

Development Management Sub Committee

Wednesday 13 April 2016

Application for Planning Permission in Principle 15/05072/PPP

At Allotments, Telferton, Edinburgh

Formalisation and reconfiguration of allotment gardens, including the provision of 40 allotment plots and 2 community plots, and a new residential development, including affordable housing, with associated access, parking and landscaping works.

Item number	6.2(b)
Report number	
Wards	A14 - Craigentinny/Duddingston

Summary

The proposed development represents a departure from the adopted Edinburgh City Local Plan, in particular policy OS1: Open Space Protection. The development of the site for residential purposes is not supported by the Second Proposed Local Development Plan and is contrary to the provisions of Policy ENV 18: Open Space Protection in the emerging plan.

Using the method described in the Housing Land Audit 2015 report to the Planning Committee meeting of 3 December 2015 to assess unconstrained housing land with support, there is a five-year effective housing land supply in the Council's area. However, even if land were required, the 28 units proposed would make a minimal contribution to overall need.

Whilst the proposal includes the formalisation of 40 allotments, and provision of seven affordable housing units, this does not outweigh the principle of loss of open space.

There are no material considerations which outweigh this conclusion or justify approval.

Links

[Policies and guidance for this application](#)

LPC, CITOS1, CITH1, CITD3, CITE12, CITT4, OTH, PLDP36, OSS1, NSG, NSGD02,

Report

Application for Planning Permission in Principle 15/05072/PPP

**At Allotments, Telferton, Edinburgh
Formalisation and reconfiguration of allotment gardens,
including the provision of 40 allotment plots and 2
community plots, and a new residential development,
including affordable housing, with associated access,
parking and landscaping works.**

Recommendations

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

Background

2.1 Site description

The site extends to 1.4 hectares and is currently laid out as allotment gardens on open ground south of houses on Inchview Terrace (the eastmost section of Portobello Road). The site is separated into two unequal halves, the larger to the west being twice as big as the section to the east. These are split by Telferton, an access road to a large industrial estate to the south. The industrial estate has a landscaped buffer around its edges closest to the allotments. This buffer rises as a bund around the western allotments, but to the east there is a generally sunken area of trees along the southern edge of the site, with only a small localised raised area at the extreme eastern end.

As seen from Telferton, each section is screened by a stone wall, dating from the early 1980s (when the Telferton access was formed).

2.2 Site History

Background

The site was laid out as allotments for use by the workers at the Portobello Power Station around 1923/24. It is likely that this was part of a "masterplan" by the then City Architect, Ebenezer J. MacRae. Portobello Power Station closed in 1977 ending the link between the allotments and power workers. Allotment holders were permitted to continue to use the ground for this function.

Planning History

10 June 1981 - an industrial estate and system of access roads approved on the Telferton estate. This took "temporary" access across the allotments to reach Inchview Terrace but the long-term plan was to access from Harry Lauder Road (application no. 81/00805/FUL). The permanent access solution was built (including a bridge over the railway line) but the connection to the Sir Harry Lauder Road was never fully completed, making the temporary solution permanent.

10 August 1994 - adjacent site to east consented as Post Office Delivery Office (application no. 94/01164/FUL).

7 October 1998 - outline application for housing refused (application no. 98/00572/OUT).

26 April 1999 - appeal on housing use dismissed on grounds of loss of open space (appeal ref. P/PPA/230/172).

25 August 2015 - Certificate of Lawfulness issued in regard to the existing use as allotments (application no. 15/03132/CLE).

Main report

3.1 Description Of The Proposal

The application seeks planning permission in principle for housing on the central and eastern sections of the current allotments, plus formalisation of existing allotments on the western section and south-west leg of the site.

The allotment section is laid out as 40 "half-plot" allotments plus two "community plots" aimed at use by schoolchildren. This section is proposed for transfer to the Council for its long-term care.

The housing, which is proposed on the central and eastern sections, is illustrated as eight private two storey houses flanking the main Telferton access road, plus 20 flats within two blocks: 8 in a two-storey block to the west, 12 in a three-storey block to the east. The applicant has agreed that 25% (i.e. seven units) would be affordable units. 28 car parking spaces are illustrated.

