

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

9:30 am Monday 21 December 2015

Present:

Councillors Perry (Convener), Dixon (Vice-Convener), Bagshaw, Balfour, Blacklock, Cairns, Child, Howat, Keil, McVey, Milligan, Mowat and Robson.

1. 17 Frogston Road East, Edinburgh (Land 296 metres south of)

On 18 November 2015, the Sub-Committee had agreed to continue consideration of the following application for planning permission at 17 Frogston Road East, Edinburgh (Land 296 metres south of) for a residential development (633 units) (with small scale commercial units) with associated roads, footpaths, parking, landscaping and open space plus site for new primary school for a hearing (Application Number. 14/04860/FUL).

(a) Protocol Note by the Head of Legal and Risk

A note setting out the procedure for the hearing had been circulated.

Decision

To note the protocol note.

(Reference – protocol note by the Head of Legal and Risk, submitted.)

(b) Report by the Head of Planning and Transport

The Acting Head of Planning and Building Standards gave details of the application for a residential development comprising 633 units with small scale commercial units, associated roads, footpaths, parking, landscaping and open space plus site for a new primary school on land 296 metres south of 17 Frogston Road East, Edinburgh.

The proposal was contrary to the Edinburgh City Local Plan in terms of development of the site in the green belt. However, the second Proposed Local Development Plan allocated this site for housing and provided a site brief for the development of the site. The application had been assessed in terms of its impact on amenity, infrastructure and the landscape and with appropriate mitigation, the development was acceptable.

A legal agreement was required to ensure the transport and education contributions and affordable housing.

The Head of Planning and Transport recommended that the Sub-Committee grant the application.

(c) Liberton & District Community Council

Jim Henry on behalf of the community council advised that they opposed this development as it was premature and should be refused pending the outcome of the local development plan examination and that to grant the application would undermine the objections submitted to that plan.

Many residents had expressed their concerns when the site was included in the local development plan, and assumed that their comments would be taken into consideration when the detailed application was submitted, which is why separate objections to this application were not submitted.

At the pre-application stage 92% of people questioned opposed the development, and residents did not feel that the concerns raised then were taken on by the developer in the detailed application.

The adopted local plan did not allocate this site for housing and it was classified as greenbelt.

He further indicated that issues such as traffic congestion, infrastructure and air quality had not been addressed by the developer, and that these proposals would exacerbate the transport problems already being experienced at the Frogston Road junction.

The Community Council was also of the opinion that brownfield sites should be developed prior to any development of the greenbelt.

In conclusion he asked the Sub-Committee to refuse the application.

(d) Gilmerton Inch Community Council

Lesley Gibson-Eaglesham and Eric Dobbie advised that the Community Council wished to raise the following points in regard to this application

Transport

Concerns were expressed over the increase in traffic within the area. It was noted that the developers were making an appropriate contribution through a Section 75 agreement which would assist with the cost of installing a MOVA system at the Kaimes junction and it was acknowledged that this may help with traffic movement at certain times of the day (outwith peak times) but would be of no assistance during peak times.

It was expected that due to this development having a through road many travellers would start to use this as a 'rat run'. It had been shown in other areas that the introduction of traffic slowing measures do not stop this.

The community council asked the Sub-Committee to take account of the cumulative impact of all the developments planned within the South East Wedge and not just the impact of this one development.

Education

It was widely acknowledged that through 'rising school rolls' some of the existing primary schools in the south east area already had prefabricated additional classrooms added. There were constraints on how many of these buildings could be placed within school grounds due to lack of available space but with the peak in primary schools intake not expected to hit until 2019 this was an ongoing problem and was happening before any allowances for any new housing developments within the area were made.

Gracemount High School was working at full capacity at the moment with waiting lists in place for many of the years. The existing primary schools within the area work hard to ensure that all the children are educated within a safe environment but obviously they would benefit from receiving funding from Section 75 contributions but how does this happen if a significant portion of the contribution is in the form of land?

It was also noted that there was no mention of the provision of Catholic education within the proposal.

It was the Community Council's opinion that that provision of safe and meaningful education for all the children within the area had not been taken into account in the developers proposals, and the 'appropriate' level of contribution as mentioned by the developer, did not mitigate the educational infrastructure needs for the area.

