

Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00 am, Wednesday 17 August 2016

Present:

Councillors Perry (Convener), Lunn (Vice-Convener), Blacklock, Burgess (substituting for Councillor Bagshaw), Cairns, Child, Gardner, Heslop, Keil, McVey, Milligan, Mowat and Ritchie.

1. General Applications and Miscellaneous Business

The Sub-Committee considered reports on planning applications and pre-applications listed in Sections 4,6, 7 and 9 of the agenda for the meeting.

Decision

To determine the applications as detailed in the Appendix to this minute.
(Reference – reports by the Head of Planning and Transport, submitted.)

2. 18 Whitehouse Road, Edinburgh

The Head of Planning and Transport had identified applications for planning permission for the proposed demolition of existing dwelling and construction of new care home and associated car parking (as amended) at 18 Whitehouse Road, Edinburgh to be dealt with by means of a hearing (application no 15/05434/FUL).

(a) Report by the Head of Planning and Transport

The proposal was acceptable in principle and represented sustainable development as defined by the Edinburgh City Local Plan and Scottish Planning Policy.

The proposal was acceptable with respect to density, layout, scale and design and it would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the site or the Cramond Conservation Area. No concerns were raised with regard to the proposal's impact on traffic, road safety, parking, flooding, drainage, trees, protected species, archaeology, neighbouring amenity or the amenity of future occupiers. The proposal complied with relevant policies in the Development Plan and associated non-statutory guidance.

The proposal was acceptable. There were no material considerations which outweighed this conclusion.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

(b) Cramond and Barnton Community Council

Andrew Mather gave a presentation on behalf of the Cramond and Barnton Community Council.

He explained that, generally, the Community Council supported care home applications such as for the AMA/Brighthouse site, the Barnton hotel development, the Cramond Place development and did not object to the new Queensferry Road proposal. However, their objections to this application were specific, comprehensive and emphatic. This was the wrong building in the wrong place.

Firstly this was an abuse of the Conservation area. This application contravened a multitude of design and policy guidelines, detailed in their written submission, therefore, the Community Council did not need to add anything and they submitted that the Sub-Committee would be obliged to turn down this application.

However, there was much more. With all the other care home developments the proposer's claimed that this met a local need was clearly not true as was the claim to provide local employment. Employees would have to be brought in, thus exacerbating the traffic issues. The long established GP practice was already operating at or beyond capacity. The load from a further 50 needy patients would simply reduce the level of care available to existing residents, which was a very real concern.

The applicants Transport Statement was full of inaccuracies. The railway station was at the Gyle hardly walking distance as claimed. The only realistic bus service was the no 41 which did not go via Waverley Station as claimed, but via the Mound. The travel time to town from the LRT timetable was 39 minutes at best and not the 10 minutes claimed. The service interval was claimed as 10 minutes. It was not, being at best 15 minutes during the day Monday to Saturday and 30 minutes during evenings and all day on Sunday. The Transport Statement was largely inaccurate.

Section 2.4 of the submission stated that Glebe Road was a cul-de-sac serving only as a local access road. The fact was that it was a cul-de-sac was the major problem. Section 6.4 stated that Cramond Glebe served a much more local function and was relatively lightly trafficked over most of the day. Not only was this assertion totally unsupported by data in the report, the report itself did not refer to the local premises served these included the following:

- Cramond Inn
- The local authority car park for the promenade
- The boat club
- The nursery school in Kirk Cramond with a role of 240 children and a staff of 35
- The Cramond Kirk halls. This was the only facility of its kind in Cramond and Barnton and enjoyed in excess of 2,000 bookings for events and activities, including wedding receptions, per year
- Cramond Kirk with services on Sundays and regular funerals and weddings.
- The manse and kirk office with regular daily visits by elders and members of the congregation

- The Cramond health practice
- A significant number of residential homes, most with no provision for off street parking

A total of around 320 parking spaces, most experiencing significant turnover and overflow parking into Glebe Road itself.

The photographs in the applicant's submission did not show a single moving car. It was suggested a more realistic example was presented by photos and videos in the Cramond Action Group's submission showing gridlock in the Glebe Road and a delivery lorry failing to access the site at School Brae while blocking Whitehouse Road in both directions.