Supporting Statement

The application includes the following

- Design and Access Statement
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Tree Survey
- Ecology Survey
- Sustainability Report
- Air Quality Report
- Archaeological Report
- Transport Assessment; and
- Noise Assessment Report.

These documents are available to view on the Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

3.2 Determining Issues

Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 states - Where, in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

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) the principle of housing is acceptable;
- b) loss of the open space is acceptable in policy terms;
- c) the scale, form and design are appropriate to the area;
- d) amenity of the proposed housing would be sufficient;
- e) the proposal would impact upon neighbouring amenity;
- f) parking and road safety issues are considered adequate;
- g) impact on trees and biodiversity;
- h) other issues relating to allotment use are addressed;
- i) issues relating to effective housing supply;
- j) affordable housing policy is addressed
- k) archaeological issues are addressed;
- l) comments made have been addressed; and
- m) equality and human rights issues have been addressed.

a) The Principle of Housing/Affordable Housing

The principle of housing is acceptable subject to policy Hou 1 - Housing Development, of the Edinburgh City Local Plan, being met.

Policy Hou 1, criterion d), allows housing development "on other suitable sites within the urban area, provided proposals are compatible with other policies in the Plan".

The site falls within the urban area, so it must be assessed whether or not the site is "suitable" in terms of other policy requirements.

b) Loss of Open Space

With the exception of a thin strip to the extreme east, the site is designated as Open Space. Policy OS1 applies - Open Space Protection. This policy has five linked criteria. This policy states:

Proposals involving the loss of open space will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated that:

- i. there will be no significant impact on the quality or character of the local environment
- ii. the open space is a small part of a larger area or of limited amenity or leisure value and there is a significant over-provision of open space serving the immediate area and
- iii. the loss would not be detrimental to the wider network including its continuity and biodiversity value and either
- iv. there will be a local benefit in allowing the development in terms of either alternative equivalent provision being made or improvement to an existing public park or other open space; or
- v. the development is for a community purpose and the benefits to the local community outweigh the loss.

In order to assess against this policy it is necessary to meet the requirements of the first three criteria, before going on to consider whether either of the final two are met.

i) The designated open space would reduce by around 0.75 hectares, representing half of the existing open space. The areas proposed as housing would significantly change the existing character and appearance of the local environment, and these sections could no longer remain as designated open space. This criterion is therefore breached.

This allotment site provides a landscape buffer between the residential properties fronting Inchview Terrace, an arterial route, and the Telferton industrial estate lying to the south.

Therefore the proposals, involving the entire eastern section and part of the western section of the site fronting onto Telferton, will have a significant adverse impact on the quality and character of the local environment.

ii) The area is of high amenity value as it is used as allotments.

The Open Space Strategy recognises that there is an increasing demand for allotment gardening. There is a gap between demand for allotments and numbers of plots, creating lengthy waiting times.

There is therefore not a significant over-provision of allotments serving the immediate area. In relation to other open space, the houses adjacent do not fall within the distances set by the Open Space Strategy for either local or large green spaces. There is therefore not an over-provision of these types of open spaces within the area.

iii) There is no adverse impact on the continuity of a wider open space network or on biodiversity. Only this third criterion is met. In conclusion, the proposal is not acceptable in terms of this loss of open space.

If, however, Committee were minded to reach a different conclusion with respect to the aforementioned criteria, it is necessary to address whether either of the two final criteria are met. These are discussed below.

iv) The applicant's statements would imply that criterion iv) is met. However, the area where 40 allotments are to be formed already contains allotments and cannot be deemed either re-provision or improvement. The proposal does not create a local benefit in terms of providing an alternative equivalent provision as it results in a reduction in the overall area of allotments. Whilst it may provide some degree of improvement, in terms of the proposed stand-pipes, shed, fence, notice-board and paths, this improvement does not outweigh the significant adverse impact to the locality through the loss of the allotment area. The potential change of ownership is not a planning consideration, and equally cannot be deemed an "improvement". Planning cannot control the use of allotments by community groups, and use by such a community group is no different from Council-controlled allotments in terms of planning policies.

v) In relation to the fifth criterion, "community purpose" is intended to mean jointly-shared facilities, such as community halls, public sports facilities etc. Housing does not constitute a "community use". This criterion is not met.