Air Quality

Air quality would be impacted should this and the other proposed developments in the area go ahead. The comments within the report specifically relate to the air quality due to the resultant impacts of the LDP and the surrounding road network. The Environmental Assessment had advised that an air quality issue may be created if all the other sites within the LDP achieve their maximum capacities. It had been stated that the Environmental Assessment may have to monitor the areas and declare an Air Quality Management Area in nearby streets. It is considered to be wholly unacceptable that residents were going to be placed in the situation where their air quality was diminished in this way.

In conclusion, Education, Transport and Air Quality were very real, serious concerns for the residents in the area and whilst commenting only on this proposed development, the community council urged the Sub-Committee to take into account the picture as a whole within the South East Wedge.

The Community Council requested that the application be refused.

(e) Applicants

Nicholas Wright (BDW Trading), Ewan McIntyre (EMA Architecture), Alex Sneddon (Transport Planning Ltd) and Steve Fraser (Energised Environment) presented the case in support of the applicant.

Nicholas Wright (BDW Trading) advised that they fully supported the Head of Planning and Transport's recommendation that the application be granted.

Ewan McIntyre indicated that this application had involved more than two years'

consultation with the local community and had involved meetings with the local MP, MSP, Councillors, public meetings and leafleting over fifteen hundred houses.

The design had been done in consultation with ANBS and had resulted in an integrated and sustainable site with a large amount of green space and local shopping facilities. The parks and green space for the development had large areas of open space through a series of connecting green networks and which exceeded policy guidelines.

The design of the site was pedestrian focused and the properties were of a mixed occupation type with 25% affordable homes.

A transport analysis had been done in line with Council guidelines and the difference in air quality levels was negligible.

The planning gain in respect of the Section 75 agreement had increased during the planning of the development to £14m which had been agreed.

In conclusion Mr Wright advised that the benefits to this area from the development outweighed any detrimental matters and asked that the application be granted

(f) Local Ward Councillor

Councillor Austin Hart advised that the strong views expressed by her constituents against the development on the grounds that the proposals were contrary to the local development plan. There was a feeling that the west of the city was being protected from development at the expense of the east. Previous decisions by Scottish Government Reporters to overturn decisions to refuse planning permission had reinforced this belief.

The objections that were submitted in regard to the Local Development Plan were relevant to this application and should be taken into account when considering this application.

The cumulative impact of all the developments in this area on transport levels required to be taken into account. In addition, the impact of the development on the education system had not been fully considered.

In conclusion Councillor Austin Hart urged the Sub-Committee to refuse the application.

(g) Local Ward Councillor

Councillor Nick Cook advised that he supported the views expressed by the community councils and his fellow ward councillors.

The site was high quality green space with exceptional views across the Pentlands, and development of this area would be extremely detrimental to its character. It was anticipated that the increased traffic would lead to this becoming an air quality management area due to the higher levels of pollution.

The existing roads infrastructure was at capacity and would not be able to cope with the additional traffic from the development especially at peak times.

The new primary school would have very little effect on school provision in the area which was more complex than had been portrayed by the developer.

In conclusion Councillor Nick Cook recommended that the Sub-Committee refuse the application.

(h) Local Ward Councillor

Councillor Bill Cook advised he supported the view expressed by the community councils and his fellow ward councillors.

The new school would have very little effect on school provision in the area and would have been better invested in the existing school campus development.

He was concerned at the proposed traffic impact at the Kaimes crossroads highlighted by other speakers and asked the Sub-Committee to consider this carefully. The number of sites being developed in the area was the largest in the city and was leading to pressure on existing roads and increased traffic levels in the area.

In conclusion Councillor Bill Cook recommended that the Sub-Committee refuse the application.

Motion

To grant planning permission subject to conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement to ensure transport and education contributions and affordable housing were met as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Howat

Amendment

To refuse planning permission for the reasons that the proposals were contrary to Policies ENV18, TRA1 and TRA2 of the Edinburgh City Local Plan as the scale and density of the development would have a detrimental impact on air quality and would result in increased levels of traffic leading to congestion and road safety issues.

