Application for Planning Permission 17/03675/FUL
At Pentland House, 47 Robb's Loan, Edinburgh
Change of use of existing office building and redevelopment to form student residences with associated landscaping, parking, ancillary facilities and construction of new build element to incorporate plant, cycle and bin stores (as amended).

Summary

Although the site does not deliver housing as required by policy Hou 1 d) and the non-statutory Student Housing Guidance, the proposal for purpose built student accommodation accords with policy Hou 8 Student Housing in terms of location and concentration levels of accommodation in the area.

On balance, the proposal is acceptable in this location and meets the wider objectives of the LDP including the dispersal of purpose built student accommodation to sustainable locations throughout the city.
### Links

| Policies and guidance for this application | LDES01, LDES02, LDES03, LDES04, LDES05, LDES06, LDES07, LDES08, LDES12, LEN12, LEN16, LEN21, LEMP09, LHOU01, LHOU04, LHOU05, LHOU06, LHOU07, LHOU08, LTRA01, LTRA02, LTRA03, LTRA04, NSG, NSGSTU, NSGD02, |
Report

Application for Planning Permission 17/03675/FUL
At Pentland House, 47 Robb's Loan, Edinburgh
Change of use of existing office building and redevelopment
to form student residences with associated landscaping,
parking, ancillary facilities and construction of new build
element to incorporate plant, cycle and bin stores (as
amended).

Recommendations

1.1 It is recommended that this application be Granted subject to the details below.

Background

2.1 Site description

The application site, approximately 0.9 hectares in size, is located at Pentland House,
47 Robb's Loan. It is located south of Gorgie Road (A71) prior to the junction with
Chesser Avenue and is approximately 2.5 miles west of central Edinburgh. Existing
structures on site include a 5 and 6 storey office building, car parking for approximately
180 cars which includes a single storey parking deck, areas of hard standing around
the building and bicycle parking. The office building is partially occupied at present.

The site's northern boundary is partially formed of landscape planting and trees which
face residential properties on Robb's Loan and Chesser Crescent. A main pedestrian
entrance point is located at the centre of the north boundary. The character of the area
immediately surrounding the site is predominately residential with the exception of the
new Edinburgh West Retail Park to the south of the site at Hutchison Road. A single
storey Cadet Centre is located to the east of the building.

2.2 Site History

A number of minor planning applications related to the building's existing office use
have been submitted in recent years.

Neighbouring Sites:

12 June 2012 - Planning permission in principle was granted for mixed use
development comprising residential and retail foodstore (class 1) and associated
access and parking at a site 114 metres southwest of 19 Hutchison Road Edinburgh
(application reference: 11/01250/PPP). A number of subsequent applications for the
Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions of 11/01250/PPP and minor variations to
the application have since been approved. The mixed use development has been
mostly developed and now forms the southern boundary at Pentland House.
Main report

3.1 Description Of The Proposal

The applicant, Edinburgh Napier University, proposes a change of use and reconfiguration of the existing office building to form student residences with associated landscaping, parking, and ancillary facilities. Construction of new build elements to incorporate necessary plant is proposed to the west of the existing block along with cycle parking and bin stores.

The proposals comprise:

- 337 student bedrooms in a mix of 64 ‘cluster’ apartments. These include 9 x 3 bed apartments, 15 x 4 bed apartments, 10 x 5 bed apartments, 18 x 6 bed apartments, 8 x 7 bed apartments, and 4 x 9 bed apartments on the top floor. Bedroom sizes will be 12.5 sqm and 18 accessible bedrooms will be 17.5 sqm. Shared kitchen and living spaces will vary in size from 21 sqm to 61 sqm for each of the apartment sizes;

- Student amenity spaces at ground floor including study rooms, meeting space, gym and changing facilities, lounge and games room, shared kitchen space, event and dining room, and a cinema room. A library space is included on the top floor;

- Back of house facilities including laundry, offices, internal plant rooms;

- Landscaping and outdoor amenity space with a courtyard area at the rear of the building, and landscaped areas at the front of the building and in the car park area;

- Ancillary facilities which include 150 secured and covered bike parking spaces, and bin storage at the west of the building. A space for 180 potential additional cycle parking spaces is identified at the east of the building; and

- Parking provision on the site includes a total of 60 car parking spaces (52 general, four accessible, and four electric charging spaces) and 15 motorcycle spaces.