The mobile library had difficulty with access in and out and in some places the bin lorry had problems, on occasions knocking down walls. A situation of which he was well aware, from working as a building maintenance manager for the Kirk and having to rebuild the walls. Current congestion in Glebe Road regularly caused gridlock and in the recent past the police had to be called on a number of occasions to deal with violent outbreaks of road rage. This cul de sac was an extremely bad road that was too expensive for the Council to fix. He asked the Sub-Committee not to give this completely inappropriate application any further consideration.

The Council's own Transport Statement pointed out that the proposed exit onto Glebe Road could be unsafe, but despite this, accepted the applicant's inaccurate statement. went even further suggesting that to ease problems, which did not apparently exist, then parking prohibitions could be introduced, but accepted that this might not work. Of course it would not work as the residents would be deprived of their only parking space with no off road space available and the displaced vehicles would have no-where to go.

It was regretted that there was not an opportunity to give more attention to issues such as emergency vehicle access and the conflict within the site between pedestrians and vehicles as there was no provision for pedestrians, inadequate sight lines at entry and egress. The suggestion that Whitehouse Road, despite being a main bus route was described in the application as carrying relatively little traffic, and more. There was no logic underpinning this application. It was simply an example of commercial opportunism and a complete disregard for the community.

It was hoped that those members who were able to make the site visit would be able to relate their experience to the concerns that had been raised in this submission and that these concerns became a reality. His specialist colleagues using their expertise would provide more detail on the issues that had been so concerning to the Community Council over the past months.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/212485

(c) Cramond Association

Duncan Fraser gave a presentation on behalf of the Cramond Association. He indicated

that the scale was too great and it would have an inappropriate environmental impact on this residential part of the Conservation Area. He outlined the following:

- The purpose of the Transportation Statement was to assist decision makers to understand and evaluate proposal. However, the Statement omitted critical safety aspects and over estimated the modal shift for staff.
- Shared Use was non compliant as it was only 4.1m wide, whereas the minimum required width was 4.5m. Additionally, Sight Lines at the Exit were non-compliant with Vehicular Access Standards.
- In respect of the Transportation Statement regarding a modal shift, it was explained that the 50% modal shift was over optimistic and based on wrong information on the public transport service. Public transport was 4 services per hour (until 7pm), not 7 per hour as stated in statement.
- For shift workers, bus service frequency was only 2 services per hour (before 6am and after 7pm).
- The hourly service 64 had been withdrawn, therefore, there was no local link to West Lothian.
- Public Transport Journey time from Bathgate was 1.5hrs, whereas by car it was 0.5 hours.
- There was limited car parking on site for staff and visitors (19 in total for all able bodied users)
- There was no availability of parking on-street, which included junctions, the nursery, bus stops, or residential parking.
- To conclude, the scale of the proposed development was inappropriate for the residential area and the development would have an adverse environmental impact on the residential part of the Conservation Area.
- The Transportation Statement did not provide decision makers with a full understanding to evaluate the transportation impact of the Development. This included shared use, sightlines, the swept path, 50% modal share based on inaccurate information on the public transport service level. Greater than 50% modal car share would have an adverse impact for on-street residential parking

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/212485

(d) Cramond Action Group

Ian Kennedy gave a presentation on behalf of the Cramond Action Group. He summarised their objections to the proposals.

- In October 2015, the planning officer had stated that the old application was wholly unacceptable.

- The reasons for this were public record and the old application was withdrawn.
- The new application contained only minor changes. These were not material and were not the significant amendments which were required and which the planning department said were necessary on 30 October.
- Notwithstanding the cosmetic changes in the new application, the Planning Department had wholly reversed its earlier position. The planning officers had abandoned their original stance that any amendments would have to be significant. What they had previously regarded as unacceptable was apparently now acceptable. Their earlier robust critique of the proposals as having an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, failing to draw on local characteristics, and as being wholly out of keeping with the character of the conservation area had not been addressed.
- The planning report was fundamentally incorrect and ignored the department's earlier decision. It ignored the core principle of subservience, it drew on comparators beyond the conservation area and it failed to explain how the development preserved or enhanced Cramond's Conservation Area. The planners were also misdirected themselves as a matter of law, as they failed to give due weight to the relevant legislation or the council's policies to the relevant guidelines. The Planning Department was flawed in its process as de facto approval had been given, prior to the new application being submitted and prior to the commencement of the public consultation process.
- How would the building look and how would it preserve or enhance Cramond Conservation Area?
- The developer's own graphics demonstrated that this was an unimaginative, monolithic structure, which contravened the ethos of the conservation area. One proposal invited complete rejection and the other unqualified acceptance and it was difficult to distinguish between the two applications. It was difficult for the department to claim that this application was acceptable, as there were no material considerations that outweighed this conclusion and that the density, scale and layout of the building would not have an adverse affect on the site. In their determination to use the site, the planners seemed to override all other considerations.
- He urged the committee to refuse this application to avoid breaching the Council's own conservation area policies.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/212485