In relation to the forthcoming Second Proposed Plan, there is no significant change in policies protecting Open Space. Policy Env18 - Open Space Protection, continues to use the same criteria as found in the existing policy.

In conclusion, the loss of Open Space does not meet the requirements of policy OS 1 - Protection of Open Space, and cannot be justified.

c) Scale, Form and Design

Residential heights in the area are predominantly two storey but rise to three and four storeys to the east. There is no strong design idiom in the area. It is noted that views of Arthurs Seat from the Telferton access would be affected by the proposed development on the western section, however these views are not protected.

The density and mix of units are appropriate in terms of the surrounding urban grain.

The application is in principle only, but the draft proposal submitted in support of the application would be acceptable in design terms. If permission were granted then the design and layout would be subject to a further AMC application to consider these matters in detail.

d) Amenity of the Proposed Units

Site analysis has largely been on the basis of loss of open space and urban design. Absent from this analysis is the issue of juxtaposition to existing industrial uses. In particular, the operational hours of the Royal Mail facilities to the east must be considered a potential noise nuisance.

In relation to noise, whilst the western section of the site is fairly well protected by a landscaped bund on its southern edge, the eastern section is not so protected. The landscape beyond the southern edge of the eastern section lies at lower level than the site. The only mitigation to potential noise to the eastern section is a narrow and low informal "bund", which has been created at the extreme eastern end, abutting the Royal Mail site. It is concluded that the eastern section of the application site may be exposed to potential noise at unsocial hours. However, if the suggested housing layout is ignored, within this in principle application, the site could afford sufficient space within which to create a protective bund along the eastern and southern boundaries on its eastern section, which in theory could mitigate against potential noise.

This issue is therefore not a reason for refusal, and could be addressed were Committee minded to grant the application.

Indicative drawings suggest that private open space levels, privacy and daylight would all be adequate.

e) Impact Upon Neighbouring Amenity

The proposed layout is such that privacy and daylight are unlikely to be unduly affected in policy terms.

Whilst views from several existing houses would be affected, there are no rights to a view in planning terms.

f) Parking and Road Safety

The proposal would provide sufficient on-site parking.

Impact upon the existing Telferton/Portobello Road junction would be negligible in terms of existing traffic movement. This junction is of modern layout and was created with capacity for additional development on the Telferton estate. There are no road safety issues, subject to a series of requirements which would be added as Informatives, were the application approved.

Parking on the Telferton carriageway is unrestricted adjacent to the existing allotments. Should future demand so warrant, double yellow lines could be used to restrict parking on the section adjacent to the development.

If Committee were minded to grant the application several informatives are required relating to access and parking.

g) Trees and Biodiversity

Unlike the landscaped strip to the immediate south, the allotments do not contain any significant trees.

Biodiversity value exists but is limited by the constant replanting across the area.

h) Other Issues - Suitability as Council Allotments

Only the element pertaining to housing requires planning permission. The western element recreates (and formalises) the existing allotment use. Here, it is proposed by the applicant to transfer this section into Council ownership and care, to secure the long-term allotment use. It is understood that, were the application approved, the applicant would enter into a unilateral obligation to transfer the remaining allotment space into Council control.

The formalisation of the western section as allotments, and transfer into Council control, is not a matter requiring planning permission.

The sections of policy on loss of Open Space (see section 3.3 b) do allow consideration of "improvement" to the open space as a factor. However, transfer of ownership is not in its own right an "improvement". There is no change to the allotment use, and change in ownership cannot be deemed an "improvement" in terms of planning policy. Furthermore, the reduction in overall allotment numbers is not an improvement.

