee needs to consider whether:

- a) whether the principle of demolition of this building is acceptable;
- b) existing protected trees are adequately considered;
- c) the principle of residential use is acceptable;

- d) the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area is acceptable;
- e) neighbouring amenity is safeguarded;
- f) amenity of the proposed units is adequate;
- g) protected species are safeguarded;
- h) parking and road safety is adequate;
- i) the proposed sub-station is adequately considered;
- j) inconsistencies between drawings, Design Statement etc are assessed;
- k) other considerations are addressed;
- l) comments raised have been addressed; and
- m) the proposals raise any equalities or human rights issues.

a) The Principle of Demolition

When considering the demolition of an unlisted building in a conservation area it is appropriate to determine the application in accordance with policy Env 5 of the Edinburgh City Local Plan and with the Scottish Government's Historic Environment Policy (SHEP).

Policy Env 5 - Conservation Areas, Demolition of Buildings - differentiates between buildings which make a positive contribution to the conservation area and those which do not, with a presumption against the demolition of the former, except in exceptional circumstances. The SHEP test highlights the importance of the building to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the proposals for the redevelopment of the site as the main issues.

Env 5 indicates that proposals for the total or substantial demolition of a building of merit will only be supported in exceptional circumstances. These reiterate the same three tests applied to listed buildings in policy Env2. This takes into account:

- i) the condition of the building and the cost of repairing and maintaining it, in relation to its importance and to the value to be derived from its continued use (this does not have to be the same use as existing);
- ii) the adequacy of efforts to retain the building in, or adapt it to, a new use that will safeguard its future, including its marketing at a price reflecting its location and condition to potential restoring purchasers, for a reasonable period (usually taken as two years); and
- iii) the merits of alternative proposals for the site and whether the public benefits to be derived from allowing demolition outweigh the loss.

The Scottish Historic Environment Policy 2011 (SHEP) requires in paragraph 3.58 that, in deciding applications for conservation area consent, local authorities should take into account the importance of the building to the conservation area, and the future proposals for the site. If the building is considered to be of any architectural or historic value a positive attempt should be made to achieve its retention and re-use before any demolition proposals are seriously investigated. In some instances demolition may be considered appropriate, for instance where the building is of little or no townscape value, or where repair costs are unreasonable, or where the existing form or location makes any re-use extremely difficult. Whilst SHEP does not set out independent requirements for unlisted buildings, the same considerations apply:

- the building is of no architectural or historic merit, or
- the building is incapable of repair, or
- the demolition of the building serves a wider economic benefit to the community, or
- the repair of the building is uneconomic and the building has been unsuccessfully marketed for a reasonable period, at a price reflecting its condition and location.

The existing building is an excellent example of a villa typical of the area, and represents one of the oldest in the entire area. It is of both architectural and historic merit and contributes to the wider character of the area.

The building is capable of repair, and appears in good condition. It is readily available for re-use over a spectrum of uses without major repair works. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the building is incapable of repair.

Redevelopment of the site does not serve a wider economic benefit to the community.

There are no guidelines specific to instances of proposed "rebuilding". Whilst a partial rebuilding of the existing facade is proposed, this cannot be considered as a mitigating factor in its own right, and is not considered in any broader manner within legislation. Legislation on demolition allows consideration of whether or not the replacement building is more appropriate to the conservation area than the existing building.

The agent argues that the siting of the existing building justifies its demolition. Acceptable reasons to justify demolition do not include poor siting of existing buildings. The building is an excellent and early example of a stone-built villa in the area, and is no more justified for demolition than any other villa in the area in policy terms. The proposed replacement buildings would be less appropriate to the character of the conservation area than the existing villa.

The principle of demolition fails to meet the basic tests required, as it proposes demolition of an original villa, important to the development history of the wider area. The villa is of high quality and in good condition. The parallel application for Conservation Area Consent is recommended for refusal.