(e) Cramond Heritage Trust

Ian Roger gave a presentation on behalf of the Cramond heritage Trust. He summarised their objections to the proposals.

Cramond was a beautiful part of Edinburgh enjoyed by thousands of visitors and locals alike. Cramond Heritage Trust was a charity founded in 1978 to preserve and interpret the heritage of Cramond. They were actively supported by the Community Council, the Friends of the River Almond Walkway, Cramond Association and now the Cramond

Action Group.

The proposed development was indifferent to the values outlined in the conservation document and sought to overturn them by claiming a local need for another care home. This was despite three care homes which already existed or were in the process of construction.

An application for a Care Village on the Brighthouse site had lapsed since no developer was prepared to become engaged.

The introduction to the Cramond Conservation Area document stated that Cramond Conservation Area was established to protect the area of special architectural and historic interest, the character or appearance of which it was desirable to preserve or enhance. It also stated that designation demonstrated a commitment to positive action for the safeguarding and enhancement of character and appearance. The proposed development was the antithesis of this requirement.

The building proposed was completely out of scale and sympathy with the environment, it was a large commercial building placed in the midst of traditional housing and its 4 storey mass and the area of the site, which it intended to occupy, bore no relationship to the surrounding area

Cramond Conservation Area Character Appraisal document referred to Cramond Glebe Road, Whitehouse Road and Schoolbrae and stated that essential character was the predominance of traditional materials and detailing, giving a coherence and visual unity to the conservation area. The proposed modern commercial building, together with its materials and finishes were at odds with the surrounding area.

The appraisal document referred to the school building and stated that the building was important and the school was also of architectural interest and had a significant presence within the townscape. The old school building was adjacent to the driveway into the proposed development site. The mass of the proposed development would diminish the overall presence of the school building in the area.

New Development stated that it was important that any further new development was restricted in height and set back from the River Almond valley so it was not visible. The proposed development was on the edge of the escarpment and would dominate the skyline as seen from the River Almond Walkway.

To conclude, in view of the disregard for the guidance given in the Cramond Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Edinburgh's second proposed Local Development Plan, this proposed development should be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/212485

(f) The Cockburn Association

Marion Williams gave a presentation on behalf of the Cockburn Association. She summarised their objections to the proposals.

With the planning policies and issues raised, it was difficult to know how the planning officers could arrive at this decision. This was a backland development in Cramond

Conservation Area and this poorly designed development would contravene Edinburgh Design Guidance, the Local Plan and various relevant planning policies. The materials were not in keeping with the area, the height was excessive, the roof out of character and the structure was clearly visible from both the John Muir Way and the Dalmeny Pass, which would mean that there would only be tree cover for a few months of the year.

It was claimed that this was a market driven development and dependent upon demand, however, there were already a large number of care home beds available, ninety beds were under construction and there were others in the outskirts. This small community might struggle to cope with this. This was an inappropriate use for this site, there was a lack of amenity and access, there would be a need for medical support and leisure opportunities for the residents. Additionally, the communal garden should be south, rather than north facing.

As a backland development, Edinburgh Design Guidelines stated that it should be subservient to the surrounding buildings. This was clearly not the case as the building would be larger in scale than properties in the immediate area. Similarly, the character appraisal stated that further developments should be restricted in height, so as not to be visible. Additionally, low level lighting did not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The space around the house was valuable in a conservation area and should be wisely used, however, there was long list of conditions which suggested that this would be problematic.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/212485

(g) Alex Cole-Hamilton MSP

Alex Cole-Hamilton MSP thanked the Committee for being permitted to address the Committee at this late date. Even as an parliamentary candidate he had heard concerns about the development. He had been inundated with representations against the proposals, but he had not met anybody in the locality who was in favour of the development.