Moreover, the net loss of allotments at this location is likely to generate a demand elsewhere, causing a net burden and cost to the Council in addressing this demand.

The long-term securing of the western section, as Council-managed allotments, does not outweigh the loss of land to the east for housing use.

The net loss of allotments is a significant adverse impact of the development. Whether the existing or the proposed allotments are suitable for transfer into Council care is largely a moot point, as the net loss in numbers is likely to cause additional pressure on demand upon the Council for allotments, rather than relieve any existing pressures.

The potential transfer in ownership/care does not outweigh any other considerations, and is not an improvement.

i) Effective Housing Land Supply

Using the method described in the Housing Land Audit 2015 report to the Planning Committee meeting of 3 December to assess unconstrained housing land with support, there is a five-year effective housing land supply in the Council's area.

Whilst the proposal is argued as meeting a shortfall in housing supply, this effect (only 28 units) is minimal in relation to the overall need, even were the need conceded. The impact on effective housing supply would be so minimal as to not outweigh other policy shortfalls.

j) Affordable Housing

The city has a demand for affordable housing and there is no evidence that there is an existing over-provision of affordable housing.

The proposal would make a small contribution towards affordable housing needs but this contribution does not outweigh other planning issues.

k) Archaeology

If the principle of development is accepted, an archaeological investigation of the site would be required.

If Committee were minded to grant planning permission a condition would be recommended to secure this.

l) Public Comments

The application attracted substantial public comment, including 281 objections and a petition with 3032 signatures. Only three persons wrote in support of the proposal.

Material Objections

- loss of allotments/open space - addressed in section 3.3 b) of the Assessment.
- loss of privacy and daylight - addressed in section 3.3 e) of the Assessment.
- impact on parking and traffic congestion - addressed in section 3.3 f) of the Assessment.
- impact on trees and biodiversity - addressed in section 3.3 g) of the Assessment.
- overprovision of affordable housing - addressed in section 3.3 a) of the Assessment.

Non-material Objections

- loss of view - there are no rights to view in planning.

Community Council

Portobello Community Council objected to the loss of allotments as an asset to the area.

m) Equalities and Human Rights

The proposals raise no equalities or human rights concerns.

Conclusion

The proposed development represents a departure from the adopted Edinburgh City Local Plan, in particular policy OS1: Open Space Protection. The development of the site for residential purposes is not supported by the Second Proposed Local Development Plan and is contrary to the provisions of Policy ENV 18: Open Space Protection in the emerging plan.

Using the method described in the Housing Land Audit 2015 report to the Planning Committee meeting of 3 December 2015 to assess unconstrained housing land with support, there is a five-year effective housing land supply in the Council's area. However, even if land were required, the 28 units proposed would make a minimal contribution to overall need.

Whilst the proposal includes the formalisation of 40 allotments, and provision of seven affordable housing units, this does not outweigh the principle of loss of open space.

There are no material considerations which outweigh this conclusion or justify approval.

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

3.4 Conditions/reasons/informatives

Reasons:-

1. The proposal is contrary to Edinburgh City Local Plan Policy Os 1 in respect of Open Space Protection, as the proposal results in loss of open space which will impact on the character and amenity levels of the area.
2. The proposal is contrary to the objectives of policy Env 18 - Protection of Open Space within the forthcoming Second Proposed Plan (SPP) as the proposal results in the loss of open space which will impact on the character and amenity levels of the area.

Financial impact

4.1 The financial impact has been assessed as follows:

The loss of allotments is likely to place a pressure on Council waiting lists for allotments, and addressing of this pressure would have a cost 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 meets 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 13 November 2015.

281 representations were received of which only three were in support. Objections were received from both neighbours and residents throughout the wider city. Craigentenny and Telferton Allotments Committee submitted an "Objection Report" looking at the current usage and production of the allotments. Objections were also received from Portobello Community Council, Joan Griffiths (ward councillor), Alison Johnstone MSP, the committee of the Scottish Allotments and Gardens Society

A petition with 3032 electronic signatures was also submitted in objection.