- moved by Councillor Bagshaw, seconded by Councillor Robson

Voting

For the motion - 9 votes
for the amendment - 3 votes

Decision

To grant planning permission subject to conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement to ensure transport and education contributions and affordable housing are met as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.

(References – Development Management Sub-Committee 18 November 2015 (item 5); report by the Head of Planning and Transport, submitted)

2. 65 West Harbour Road, Edinburgh

On 18 November 2015, the Sub-Committee had agreed to continue consideration of the following application for a hearing - application for approval of matters specified in condition 2 of outline planning application 01/00802/OUT covering siting and height of development, design and configuration of public and open spaces, access, road layouts, footpaths and cycle routes (Scheme 3) at 65 West Harbour Road, Edinburgh (Application Number 14/05305/AMC).

(a) Protocol Note by the Head of Legal and Risk

A note setting out the procedure for the hearing had been circulated.

Decision

To note the protocol note.

(Reference – protocol note by the Head of Legal and Risk, submitted.)

(b) Report by the Head of Planning and Transport

The Head of Planning and Transport gave details of the application for approval of matters specified in condition 2 of outline application 01/00802/OUT covering siting and height of development, design and configuration of public and open spaces, access, road layouts, footpaths and cycle routes at 65 West Harbour Road, Edinburgh.

This application sought approval of a revised Masterplan for Granton Harbour which would update one approved in January 2014 (reference 13/04320/AMC). Many parts of the Masterplan were the same as currently approved. Some proposed changes would result in improvements to the approved masterplan, for example an increase in housing numbers.

The siting of the proposed large retail/leisure/commercial centre in the south eastern part of the site was unacceptable. It was contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan policy Ret 4 and Proposal S5, and Second Proposed Local Development Plan policy Ret 4 and Proposal S2. This was because the scale and type of retailing was not consistent with the role and function of the proposed local centre at Granton Harbour. Insufficient information had been submitted to assess the impact of the proposed large retail/leisure/commercial centre on the city centre or other town and local centres.

The siting of the buildings, and design and configuration of public spaces, roads and footpaths in and adjacent to the proposed large centre were unacceptable in placemaking terms. The proposals were not based on a comprehensive and integrated approach which drew upon the positive characteristics of the site's waterfront location to create a sense of place. The height, scale and form of the large centre would have a detrimental impact on the wider townscape, and the layout of car parking spaces and pedestrian/cycle routes in this part of the site would not encourage walking and cycling. The proposal was contrary to policies Ret 6, Des1, Des 3a), Des 3c), Des 3f), and Des 3h), Des 4a) and Des 4c) of the Edinburgh City Local Plan, and Second Proposed LDP policy Del 4.

Other material considerations had been taken into account, including Scottish Planning Policy, the Second Proposed Local Development Plan, Edinburgh Design Guidance,

Waterfront Granton Masterplan and submitted representations.

The Head of Planning and Transport recommended that the Sub-Committee refuse the application.

(c) Granton and District Community Council

Fred Marinello advised that the Community Council had held public meetings to discuss the development, the main concerns raised were the potential increase in traffic congestion along Lower Granton Road and the increase in the use of services that additional housing would bring.

The contribution being sought through the section 75 agreement seemed to be low for the improvements that would be required in respect of education and transport and there was concern that this would put additional burdens on the public purse.

He indicated that the Community Council was not opposed to development but that it required to be done in a sensitive manner. The proposals at present were of such a density that it would overburden the existing traffic network with the associated impact on air quality.

In conclusion he requested that the Sub-Committee refuse the application.

(d) Trinity Community Council

Tricia Brindle on behalf of the community council advised that the scale of the proposed development would have a considerable impact on Trinity area. The community council would have wished to see a well planned, fully funded and commercially viable project for the whole Waterfront with a strong emphasis on family housing and community facilities brought forward rather than piecemeal developments like this.

She raised the following points that required to be addressed in regard to this proposal, traffic generation and road safety especially on Granton and Lower Granton Roads, access to public transport, walking and cycling links, high quality design for the housing, inclusion of community and recreational facilities for residents, need to find new uses for existing buildings, adequate funding for educational requirements, support for small businesses, proposals required for the improvement of Granton Square.