The demolition of the existing building is not considered to be justified by the application. The demolition is contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Env5 - Conservation Areas - Demolition of Buildings, and fails to meet the SHEP test.

b) Effect Upon Trees

A full tree survey and condition report was submitted, which demonstrates that the existing trees are excellent specimens and in good health. Nothing within the survey concludes that removal of the trees can be justified on arboricultural grounds as the majority of trees on site are both healthy and of very great visual significance to the conservation area.

The proposed removal of trees is not considered appropriate in the context of the value which they add to the conservation area.

Loss of trees is contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Env 12 - Trees - which would not support trees of this importance being lost.

c) Residential Use

The site lies in a residential area and the principle of housing use is acceptable subject to other policy requirements being met.

However, in relation to the specific development proposals, whilst the overall design of the villas reflects the character of the surrounding area, due to the constrained nature of the site and scale of the proposals, the proposed redevelopment will be inappropriately spaced too close together when viewed from the street, having a squeezed in appearance, and out of character with the spatial characteristics of the villa area.

The proposal therefore fails to meet criterion d) of Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Hou1- Housing Development, and is therefore unacceptable.

d) Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

Merchiston and Greenhill Character Appraisal

The development [of Merchiston] was supervised by David Rhind until 1864, when he was replaced by David MacGibbon. Merchiston Place was begun by 1861.

The most regular pattern of development occurs in the predominantly rectangular grid layout on the north side of Colinton Road, between Merchiston Park and Gillsland Road.

The character of the street layout is dominated by Victorian villas.

Over and above the demolition of the building, the impact upon the conservation area can be considered as three separate effects: spatial characteristics/density of the proposal in relation to its surroundings; form and layout; and design.

i) Spatial Characteristics/ Proposed Density

Whilst the site lies adjacent to the Bruntsfield and Marchmont Conservation Area (where higher densities are appropriate) it lies fully within the Merchiston and Greenhill Conservation Area, which is characterised by substantial stone villas, set in large gardens, with generous spacing between properties.

The proposal echoes the concept of the villa area to the west and north and can be readily compared. However a density comparison is not favourable.

Existing villas in the surrounding area typically occupy sites ranging from 1000sqm to 1300sqm. The two houses immediately to the west sit on smaller plots of around 600sqm each. The plot for each proposed dwelling on site averages 275sqm. The proposed density represents approximately twice the density of the densest housing in this villa area. The plot is considered inadequate to accommodate four villas.

Ground coverage of villas in the conservation area, in relation to plot size, ranges from 10% to 20%. Due to the very restricted rear gardens, but very great depth of the proposed blocks, the proposed densities range from 32% to 37.5%. This density is considered to be inappropriate to its context, being broadly twice the usual maximum ground coverage of its surroundings.

In conclusion, the density is excessive both in terms of insufficient plot per unit and in terms of net ground coverage per plot and is considered to be unacceptable and contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Env 6 - Conservation Area - Development and Edinburgh's Design Guidance on density.

ii) Form and layout

The broad layout of two blocks (each designed to appear as a single villa) facing the street, may be considered appropriate, were the site larger and the proposal reflected the spatial character of the area.

The depth of the blocks, especially the western block, is excessive both in relation to neighbouring buildings and in relation to the plot size, and is therefore contrary to policy Env 6 and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

Objection was raised to the spacing of the blocks. The close spacing does occur elsewhere in the conservation area and is not an independent reason for refusal.

iii) Design

The proposed frontages are a combination of rebuilding and pastiche, thereby repeating its surroundings and being in character. However, the design concept is changed to the sides and rear, and is considered to be substandard. The rear of each block is out of character with the conservation area in terms of both proportions and materials.