He would concentrate on certain topics, such as health care and its delivery, which was within his remit. There was burgeoning crisis in West Edinburgh, which meant that Park Grove Medical Centre had to close its lists after being unable to recruit one third of GP vacancies and Cramond had almost reached this stage. A leading medical practitioner had been opposed to both the original care home application and the current one, because Cramond was currently at full capacity. The demand created by 50 beds in the care home would put an unsustainable strain on this practice. Cramond was already having to cope with Lyle Court and could not cope with the proposed new care home.

There was concern about the proliferation of care homes in West Edinburgh, for which there was a lack of capacity. His party was not opposed to the intelligent construction of care homes, however, the construction of Park Grove Care Home was against the wishes of the community. In terms of the local support network, especially GP services, he would strenuously recommend that the Committee reject the application.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

(h) Councillor Norman Work, Ward Member

Councillor Work indicated that the proposed care home had aroused more opposition in the area than any other application in the past 40 years. Numerous interest groups had come together to protest against this infringement of the conservation status and various specialists had put together their objections to the development.

There was a proliferation of care homes, including one that was now underway in the vicinity. There had been widespread concerns about the impact on the local medical practice as if this care home was approved, there would be 100 additional people in the Cramond Medical Practice, which would be difficult to cope with. There were also concerns about the perceived material inaccuracies in the applicant's submission and about traffic issues.

There were inaccuracies in the report regarding the public accessibility of the site. The development would mean large vehicles driving on to Cramond Glebe Road which have difficulties in accessing Whitehouse Road. There would be a substantial increase to queues and the volume of traffic on this busy road. Transport officials had said there would be no major impact, but they were already implementing traffic measures.

To conclude, there was an unprecedented amount of objections to the proposals. This included the two other Almond Ward Councillors, the Westminster MP, the local community councillors and other local bodies. This represented a massive opposition to the proposed development. The Sub-Committee had to listen to local democracy and not ignore the local groups who were representing the community.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/212485

(i) Councillor Alastair Shields – Written Submission

As you know, I have made no secret of my objections to the above planning proposal since it was introduced some eighteen months ago. At this critical stage in the application process I will make a final call for you to reject it for the sake of protecting a conservation area and preventing the northern side of Whitehouse Road, Cramond, from irreparable and chaotic traffic congestion.

We have an ageing population and Edinburgh is growing with it. The demand for new and advanced care facilities is without question a desired ambition for our local authority to meet. Our elderly residents, I agree, need more than the physical resources at their disposal for a fuller and more pleasurable life. It is important that they inhabit a nice area, that they have scenery around them and the comforts of tranquility. No-one I know of disputes this but the contention with this selected site heightens because those residents would be inhabiting a premises that has been built over the beautiful imagery, the peacefulness would be taken away by vehicles trying to manoeuvre between the entrance and exit areas, and the air pollution would rise. Emergency services would struggle to get through the traffic at peak times of the day (thinking of the nearby nursery and primary school as a classic example) and nearby residents, one of whom invited me

into his property to explain the potential detriment the plans would have upon his quality of living, would fall victim to losing just that.

I cannot reiterate enough that I have never on any occasion had a resident of Cramond - or anywhere else with interests for that matter - being in support of this application. Added to that, I've never come across anyone to weigh out a list of pro's and cons about it. There are no advantages! Just a series of worries born out of what the planners aim to achieve against what the people that they know the area struggle to digest. They have been told that biodiversity examinations have been conducted but fail to appreciate how this can be made any better by large scale development upon green area. They learn that this new care home will encourage employment opportunities for local people in that sector yet we don't know if there is a demand for such work within the vicinity and neighbouring parts (therefore adding to the suggestion that employees may come from further out with the need to use their own transport and further choking the already precarious management of it that exists already). They are even informed that traffic studies have been carried out to test whether such a facility could be conducive to the current standards but are left no wiser as to what time of day the studies were carried out - even what day itself they were carried out.