The student amenity spaces at ground floor will open onto a landscaped courtyard at the rear of the building to provide an external social space. The existing parking deck at the east of the site is to be removed to leave surface parking which can be accessed via Robb's Loan.

Service access and bin collection is proposed via Chesser Crescent. The existing pedestrian entrance to the building will be removed and secure access points will be located at the sides of the building near the vehicular entrance points. Access to the building will be gained through the main northern entrance of the building which provides a route to the external social courtyard at the rear.
The applicant proposes to retain much of the building's existing brick work and intends to remove the horizontal bands of brick between windows. The building's windows will be replaced with new composite double glazed windows and horizontal brickwork will be replaced with aluminium cladding. The bin store and cycle store will be constructed of a metal roof and aluminium cladding.

Existing boundary fencing and walls at the site will be retained at the north, east and west boundaries. A 4m high noise barrier is proposed at the southern boundary facing the adjacent retail park.

A 1.8m high galvanised and powder coated steel fence will be introduced to parts of the site to allow for secure access to be managed.

Supporting Statement

Scheme 1

The following documents have been submitted in support of the application and are available to view on the Planning and Building Standards Online Services:

- Design and Access Statement;
- Planning Supporting Statement;
- Sustainability Statement S1 Form (Part A);
- Landscape Plan and Maintenance Strategy;
- Transport Statement;
- Arboricultural Survey & Report;
- Ecological Walkover Survey;
- Flood Risk Assessment;
- Surface Water Management Plan;
- Topographical Survey;
- Noise Impact Assessment; and
- Refuse Vehicle Swept Path Analysis.

Revised drawings and clarifying information provided by the applicant include:

- Revised Landscape Plans;
- Landscape Management Plan;
- Proposed elevation plans;
- Revised noise impact assessment;
- Bin and cycle store plan; and
- Refuse swept path analysis.

The revised information did not materially affect the proposals.

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 the proposed land use is acceptable in this location;

b) The scale, design and landscaping proposals are appropriate to the character of the area;

c) The proposal will impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents and will provide sufficient residential amenity for the occupiers of the development;

d) The proposal raises issues in terms of traffic or road safety;

e) The proposal raises any flooding or drainage issues;

f) Issues raised in material representations have been addressed;

g) The proposal meets sustainability criteria; and

h) Any impacts on equalities or human rights are acceptable.

a) Principle

Development Location

The application site is located in the urban area as designated in the Local Development Plan (LDP). Proposals in the urban area must accord with relevant policies in the LDP and guidance.

Policy Hou 1 (d) of the LDP prioritises housing delivery to meet housing land supply "on all other suitable sites in the urban area, provided the proposals are compatible with other policies in the plan". The LDP requires that the site should be considered for housing first.

Edinburgh Napier University does not propose to include housing as a part of the proposals. Conversion of an existing building is a mitigating factor for not providing housing in this case. Due to the operational and management requirements of Edinburgh Napier University, and the nature and layout of the existing building, it would not be practical to provide housing at the site for a change of use application with no new build elements.
The proposals do not accord with policy Hou1 d), however limitations in converting an existing building to housing or a mix of uses is material. The applicant's status as a university, who do not develop housing, is also a material consideration.

**Student Housing**

LDP Policy Hou 8 has two requirements for assessing student accommodation. Firstly, proposals must be in a suitable location in relation to university and college facilities, well connected by means of walking, cycling or public transport. Secondly, it must not lead to an excessive concentration of student accommodation in the locality to an extent that would adversely affect the area and its established residential amenity or character.