In conclusion she requested that the Sub-Committee refuse the application.

(e) Applicant

John Paton, Kevin Fawcett and Tim Ferguson spoke on behalf of the applicant. They advised that this was an application to amend the previously approved planning consent, this has been done to ensure that the development was deliverable and commercially viable

The Local Plan included proposals for local shopping centres at Granton Harbour, the master plan for the Waterfront restricts retail to small stores. It was proposed that the retail element of this development be brought together to provide an outlet for retailers specialising in the best of Scottish produce. The present proposals would increase the number of housing units on the site including affordable housing. The overall retail floorspace had been reduced and community, business and leisure use had been

increased, and openspace provision had increased to nearly sixty thousand square meters. It was also proposed to introduce a range of cafes and restaurants to help diversify the site

The retail units in the masterplan were scattered around the site, however this was not commercially feasible and would only be viable if located in one spot. It was further proposed to have a community boatyard on the site.

Granton had an existing parking problem, and it was proposed to ease this along with any additional parking requirements by the construction of the multi-storey carpark, with some surface level provision.

There will be a reduced peak period traffic impact from the development and this would reduce vehicular movements on the main arterial routes. There was good linkage with public transport and the proposed tram extension, and there was also easy access for cyclists and walking.

The proposals would bring much needed investment to the area together with employment opportunities, it would also aid with the housing shortfall in the city.

In conclusion they requested that the application be granted.

(f) Local Ward Councillor

Councillor Vicki Redpath as a local ward member advised that increased housing, together with commercial, retail and employment opportunities was welcome. However the housing needed to be affordable and the employment opportunities needed to be local and sustainable and this did not appear to be the case in this instance. In regards to the proposal for a retailers specialising in the best of Scottish produce, this did not constitute a local shopping centre.

This proposal would only be viable by attracting destination shoppers looking for specialist produce, and would not be used by local people, this would lead to an increase in traffic congestion with the associated decrease in air quality.

There appears to have been little local consultation on the proposed community uses such as the boatyard, feedback from the local yacht clubs in the area was that this was not an appropriate location for this proposal as there was no facility for the removal of boats from the water at this site. There was also no direct access to the boatyard from the main road and all traffic would have to drive through the residential part of the development. There was also no proposal to develop the existing harbour.

The proposals for employment were not specific and looked like it was more a redistribution of existing jobs on other sites to this one, a retail impact assessment for this site was required.

(g) Local Ward Councillor

Councillor Cammy Day as a local ward member advised that the whole community was supportive of getting new housing into Granton, but there needed to be a level affordable housing

There had been no evidence brought forward to indicate that the proposed jobs would be

new employment opportunities, rather than existing jobs being moved from existing sites like Ocean Terminal to this one

This proposal would bring extra traffic to this site leading to further congestion

In conclusion he indicated that the local community was supportive of development in the area but these had to include appropriate levels of affordable housing, and evidence needed to be supplied to show that the employment opportunities proposed were new opportunities and sustainable.

During discussion of the application the members agreed that they were not able to support the recommendation by the Head of Planning and Transport to refuse the application.

The Convener (Councillor Perry) submitted the following proposal for determining the application.

“That the Sub-Committee was minded to approve this application with the exception of the large retail/leisure/commercial centre, and that the following conditions and informatives be applied.

1. The consent did not discharge any reserved matters in respect of the following:
 - (i) The private amenity space and car parking areas for the individual plots are shown on the plans for illustrative purposes only and do not form part of the development hereby permitted. These will be agreed as part of the detailed design for the individual plots and shall be in accordance with the Council's Edinburgh Design Guidance and Parking Standards.
 - (ii) Development or works relating to Middle Pier. These should be the subject of a further application(s) for the approval of reserved matters which should address the needs of the sailing community for berths and storage facilities, etc.
2. No further development shall take place at the site until a revised flood risk assessment and surface water management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning and Transport. This shall then inform the detailed planning applications on the individual plots.
3. No development shall take place to construct the new berths within the marina until the extension to the Western Breakwater has been implemented.
4. The reserved matters covering siting and height of development, design and configuration of public and open spaces, access, road layouts, footpaths and cycle routes are not approved in respect of plots 12, 14, 15, 15A, 16 and 17 as shown on the masterplan drawings A-P-00-G7-001 revX1 and the proposed Plot Area and Accommodations Schedule Revision X-1.
5. Details of a suitable Waterfront cycle/ pedestrian route shall be submitted to and approved by the Head of Planning and Transport and shall give priority to the cyclists and pedestrians using this facility over side road traffic. The details shall include details of the connections to the promenade at the east and west sides of the site. The approved route shall be implemented as agreed by the Head of Planning and Transport.