The very fact alone that this hearing of August 17th has been granted following a second site visit and further acceptance of a considerably high volume of objections (over 400!) is SURELY enough to suggest that this is a flawed project from the outset. I wish to thank the architects Yeoman McAllister, their PR body Orbit Communications, and Care Concern for their time and transparency with the residents and myself as an elected member of the Almond ward. But this gratitude only extends so far to the point that on reflection these proposals are simply not feasible. I, like you, act in the interests of what the residents of my ward want to see happen and don't want to see happen. These plans offer no sense of acceptance, let alone desire among the people closest to it.

Without trying to conflate this application with the on-going matter of LDP2, the Council must be at a point where the need to uphold and preserve the good characteristics of Edinburgh far outweighs the choice to rubber stamp for the purpose of quotas (i.e. meeting targets for the benefit of the national government) and with that set unwanted precedents. Conservation and green space is of great value to our heritage and this project greatly counteracts that. Surely we don't want to lose this and create a sea of disappointment for those that only wish to protect.

Build the new care home - but build it somewhere else than this chosen location. I strongly encourage you.

(j) Councillor Lindsay Paterson – Written Submission

The initial and subsequent amended applications to demolish the existing dwelling and construct a care home at this site have resulted in a groundswell of opposition from the local community, leading to a well organised, eloquent and significant community run campaign. This has not been a campaign against the idea of a care home – this is a campaign against development at what many have described as a “totally inappropriate” site.

I am fully supportive of the community campaign against this proposed development and

urge the Committee to note the hundreds of written comments that have been submitted.

Cramond and Barnton Community Council; the Cramond Association; the Cramond Action Group and others have all made articulate and persuasive arguments against the development and I would reiterate some of the important points raised by them:

- Cramond Conservation Area is a very special area in Edinburgh with a historic village and great character and amenity. The proposed development would adversely impact on this.
- the scale and height of the proposed building are disproportionate to the area of land and out of place in this semi-rural village setting.
- increased traffic will further exacerbate traffic problems in the village and the proposed access points at both the entrance and exit have difficulties: the exit point is onto the narrow Cramond Glebe Road which suffers from congestion and problems with volume of traffic during busy peak times (eg. summer; weekends; when the church and halls are in use), while the entrance is on Whitehouse Road at an angle and at an area which can be very busy with parking and drop off/pick up.

In summary there are a number of significant reasons why the proposed development should not proceed, which are more fully examined in the oral and written comments from local organisations. I urge that these be taken into account when considering this application.

(k) Applicant – Care Concern Holdings Ltd

Steve Yeoman of Yeoman McAllister Architects and Andrew Carrie of Transport Consultant gave a presentation on behalf of the applicants.

Steve Yeoman thanked the committee for giving them the opportunity to present the case for the applicant. They welcomed the recommendations to grant permission and thought that the report was a fair representation of the proposals.

He explained how they arrived at this point in the design process. As well as the applicant's commitment to create care homes, this was an opportunity to knit these homes into the fabric of the communities. The shortage of care home provision was likely to become more acute with the projected increase in the population of people who were over 85 year olds, therefore, investment in new care homes in this area was vital. The needs assessment for West Edinburgh indicated that there would be a shortfall of 600 places in this part of the city. Additionally, there was an existing shortfall of care home spaces.

Live Well in Later Life represented the city's strategy for older people. Care homes played an important part in helping elderly people lead fulfilling, independent lives. The provision of care homes for people with dementia was especially acute and many of the older care homes were unable to provide the necessary care for people with specialist care needs. Demand for private care was increasing. As needs became more acute, many older care homes could not meet these standards. The proposal was specifically designed to provide a care pathway which provided residential nursing which enabled

elderly people to remain in the same care home as their needs changes. The analysis showed a clear and growing demand for this type of facility in the area.

The applicant had a good record in care provision, they were a care home operator and not a developer. They had constructed 30 homes within the UK and were in the process of delivering two care homes in the city itself. Here was an opportunity to provide a facility which would have a long term future and bring short term economic benefits. The proposals represented an £8m investment in Cramond, which would bring significant employment through the construction phase and in the care home.

Because of the site's importance in the context of the Cramond Conservation area, the applicant had prepared an extensive study at an early stage in the design process. These included transport and access considerations. Landscape analysis showed that the trees would be largely screened the development from users. Tree and other studies also complied with national policy. The design and access statement took into account the urban context to design an appropriate house for this location. The development would improve and enhance the local conservation area and the new use for the site would enhance the diversity of the community itself. There were no technical or physical constraints against developing the site.