The design of the rear elevations is not acceptable. The design is contrary to policy Env 6 and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

e) Effect Upon Neighbouring Amenity

Due to the depth of the westmost block (well beyond the rear building line) the proposed form would overshadow the neighbouring building at 14 Merchiston Place. This effect largely derives from the decision to build the new villas far deeper than other houses on the street and is not justifiable in terms of urban design. This effect is contrary to policy Des 3 (c) and the Edinburgh Design Guidance, and is not acceptable.

On the east side, the eastern block will obscure existing windows on the gable of 8 Merchiston Place. However, gable windows are not protected in policy guidelines.

Only the overshadowing on the west side is a reason for refusal. That effect is considered contrary to policy Des3 (c) and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

f) Amenity of the Proposed Houses

The Edinburgh Design Guidance states that the spatial character of the area will be used to determine appropriate privacy distances. As the distances between the dwellings and neighbouring buildings are shorter than those of the prevailing character, privacy to neighbouring gardens fails to meet the expectations of guidance.

Privacy distances are not met in relation to rear boundaries. Gardens average 6m in depth and this is considered to be disproportionately small in relation to the size of houses proposed and in relation to the spatial pattern of the wider villa area.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the units look to open space beyond their southern boundary, development at distances below standard privacy distances would create a long-term prejudice to the neighbouring development rights. Compliance with policy is required within the boundary of the application site. Existence of open space to the south of the application site is not seen as a mitigating factor.

Garden ground is considered inadequate throughout and contrary to policy Env 6 and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

g) Protected Species

There is a possibility of bats on site within the existing unused garaging. Directives, as enshrined in UK law, require that this issue be further investigated before any approval might be considered.

Bat surveys are generally only practical in the spring, but in the absence of such information this must be considered as an additional reason for refusal. The application is therefore considered contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Env16 - Protected Species.

Should Committee be minded to grant consent contrary to recommendation it should be noted that this could not be pursued without further evidence in relation to protected species on site.

h) Parking and Road Safety

Transport recommend refusal due to the proposed driveways being within 15m of a junction.

All driveways lie either at or within 15m of the junction of Merchiston Place and Merchiston Park. However, the existing site access lies opposite this junction. Other than vehicles approaching the junction in reverse rather than forward gear this situation is similar to that existing, and is not independently considered to be a reason for refusal.

No cycle parking provision is made. However, it is accepted that the houses are big enough to accommodate cycles internally.

i) Sub-station Location and Design

A sub-station currently exists on site. There is no objection in principle to this remaining subject to suitable location. Environmental Assessment do not object subject to a condition on noise.

Due to the low wall to the north-east, adjacent to 10 Merchiston Place, the re-sited sub-station would be highly visible when approaching from the east, and would have a radical effect upon views from the adjacent house. The sub-station is considered wholly inappropriate in terms of its position relative to the neighbouring form. The sub-station is enclosed in GRP which is also considered an inappropriate material for the conservation area unless in a highly concealed location.

Detailed drawings infer that the sub-station will partly vent into the neighbouring front garden at 10 Merchiston Place.

The sub-station is inappropriate in terms of being located forward of the building line and would be visually obtrusive to the street in general and particularly in relation to the adjacent bay window.

The sub-station would cause loss of amenity to neighbouring housing, contrary to policy Hou8 and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area in its proposed position, contrary to policy Env6 and to non-statutory guidelines on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

j) Inconsistencies in the Submission

Whilst it is observed that drawings are inconsistent with each other and some contradict the Design Statement, this is not, in its own right a reason for refusal.

However, were Committee minded to grant consent it would be prudent to first request improved consistency of information throughout the submission prior to final approval.

k) Other Considerations

Whilst there was some local support for the removal of the former student use, this consideration does not outweigh other factors.