6. The detailed design of a 5 metre wide cycle track for shared cycle/pedestrian use on West Harbour Road/Lower Granton Road shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Head of Planning and Transport. It shall be designed to give priority to the cyclists and pedestrians using this facility over the side road traffic. It shall also allow for suitable connections to the promenade at the east and west of the site.

Reasons:-

1. In order to define the consent hereby permitted.
2. In order to minimise the risk of flooding.
3. In the interests of the safe operation of the marina.
4. The proposals for these plots are contrary to policy Ret 4 and proposal S5 of the Edinburgh City Local Plan and policy Ret 4 and proposal S2 of the Second Proposed Local Development Plan as the scale and type of retailing is not consistent with the role and function of the proposed local centre at Granton Harbour. Insufficient information has been provided to conclude whether the proposed retail/leisure/commercial centre will have a significant adverse impact on the city centre or other town or local centres.

The proposals are contrary to policies Ret 6, Des1, Des 3, and Des 4 of the Edinburgh City Local Plan, and policy Del 4 of the Second Proposed Local Development Plan because the siting of the buildings, and design and configuration of public spaces, roads and footpaths in the proposed large centre are unacceptable. These are not based on a comprehensive and integrated approach which draws upon the positive characteristics of the site's waterfront location to create a sense of place. In addition, the height, scale and form of the large centre will have a detrimental impact on the wider townscape and the layout of car parking spaces and pedestrian/cycle routes in this part of the site will not encourage walking and cycling.

5. In order to safeguard the interests of road safety and to provide suitable off road transport routes.
6. In order to safeguard the interests of road safety and to provide suitable off road transport routes.

Informatives

It should be noted that:

1. The decision shall not be issued until a suitable legal agreement has been concluded to secure land for the provision for 293 Affordable Housing units of an agreed tenure on Plots 10A and 13 as shown on master plan drawing A-P-00-G7-001 rev X1

The legal agreement should be concluded within six months of the date of this notice. If not concluded within the six month period, a report will be put to Committee with a recommendation that the application be refused.

Note : No affordable housing is required on Plots 4 and 28 as these are already built. The affordable housing shown for plots 3, 7A, 26, 27 and 30 on master plan drawing A-P-00-G7-001 rev X1 is indicative only. The Council will seek to secure affordable housing on these and other plots where the opportunity arises.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than the expiration of two years from the date of this consent or from the date of subsequent approval of matters specified in conditions, or fifteen years from the date of the outline planning permission, whichever is the later.
3. The new breakwater section to protect the marina will require separate consent from the Council under the Coast Protection Act 1949.
4. For the avoidance of doubt, the car parking numbers are not approved at this stage.
5. Tram: There are a number of issues which conflict with the current design and operation of the tram. These should be addressed in future application submissions:
 - The boundaries of the development are on the Limits of Deviation and there is potentially a conflict if the two are constructed at the same time;
 - An additional road crossing is shown to the east of Chestnut Street which is not on the current tram design;
 - As a consequence of the above, the proximity of the road crossings to each other at this location gives cause for concern, particularly if they are signalised;
 - In addition, the developer will be required to amend the design to reflect the tram track or pay for the tram design to be amended;
 - The development drawing does not reflect the proposed position of Granton Tram stop and the adjacent tracks with overhead equipment, footway and soft landscaping. The detailed drawings will be required to reflect the proposed position of the platform.
6. A Quality Audit, as set out in Designing Streets, to be submitted at an early stage and prior to the grant of Road Construction Consent. Quality Audits may be phased if appropriate;
7. The applicant should note that new road names may be required for the development and this should be discussed with the Council's Street Naming and Numbering Team at an early opportunity;
8. Any off-street residential hard standing outside should be porous, to comply with 'Guidance for Householders' published in December 2012;
9. Prior to carrying out works to an existing road, whether adopted or not, appropriate permits must be applied for and secured.
10. All accesses must be open for use by the public in terms of the statutory definition of 'road' and shall be the subject of applications for road construction consent. The extent of adoptable roads, including footways, footpaths, access, cycle tracks, verges and service strips to be agreed. The applicant should note that this will include details of lighting, drainage, Sustainable Urban Drainage, materials, structures, layout, car and cycle parking numbers including location, design and specification;