Reasons for objection were:

- loss of allotments.
- there is sufficient affordable housing in the area.
- effect upon biodiversity.
- road safety concerns/ congestion.
- loss of privacy/daylight.
- loss of view.

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 majority of the site is shown as Open Space in the Edinburgh City Local Plan and the emerging Second Proposed Plan. The easternmost section (a stepped form of 14 to 16m width) lies within the designated Urban Area, together with a 5m wide strip along the northern edge of the eastern section of the site.

Date registered

4 November 2015

Drawing numbers/Scheme

1-4 plus support info,

Scheme 1

John Bury

Head of Planning & Transport
PLACE
City of Edinburgh Council

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 Os 1 (Open Space Protection) sets criteria for assessing the loss of open space.

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

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

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

Other Relevant policy guidance

Second Proposed LDP Policy Env 18 (Open Space Protection) sets criteria for assessing the loss of open space.

Open Space Strategy- The strategy helps to protect and develop the city's open spaces. It sets standards that will be expected to meet when making decisions on open spaces.

Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines

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 in Principle 15/05072/PPP

**At Allotments, Telferton, Edinburgh
Formalisation and reconfiguration of allotment gardens,
including the provision of 40 allotment plots and 2
community plots, and a new residential development,
including affordable housing, with associated access,
parking and landscaping works.**

Consultations

Council Allotment Officer

Many of our new allotment sites built during the last 4 years have different sizes of plots. A majority of these new sites have half plots, we would try and mix it up with whole, half plots and raised beds where appropriate, however for this development at Telferton half plots could be better a choice

On new sites 20-40 plots are preferred although this development could see 60 which is still manageable

CEC would be happy to manage Telferton so long as the plot-holders pay the usual rents and abide by our Allotment regulations.

There may be circumstances where some plot-holders at Telferton have council plots too. This may have arisen where ploholders were unsure how long tenancy would last at Telferton just in case the site was sold

If this site were to be developed there may not be sufficient plots to meet all plot-holders requirements. If this was correct, alternative allocation procedures may have to apply. However whatever way plots are to be allocated there may be some plot-holders who will be disappointed. Plots could be allocated on longest on site first or drawing names out a hat

Without these private allotments we would have more on CEC waiting list. I have visited this site over a number of years and it has improved greatly as plot-holders have become further involved

A water supply is essential and the site designed to be as aesthetically pleasing as possible with good fencing as well as a good pathway network and a communal meeting space for plot-holders would be good. This is something we now encourage rather than individual plot sheds.

I am of the view that by simply transferring ownership of the Telferton allotments to the Council can not constitute "improvement". Indeed, disturbance of the soil and other structures would be detrimental to food growing, at least over the short-term. Moreover, since the net number of plots will reduce it is likely that those losing their plot will join the Council waiting list and therefore be a net cost to the local authority.

City Archaeologist

Further to your consultation request I would like to make the following comments and recommendations concerning this application for the formalisation and reconfiguration of allotment gardens, including the provision of 40 allotment plots and 2 community plots and a new residential development, including affordable housing with associated access, parking and landscaping works.

As stated in the supporting Archaeological Desk-based Assessment undertaken by GUARD Archaeology, the site lies occurs adjacent to the recorded large former clay extraction pits associated with industrial Potteries and brick & Tiles works at Portobello. Pottery production at Portobello started in the 1760's centred upon the Figgate Burn and foreshore and by the early 19th century the industry dominated the western half Portobello. Cartographic evidence shows the area to the west of the site being dominated by the main clay-pits which went of use during the 20th century, with the site forming part of a nursery from 1910-35. However the exact locations of these earlier 18th century and early-19th century clay extraction pits are not fully understood and may occur across this area.

The site is regarded as occurring within an area of archaeological potential and this application must be considered under terms of the Scottish Government's Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), PAN2/2011 and Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) and also CEC's Edinburgh City Local Plan policies ENV9. The aim should be to preserve archaeological remains in situ as a first option, but alternatively where this is not possible, archaeological excavation or an appropriate level of recording may be an acceptable alternative.