It is noted that the student union use has already terminated.

l) Public Comments

The application attracted six representations, including objection from the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland. Whilst several accepted the principle of redevelopment the following issues were raised:

Material Objections

- The proposal is over-dense/ overdevelopment of the site - addressed in section 3.3. d)ii) of the Assessment;
- The spacing of the villas is out of character with the area - addressed in section 3.3. d)iii) of the Assessment;
- Loss of the existing villa on its original site is not justified - addressed in section 3.3 a) of the Assessment
- Impact upon privacy and daylight - addressed in section 3.3 e) of the Assessment;
- Location of sub-station is inappropriate - addressed in section 3.3 i) of the Assessment;
- Additional traffic/ road safety concerns - addressed in section 3.3 h) of the Assessment;
- Garden size is too small and out of character with the area - addressed in section 3.3 f) of the Assessment; and
- The loss of the student union is welcomed - addressed in section 3.3 k) of the Assessment.

Non-material Objections

- No consultation with neighbours - this is not required under planning legislation;
- Clarification required on boundary being "predominantly" retained on the western boundary - whilst this is ambiguous in the Design Statement the drawings make no mention of demolition of the boundary wall and it is presumed that this will remain. Were the application approved a condition could clarify this issue;
- Where will existing recycling bins be relocated - this is outwith the remit of the applicant;
- Disruption from building works - this is not a planning concern; and
- Design Statement is misleading and contradicts plans - this is noted, and considered in section 3.3 j) of the Assessment.

Some supported the loss of the student union.

m) Equalities and Human Rights

The proposals raise no equalities or human rights concerns.

Conclusion

Arguments regarding "saving" of the villa, or regarding the desirability of losing the former student union use, do not outweigh the considerable policy shortfalls of the proposal nor do they justify the demolition of the villa in its original location.

The housing proposals are contrary to policies: Env5 - Demolition in Conservation Areas; Env6 - Development in Conservation Areas; Env12 - Tree Protection; Env16 - Protected Species; and Des3 - Development Design. The proposals are also contrary to non-statutory guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, and Edinburgh Design Guidance (in relation to position of buildings on site and garden size). As a consequence of not meeting the aforementioned policies and guidance the proposal does not comply with policy Hou1 (d).

The sub-station element is considered contrary to policies: Hou 8 - Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas; Env6 - Development in Conservation Areas; and to non-statutory guidelines on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

The proposals are unacceptable for these reasons and no other issues outweigh this conclusion.

Addendum to Assessment

The application was presented to Committee on 25 March 2015 and was continued for a site visit.

This took place on 26 May 2015.

It is recommended that this application be Refused for the reasons below.

3.4 Conditions/reasons/informatives

Reasons:-

1. The proposals are contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Env5 in respect of Conservation Areas - Demolition of Buildings and contrary to non-statutory guidelines on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas in that the demolition of the existing Victorian villa is not justified.
2. The proposal is contrary to Edinburgh City Local plan policy Env6 - Development in Conservation Areas, and to non-statutory guidelines on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas as the depth and scale of the buildings and the design of the rear elevations is considered to be out of character with the area.
3. The proposal is contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan Policy Env 12 in respect of Trees, as the proposal would result in the loss of significant trees, critical to the existing character of the site.

4. The proposal is contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Hou4 - Density, to Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Env6 - Development in Conservation Areas, to non-statutory guidelines on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, and to non-statutory Edinburgh Design Guidance, all being in relation to inappropriate density, inappropriate depth and inadequate size of garden ground.
5. The proposal is contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan Policy Env 16 in respect of Species Protection, as the submission has failed to demonstrate that there is no effect upon protected species (as required by European Law).
6. The proposal is contrary to section c) of Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Des3 - Development Design and to non-statutory guidelines on Guidance to Householders in that the proposal will cause overshadowing to neighbouring property to the west.
7. The proposed sub-station is contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Hou8 - Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas, due to its juxtaposition to 8/10 Merchiston Place, and to both Edinburgh City Local Plan Policy Env6 - Development in Conservation Areas and non-statutory guidelines on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, due to its position and appearance.

Informatives

It should be noted that:

1. It should be noted that a full bat survey is required were any proposal to be accepted. This is generally done in spring and a winter-time survey would serve little purpose.