11. No works shall be commenced until:
 - a. the design and full specification of all traffic controlled junctions, crossings and road layouts have been approved by the Head of Transport;
 - b. the details of the surface water and drainage have been approved by the Head of Planning and Transport, including in relation to road construction consent;
 - c. the details of hard and soft landscaping including street furniture as they relate to roads, have been approved by the Head of Planning and Transport, including in relation to road construction consent;
 - d. appropriate road opening permits have been applied for and secured.
12. Electric vehicle charging outlets should be considered for this development which includes: dedicated parking spaces with charging facilities; ducting and infrastructure to allow electric vehicles to be readily accommodated in the future.

The Convener agreed in terms of Standing Order 8.1(b) to adjourn the meeting for 10 minutes to allow the members to consider the proposals in detail.

When the meeting reconvened the Convener indicated he was prepared to formally propose that the application be determined as detailed above. Councillor Howat indicated that he would second the motion.

There being no alternative proposal submitted the Development Management Sub-Committee agreed to determine the application as follows.

Decision

To approve the application with the exception of the large retail/leisure/commercial centre, subject to the following conditions, informatives and a legal agreement:

Conditions

1. The consent did not discharge any reserved matters in respect of the following:
 - (i) The private amenity space and car parking areas for the individual plots were shown on the plans for illustrative purposes only and did not form part of the development hereby permitted. These would be agreed as part of the detailed design for the individual plots and should be in accordance with the Council's Edinburgh Design Guidance and Parking Standards.
 - (ii) Development or works relating to Middle Pier. These should be the subject of a further application(s) for the approval of reserved matters which should address the needs of the sailing community for berths and storage facilities, etc.
2. No further development shall take place at the site until a revised flood risk assessment and surface water management plan had been submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning and Transport. This shall then inform the detailed planning applications on the individual plots.
3. No development shall take place to construct the new berths within the marina until the extension to the Western Breakwater has been implemented.

4. The reserved matters covering siting and height of development, design and configuration of public and open spaces, access, road layouts, footpaths and cycle routes were not approved in respect of plots 12, 14, 15, 15A, 16 and 17 as shown on the masterplan drawings A-P-00-G7-001 revX1 and the proposed Plot Area and Accommodations Schedule Revision X-1.
5. Details of a suitable Waterfront cycle/ pedestrian route shall be submitted to and approved by the Head of Planning and Transport and shall give priority to the cyclists and pedestrians using this facility over side road traffic. The details shall include details of the connections to the promenade at the east and west sides of the site. The approved route shall be implemented as agreed by the Head of Planning and Transport.
6. The detailed design of a 5 metre wide cycle track for shared cycle/pedestrian use on West Harbour Road/Lower Granton Road shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Head of Planning and Transport. It shall be designed to give priority to the cyclists and pedestrians using this facility over the side road traffic. It shall also allow for suitable connections to the promenade at the east and west of the site.

Reasons

1. In order to define the consent hereby permitted.
2. In order to minimise the risk of flooding.
3. In the interests of the safe operation of the marina.
4. The proposals for these plots are contrary to policy Ret 4 and proposal S5 of the Edinburgh City Local Plan and policy Ret 4 and proposal S2 of the Second Proposed Local Development Plan as the scale and type of retailing is not consistent with the role and function of the proposed local centre at Granton Harbour. Insufficient information has been provided to conclude whether the proposed retail/leisure/commercial centre will have a significant adverse impact on the city centre or other town or local centres.