The site appears to have remained relatively unaffected by modern development. Given the sites close proximately to the nearby (nationally significant) 18th-20th century potteries and glass works, the has the potential for containing archaeological deposits (in terms of possible clay extraction pits and dumps of waste material) in particular dating to the 18th and early 19th centuries. Ground breaking works therefore associated with landscaping and construction activities are considered to have a potentially significant but low-moderate archaeological impact.

Accordingly it is recommended that a programme of archaeological works is undertaken prior to development. In essence this will see a phased archaeological programme of works, the initial phase being an archaeological evaluation up to a maximum of 10% of the site. The results of which would allow for the production of appropriate more detailed mitigation strategies to be drawn up to ensure the appropriate protection and/or full excavation, recording and analysis of any surviving archaeological remains affected.

It is recommended that these programme of works be secured using a condition based upon the model condition stated in PAN 42 Planning and Archaeology (para 34), as follows;

'No development shall take place on the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work (Excavation, reporting and analysis, publication) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority.'

The work must be carried out by a professional archaeological organisation, either working to a brief prepared by CECAS or through a written scheme of investigation (WSI) submitted to and agreed by CECAS for the site. Responsibility for the execution and resourcing of the programme of archaeological works and for the archiving and appropriate level of publication of the results lies with the applicant.

Roads Authority Issues

No objections to the application subject to the following being included as conditions or informatives as appropriate:

- 1) Consent should not be issued until the applicant has entered into a suitable legal agreement to:
 - a) construct a 2m wide footway on the east side of Telferton Road along the development frontage to a point approximately 35m south of the proposed site;*
 - b) contribute the sum of £2,000 to progress a suitable order to control disabled parking spaces;**
- 2) All accesses must be open for use by the public in terms of the statutory definition of 'road' and require to be the subject of applications for road construction consent. The extent of adoptable roads, including footways, footpaths, accesses, cycle tracks, verges and service strips to be agreed and to include the footway referred to in 1 above. 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. Particular attention must be paid to ensuring that refuse collection vehicles are able to service the site. The applicant is recommended to contact the Council's waste management team to agree details;*
- 3) The applicant must be informed that any proposed on-street car parking spaces cannot be allocated to individual properties, nor can they be the subject of sale or rent. The spaces will form part of the road and as such will be available to all road users. Private enforcement is illegal and only the Council as roads authority has the legal right to control on-street spaces, whether the road has been adopted or not. The developer is expected to make this clear to prospective residents;*
- 4) A Quality Audit, as set out in Designing Streets, to be submitted prior to the grant of Road Construction Consent;*
- 5) A draft travel plan will be required prior to first occupation of the site and a final travel plan within 12 months of first occupation;*
- 6) Access to any car parking area is to be by dropped kerb (i.e. not bell mouth);*
- 7) 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;*
- 8) Any gate or doors must open inwards onto the property;*
- 9) Any hard standing outside should be porous, to comply with 'Guidance for Householders' published in December 2012;*

10) *The works to form a footway crossing must be carried out under permit and in accordance with the specifications. See Road Occupation Permits*
http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/1263/apply_for_permission_to_create_or_alter_a_driveway_or_other_access_point

11) *Any off-street parking space should comply with the Council's Guidance for Householders and be at least 6 metres deep and should not be wider than 3 metres. See*

http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/704/guidance_for_householders
12) *Electric vehicle charging outlets should be considered for this development which includes dedicated parking spaces with charging facilities and ducting and infrastructure to allow electric vehicles to be readily accommodated in the future;*

13) *All disabled persons parking places should comply with Disabled Persons Parking Places (Scotland) Act 2009 and the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002.*

Note:

The development proposed 34 spaces, including 12 off-street space, which complies with current Council parking standards.

Environmental Assessment

Environmental Assessment would be happy to support this application as it is a PPP app, however the applicant would need to take into account the noise from the industrial units and ensure they design out the noise amenity issues when the detailed plans are submitted. I would stress we do not accept closed windows as a form of commercial/industrial noise mitigation.

Location Plan



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

END