Financial impact

4.1 The financial impact has been assessed as follows:

There are no financial implications to the Council.

Risk, Policy, compliance and governance impact

5.1 Provided planning applications are determined in accordance with statutory legislation, the level of risk is low.

Equalities impact

6.1 The equalities impact has been assessed as follows:

The application has been assessed and has no impact in terms of equalities or human rights.

Sustainability impact

7.1 The sustainability impact has been assessed as follows:

This application is not subject to the sustainability requirements of the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

Consultation and engagement

8.1 Pre-Application Process

Pre-application discussions took place on this application.

8.2 Publicity summary of representations and Community Council comments

The application was advertised on 9 January 2015.

Six representations were received including an objection to the demolition from AHSS. Some supported the principle of redevelopment. Reasons for objection were:

- Loss of the original villa is not acceptable;
- Even on a vacant site four dwellings on a site of this size is overdevelopment;
- Redevelopment examples cited are not of sufficient quality for this site;
- Spacing between villas is too narrow;
- The sub-station location is inappropriate;
- Road safety concerns/parking levels;
- No neighbour consultation;
- Loss of daylight;
- Compromises window cleaning on the tenement to the east;
- Proposal is too high;
- Works to boundary walls are unclear;
- Design Statement unclear and inconsistent with drawings;
- Garden size too small;
- Relocation of existing on-street communal bins is not explained; and
- Disruption caused by building works.

Councillor Howat requested a Committee presentation.

It is noted that Scottish Power raised a late objection in relation to their late notification as joint owner. They objected on the grounds of ownership and access rights. This is not a planning concern and must be independently resolved.

Background reading/external references

- To view details of the application go to
- [Planning and Building Standards online services](#)
- [Edinburgh City Local Plan and Rural West Edinburgh Local Plan](#)
- [Planning guidelines](#)

- [Conservation Area Character Appraisals](#)
- [Edinburgh Local Development Plan](#)
- [Scottish Planning Policy](#)

Statutory Development

Plan Provision

The site lies within the Merchiston and Greenhill Conservation Area as shown in the Edinburgh City Local Plan.

Date registered

19 December 2014

Drawing numbers/Scheme

1a,2a,3a,4-8,

Scheme 2

David R. Leslie

Acting Head of Planning and Building Standards

Contact: Stephen Dickson, Senior Planning Officer

E-mail:stephen.dickson@edinburgh.gov.uk Tel:0131 529 3529

Links - Policies

Relevant Policies:

Relevant policies of the Edinburgh City Local Plan.

Policy Des 3 (Development Design) sets criteria for assessing development design.

Policy Des 4 (Layout Design) sets criteria for assessing layout design.

Policy Env 4 (Listed Buildings – Alterations & Extensions) identifies the circumstances in which alterations and extensions to listed buildings will be permitted.

Policy Env 5 (Conservation Areas – Demolition of Buildings) sets out criteria for assessing proposals involving demolition of buildings in conservation areas.

Policy Env 6 (Conservation Areas Development) sets out criteria for assessing development in conservation areas.

Policy Env 12 (Trees) sets out tree protection requirements for new development.

Policy Os 3 (Open Space in New Development) sets out requirements for the provision of open space in new development.

Policy Hou 1 (Housing Development) supports housing on appropriate sites in the urban area, and on specific sites identified in the Plan.

Policy Hou 3 (Private Open Space) sets out the requirements for the provision of private open space in housing development.

Policy Hou 4 (Density) sets out the factors to be taken into account in assessing density levels in new development.

Policy Tra 4 (Private Car Parking) requires private car parking provision to comply with the parking levels set out in supplementary planning guidance, and sets criteria for assessing lower provision.

Policy Tra 5 (Private Cycle Parking) requires cycle parking provision in accordance with levels set out in supplementary guidance.