The Council's non-statutory Student Housing Guidance re-enforces the requirements of policy Hou 8 and identifies that student accommodation needs should be met in well managed and regulated schemes where possible. Clause c) of the locational and design guidance requires that sites above 0.25 hectares in area should provide a proportion of housing as part of the proposed development to contribute to balanced communities and housing land need. The new build residential gross floor area should represent a minimum of 50% of the total new build housing and student accommodation gross floor area. The guidance states that it applies to new buildings and changes of use.

**Location of Student Housing**

The accommodation will be managed by the applicant for this application, which is Edinburgh Napier University. The site is located between approximately 1.3 miles and 2 miles from all three of the university's campuses. It is close to existing bus services with reasonably good links to Napier University campuses at Merchiston (approximately 1.8 miles), Sighthill (approximately 1.9 miles) and Craiglockhart (approximately 1.3 miles).

Frequent bus services are located on Chesser Avenue approximately 150 metres away and on Gorgie Road approximately 500m away. Cycle routes are also available in the local area via a combination of on and off road connections to campus locations. Direct bus access to the Sighthill Campus can be achieved via frequent bus services, including Lothian Bus services 3, 25, 33, 34 and 35 (now service 300), all of which run along Gorgie Road. Access to the Craiglockhart campus is from Slateford Road via Lothian Bus service 4. The Merchiston campus would require a journey with more than one bus service.

Whilst the proposal is not located next to any of the university's campuses, the proposal is in a location with good connections to public transport. Campuses can also be accessed by bicycle and walking.

The location of the accommodation is suitable and accords with policy Hou 8 a).

**Concentration of student housing**
Criteria b) of LDP policy Hou 8 seeks to limit the concentration of student accommodation where it would have an adverse impact on the maintenance of balanced communities or the established character and residential amenity on a locality. Criteria c) of the non-statutory Student Housing Guidance requires sites of this size to provide a 50/50 split between student accommodation and housing.

There have been relatively few planning applications for student accommodation in this area in recent years, with the closest being located at 400 Gorgie Road approximately 0.6 miles to the north east of the site. There have also been recent residential / mixed use development on Hutchison Road which has increased housing provision in the area and reflects the changing nature of the Chesser area.

The introduction of 337 students to the area would not be detrimental to the maintenance of balanced communities or lead to a dominant student population. There is a low amount of purpose built student accommodation in this part of the city. 2011 Census data collection zones in the Chesser area show that concentration levels of full-time students in the area is approximately 10% on average. Student accommodation in the area would not adversely affect residential amenity or the established character which is a mixture of residential and a major retail location. The proposal accords with policy Hou 8 b).

The proposal does not provide a 50/50 split between student accommodation and housing as required by clause c) of the non-statutory Student Housing Guidance. The non-statutory Student Housing Guidance includes this clause to avoid an over concentration of student population in parts of the city and deliver much needed housing. Edinburgh Napier University does not seek to deliver housing at this site due to the university's operational requirement for provision of student accommodation. The university has stated that for management purposes it would not be appropriate to apportion part of the existing office building for housing.

It is accepted that the re-use of the existing building is a sustainable solution, and that a mixed use development would be difficult for Edinburgh Napier University to deliver in this case. It is also material that this location is outwith areas which have seen significant levels of student accommodation development and is therefore in line with an overall objective to decentralise student accommodation.

Given the low amount of student accommodation in the area and the Council's stated wider aim to deliver purpose built student accommodation throughout the city, the development is suitable at this site.

The change of use to student accommodation complies with policy Hou 8 but does not meet non-statutory Student Housing Guidance requirements to provide housing.

**Other considerations**

The supporting text of LDP policy Hou 5 provides contextual information with regard to conversion of housing. This identifies the positive contribution that the recycling of buildings can make in achieving sustainability goals as well as making a contribution to housing needs. Whilst the site does not deliver housing as specified by the non-statutory Student Housing Guidance, it re-uses an existing building and utilises a brownfield site which is a relevant sustainability consideration.
The application site is identified in the 2014 LDP Housing Land Study as having a medium probability of delivering housing on the site. Since the study was published, the site has not been subject to development pressure for housing. Housing has already been delivered in the local area at Hutchison Road, and the area has not seen any other student developments.