The proposals are contrary to policies Ret 6, Des1, Des 3, and Des 4 of the Edinburgh City Local Plan, and policy Del 4 of the Second Proposed Local Development Plan because the siting of the buildings, and design and configuration of public spaces, roads and footpaths in the proposed large centre are unacceptable. These are not based on a comprehensive and integrated approach which draws upon the positive characteristics of the site's waterfront location to create a sense of place.

In addition, the height, scale and form of the large centre will have a detrimental impact on the wider townscape and the layout of car parking spaces and pedestrian/cycle routes in this part of the site will not encourage walking and cycling.

5. In order to safeguard the interests of road safety and to provide suitable off road transport routes.
6. In order to safeguard the interests of road safety and to provide suitable off road transport routes.

Informatives

It should be noted that:

1. The decision shall not be issued until a suitable legal agreement has been concluded to secure land for the provision for 293 Affordable Housing units of an agreed tenure on Plots 10A and 13 as shown on master plan drawing A-P-00-G7-001 rev X1

The legal agreement should be concluded within six months of the date of this notice. If not concluded within the six month period, a report will be put to Committee with a recommendation that the application be refused.

Note : No affordable housing is required on Plots 4 and 28 as these are already built. The affordable housing shown for plots 3, 7A, 26, 27 and 30 on master plan drawing A-P-00-G7-001 rev X1 is indicative only. The Council will seek to secure affordable housing on these and other plots where the opportunity arises.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than the expiration of two years from the date of this consent or from the date of subsequent approval of matters specified in conditions, or fifteen years from the date of the outline planning permission, whichever is the later.
3. The new breakwater section to protect the marina will require separate consent from the Council under the Coast Protection Act 1949.
4. For the avoidance of doubt, the car parking numbers are not approved at this stage.
5. Tram: There are a number of issues which conflict with the current design and operation of the tram. These should be addressed in future application submissions:
 - The boundaries of the development are on the Limits of Deviation and there is potentially a conflict if the two are constructed at the same time;
 - An additional road crossing is shown to the east of Chestnut Street which is not on the current tram design;
 - As a consequence of the above, the proximity of the road crossings to each other at this location gives cause for concern, particularly if they are signalised;
 - In addition, the developer will be required to amend the design to reflect the tram track or pay for the tram design to be amended;
 - The development drawing does not reflect the proposed position of Granton Tram stop and the adjacent tracks with overhead equipment, footway and soft landscaping. The detailed drawings will be required to reflect the proposed position of the platform.
6. A Quality Audit, as set out in Designing Streets, to be submitted at an early stage and prior to the grant of Road Construction Consent. Quality Audits may be phased if appropriate;
7. The applicant should note that new road names may be required for the development and this should be discussed with the Council's Street Naming and Numbering Team at an early opportunity;

8. Any off-street residential hard standing outside should be porous, to comply with 'Guidance for Householders' published in December 2012;
9. Prior to carrying out works to an existing road, whether adopted or not, appropriate permits must be applied for and secured.
10. All accesses must be open for use by the public in terms of the statutory definition of 'road' and shall be the subject of applications for road construction consent. The extent of adoptable roads, including footways, footpaths, access, cycle tracks, verges and service strips to be agreed. The applicant should note that this will include details of lighting, drainage, Sustainable Urban Drainage, materials, structures, layout, car and cycle parking numbers including location, design and specification;
11. No works shall be commenced until:
 - a. the design and full specification of all traffic controlled junctions, crossings and road layouts have been approved by the Head of Transport;
 - b. the details of the surface water and drainage have been approved by the Head of Planning and Transport, including in relation to road construction consent;
 - c. the details of hard and soft landscaping including street furniture as they relate to roads, have been approved by the Head of Planning and Transport, including in relation to road construction consent;
 - d. appropriate road opening permits have been applied for and secured.
12. Electric vehicle charging outlets should be considered for this development which includes: dedicated parking spaces with charging facilities; ducting and infrastructure to allow electric vehicles to be readily accommodated in the future.

(References – Development Management Sub-Committee 18 November 2015 (item 2); report by the Head of Planning and Transport, submitted)

The webcast of the meeting, including all presentations, can be viewed via the link below:-

http://www.edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/201229