Policy Tra 6 (Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking) sets criteria for assessing design of off-street car and cycle parking.

Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines

Non-statutory guidelines 'LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS' provides guidance on repairing, altering or extending listed buildings and unlisted buildings in conservation areas.

Non-statutory guidelines 'GUIDANCE FOR HOUSEHOLDERS' provides guidance for proposals to alter or extend houses or flats.

Non-Statutory guidelines Edinburgh Design Guidance supports development of the highest design quality and that integrates well with the existing city. It sets out the Council's expectations for the design of new development, including buildings and landscape, in Edinburgh.

Appendix 1

**Application for Planning Permission 14/05155/FUL
At 12 Merchiston Place, Edinburgh, EH10 4NR
Demolish existing stone building and erect two new blocks
to form four dwellings in total and erection of an electricity
sub-station to the north-east corner.**

Consultations

Environmental Assessment

No objection to this proposed development, subject to the following being confirmed in a noise impact assessment:

The electrical sub-station shall be designed and constructed so that any noise complies with NR20 when measured within any nearby living apartment with the windows open for ventilation purposes.

Transport

Advise that the application be refused.

Reason:

The Council's Movement and Development guidelines state that Driveways in new developments must not be located within 15m of a junction.

Should the application be granted the following should be included as conditions or informatives as appropriate:

1. *Consent should not be issued until the applicant has entered into a suitable legal agreement to provide:-*
 - a) *The cost of relocating a traffic sign (est. cost £500);*
 - b) *The cost of relocating a lighting column (est. cost £500);*
 - c) *The cost of relocating a ticket machine (est. cost £1,000);*
 - d) *Contribute the sum of £2,000 to progress the necessary traffic order to amend the controlled parking and for the remarking of all road markings in the event that the amendment is concluded;*
2. *A suspensive condition will be required such that no work on the formation of the access points can be commenced prior to a successful conclusion to the traffic order amendment in 1.d) above. The applicant should note that it is likely that any proposed amendment to the existing order will attract objections. There can therefore be no certainty of securing the amendments;*
3. *There are two utilities cabinets in the area of the proposed access points the applicant should ensure that they have approval from the utilities company and that the proposed layout does not require the cabinets to be relocated;*

4. *New residential properties in the extended Controlled Parking Zone, are eligible for one residents' permit per property only;*
5. *Access to any car parking area is to be by dropped kerb (i.e. not bell mouth);*
6. *A length of 2 metres nearest the road should be paved in a solid material to prevent deleterious material (e.g. loose chippings) being carried on to the road;*
7. *Any gate or gates must open inwards on to the property. Note that this also applies to the sub-station;*
8. *Any hard standing outside should be porous, to comply with 'Guidance for Householders' published in December 2012;*
9. *The applicant should be informed that prior to carrying out any works to form a footway crossing a Minor Roadworks consent must be applied for and secured;*
10. *The works to form a footway crossing must be carried out in accordance with "Development Roads - Guidelines and Specification". See pages 5, 15 & 16 of http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/704/guidance_for_householders*

Note:

- o Current Council car parking standards for residential dwellings within this area (Zone 3a) require a minimum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling however in this instance 1 space per property is considered to be acceptable as they are also limited to one residents permit per property therefore this development should not have a detrimental impact on the existing road network. There is no maximum.*
- o The applicant should contact the Council's Parking Operations section, John Richmond, Tel 0131 469 3765, email john.richmond@edinburgh.gov.uk to agree the position of the parking bays and sign the parking meter and for the details of the Traffic Regulation Order.*
- o The applicant should contact the Council's Street Lighting section, Stuart McLeod, Tel 0131 458 8029, email Stuart.mcleod@edinburgh.gov.uk to agree the position of the lighting column.*

With reference to the proposed sub-station, under new RAUC standards the existing footway should not be narrowed to less than 1.8m this includes when the gates are open.

Location Plan



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