The consultation was not compulsory, but the applicant has followed an exemplary approach at the pre application stage. The consultations were well attended and the feedback was documented in the report. The City Archaeologist had some concerns about the development and the subsequent archaeological evaluation which was undertaken was to the satisfaction of the City Archaeologist.

The planning department had concerns regarding the first application for 61 beds, in respect of the massing and scale and impact on the neighbouring properties and could not support that application. The proposals were comprehensively revised. The comparative visuals and figures demonstrated how the previous proposals related to the current proposals for 50 beds. There had been significant changes to the scale, height, massing and reductions in the bed numbers. The applicant had addressed the concerns in relation to the site which recognised the planning policy and context.

Despite the commercial considerations of the reduction in the number of the beds, the applicant remained committed to delivering this unique opportunity. He was happy to answer any questions regarding the objections. There had been significant objection to the proposals, but also some support. He urged the Sub-Committee to accept the recommendation of the officers. The proposal was acceptable in principle and represented sustainable development. The applicant would welcome the opportunity to be part of a modern and sustainable community at Cramond.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/212485

Motion

To grant planning permission subject to conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Lunn

Amendment

To refuse planning permission as it was contrary to policies S1, Des 3 and Env 6 of the Edinburgh City Local Plan.

- moved by Councillor Gardner, seconded by Councillor Keil.

Voting

For the motion: 7 votes
For the amendment: 6 votes

Decision

To grant planning permission subject to conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.

2. 18 Whitehouse Road, Edinburgh

Details were provided of proposals for the demolition of the dwelling in the conservation area at 18 Whitehouse Road (Application No 15/05435/CON).

Decision

To grant conservation area consent subject to a condition detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport

(References – Development Management Sub-Committee 22 June 2016 (item 2); report by the Head of Planning and Transport, submitted)

4. 18 Cambridge Avenue, Edinburgh

Details were provided of an application for planning permission for a new house extension to the garden with external steps at 18 Cambridge Avenue (Application no 16/02622/FUL).

Motion

To grant planning permission subject to the informatives detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.

- moved by Councillor Lunn, seconded by Councillor Cairns.

Amendment

To refuse planning permission as it was contrary to policy Env 6 of the Edinburgh City Local Plan.

- moved by Councillor Blacklock, seconded by Councillor Ritchie.

Voting

For the motion: 5 votes
For the amendment: 3 votes

Decision

To grant planning permission subject to the informatives detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.

(Reference – report by the Head of Planning and Transport, submitted)

Declaration of Interest

Councillor Gardner declared a non-financial interest in the above application, as he was an objector to the application, left the room and took no further part in the consideration of this item.

Appendix

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
Note: Detailed conditions/reasons for the following decisions are contained in the statutory planning register.		

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
Item 4.1 - 18 Cambridge Avenue Edinburgh	New house extension to the garden with external steps – application no 16/02622/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to informatives detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport. (On a division.)
Item 4.2(a) - 62 Corstorphine High Street Edinburgh (Corstorphine Primary School)	New build stand-alone nursery within the grounds of Corstorphine Primary School and the removal of existing stand-alone "prefabricated" buildings within the same grounds (as amended) – application no 16/02158/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to a condition and informatives detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 4.2(b) - 62 Corstorphine High Street Edinburgh (Corstorphine Primary School)	Removal of two temporary prefabricated building units currently sitting on the site – application no 16/02419/CON	To GRANT conservation area consent
Item 4.3(a) - Craighouse Road, Edinburgh (Napier University Craighouse Campus)	Reduction of the height of an existing chimney to the rear of the New Craig building which was leaning off the vertical and unsafe. Also to remove a set of gates and a gate pillar to allow construction traffic egress from the site on to Craighouse Road and to reinstate the original gates and gate pillar back in the original location – application no 16/02163/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to a condition and informatives detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 4.3(b) - Craighouse Road Edinburgh (Napier University Craighouse Campus)	Reduction of the Chimney to the rear of the New Craig Building and temporary removal/reinstatement of the gates and gate pillar at the South entrance – application no 16/02164/LBC	To GRANT listed building consent subject to a condition and an informative as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
Item 4.4 - 198 Lanark Road West Edinburgh	Remove existing front decking and replace with clear glass extension on existing footprint (re-submission of 15/03419/FUL) – application no 16/02581/FUL	To REFUSE planning permission for the reasons detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 4.5 - 5 New Street Edinburgh	Conversion of former school house to 20 room hotel, including demolition of extension, and construction of glazed restaurant and external terrace – application no 16/01952/LBC	To GRANT listed building consent subject to conditions and an informative detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 4.6 - 3a Redhall Grove Edinburgh (Longstone Primary School)	Erect a new build stand-alone nursery school building within the grounds of Longstone Primary School (as amended) – application no 16/1454/FUL)	To GRANT planning permission subject to conditions and informatives detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 4.7(a) - 8 3f Scotland Street Edinburgh	Subdivide property from 3 bedroom 3rd floor residence to two 2 bedroom residences. – application no 16/02229/FUL)	To GRANT planning permission subject to informatives detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 4.7(b) - 8 3f Scotland Street Edinburgh	Subdivide property from 3 bedroom 3rd floor residence to two 2 bedroom residences (as amended). – application no 16/02230/LBC	To GRANT listed building consent subject to a condition and an informative detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 4.8(a) - 19 St Leonards Lane Edinburgh	Change of use to distillery and extension to north end including ancillary uses, including exhibition and tasting areas, and associated retail sales area. Use of external yard for distillery related servicing, storage, community amenity space and occasional open air market or other events (as amended) – application no 16/01742/FUL)	To GRANT planning permission subject to conditions and informatives detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
Item 4.8(b) - 9 St Leonards Lane Edinburgh	Conversion, alteration, and extension to existing building. Removal (outbuilding) of roof and pitched sections of gables, erect new entrance canopy – application no 16/01743/LBC)	To GRANT listed building consent subject to conditions and an informative detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 6.1(a) - 18 Whitehouse Road	Protocol Note	Noted
Item 6.1(b) - 18 Whitehouse Road Edinburgh	Proposed demolition of existing dwelling and construction of new care home and associated car parking (as amended) – application no 15/05434/FUL	To GRANT planning permission subject to conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport. (On a division.)
Item 6.1(c) - 18 Whitehouse Road Edinburgh	Demolition of dwelling in a conservation area – application no 15/05435/CON	To GRANT conservation area consent subject to a condition detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
Item 7.1(a) - 5 - 7 Regent Road Edinburgh (New Parliament House)	Project proposes conservation of Thomas Hamilton designed former Royal High School building to form new premises for St Mary's Music School. Combined with demolition of later ancillary buildings, space to the East was created for new residential, teaching/practice facility. Proposed new landscaped public garden to West. New basement created under Main Hall to provide new foyer giving access to public performance spaces above – application no 15/05662/FUL	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To GRANT planning permission subject to conditions, reasons, informatives and a legal agreement as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport. 2. To agree to amend informative 2 as requested by the applicant to read “The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than the expiration of seven years from the date of this consent” . .
Item 7.1(b) - 5 - 7 Regent Road Edinburgh (New Parliament House)	Project proposes conservation of Thomas Hamilton designed former Royal High School building to form new premises for St Mary's Music School. Combined with demolition of later ancillary buildings, space to East is created for new residential, teaching and practice facility. To West, a new landscaped public garden was proposed. A new basement created located under the Main Hall to provide new foyer giving access to the public performance spaces above (as amended). – application no 15/05665/LBC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To GRANT listed building consent subject to conditions and an informative detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport. 2. To agree to amend informative1 as requested by the applicant to read “The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than the expiration of seven years from the date of this consent” .

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
Item 7.2 - 65 West Harbour Road Edinburgh	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 (Scheme 5)	To APPROVE the application subject to conditions, reasons, informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 7.3 - 62 West Harbour Road, 11 Granton Square Edinburgh	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: Granton local shopping centre Masterplan – application no 16/01273/AMC	To APPROVE the application subject to conditions, reasons, informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Head of Planning and Transport.
Item 9.1 - 1 Craigpark Ratho (Craigpark Quarry)	Forthcoming application by Alex Brewster And Sons for restoration of former Craigpark Quarry for outdoor countryside and water related leisure and recreation, waterside development, visitor accommodation, access infrastructure and ancillary facilities – application no 16/03170/PAN	To note the key issues at this stage. Additional issues to be addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility by sustainable transport modes.