The introduction of a major retail location to the area in the form of the West Edinburgh Retail Park has significantly changed the nature of the area in recent years and the proposed student accommodation would be compatible with the surrounding land uses.

**Loss of Office Space**

The development will result in a loss of office space which is partially occupied at present and will soon be vacant. Converting the building to student accommodation will not prejudice or inhibit the activities of any nearby employment uses and will contribute to the regeneration and improvement in the wider area which meets the requirements of policy Emp 9 a) and b). The site is not greater than one hectare and is not required to include floorspace for a range of business users, and meets the requirements of policy Emp 9 c).

**Conclusion**

Should the committee set aside the proposal's failure to comply with policy Hou 1 d), which gives priority to the delivery of the housing land supply on suitable sites within the urban area, the proposal complies with policy Hou 8 and re-uses an existing building on a brownfield site.

The proposal does not comply with criteria c) of the non-statutory Student Housing Guidance to provide a 50/50 split between student accommodation and general housing.

On balance, the principle of a change of use to student accommodation is acceptable in this location.

b) **Scale, design and landscaping**

**Scale and design**

Due to the nature of the proposed development there is limited change to the building's form. The existing building will be retained with structural amendments introducing two new lift cores which do not alter the building's height.

The existing external brick appearance of the building will be mostly retained, however some changes will be made to the building's appearance. The existing horizontal band of windows and intermediate brick panels will be replaced with aluminium clad double glazed windows. The refurbishment of the building will sit comfortably in the area and it enhances its appearance through the use of modern materials. Signage is proposed but this will require a separate consent.
The site's ancillary facilities include waste storage and bicycle storage. These are appropriately located at the west of the site and easily accessible. At the request of Waste Services the applicant revised the size of the bin store to meet operational requirements.

The implementation of a 4m noise barrier at the site’s south boundary is recommended by condition to protect the building from noise at the neighbouring West Edinburgh Retail Park. There are no neighbouring properties at the site’s southern boundary and the boundary amendment is acceptable. Noise is further discussed in Section c) below.

The design of the proposal is acceptable and it is recommended that the colour and detail of materials be agreed by planning condition.

Landscaping

A landscape layout plan, soft landscape plan, landscape maintenance plan, and arboricultural report were submitted with the application. Landscape measures include the introduction of a landscaped area at the east of the building in place of the raised parking deck which will be demolished. Trees at the site’s north boundary will be retained and two trees within the site which are in poor condition will be removed. A number of trees and hedging will be introduced to the site to add to the site’s existing soft landscape in the front and rear courtyard areas. Grass and groundcover planting are included around parts of the site as well.

The introduction of hard and soft landscaping features will improve the street scene and reduce the amount of hard standing around the building.

The landscape proposals are acceptable and will contribute to creating a sense of place.

The scale, design and landscape proposals are suitable and comply with LDP policies Des 1 Design Quality and Context, Des 3 Development Design - Incorporating and Enhancing Potential Features, Des 4 Development Design - Impact on Setting, Des 5 Development Design - Amenity, Des 7 Layout Design and Des 8 Public Realm and Landscape Design.

c) Amenity

A number of LDP policies consider effects from development proposals relating to amenity on both the surrounding area and for future residents. These include policies Des 5 Development Design - Amenity, Hou 4 Housing Density, Hou 5 Conversion to Housing, Hou 7 Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas, and Hou 8 Student Accommodation. The Edinburgh Design Guidance and Student Housing Guidance consider amenity as well.
Impact on neighbouring amenity

The proposal seeks to change the use of an existing building. There are no changes in height and external amendments to the building will not impact on neighbouring amenity. The introduction of a bin store and cycle store at the west of the site are largely screened by existing boundary fencing and will not adversely affect neighbouring properties.

Representations received raise concerns relating to potential adverse impacts on residential amenity as a result of the proposal. Concerns identified relate to noise, disruption, anti-social behaviour, traffic and litter arising from a student population being introduced to the area.

Edinburgh Napier University in its capacity as applicant, has confirmed that the accommodation will be subject to its management regime, which is in place across its other accommodation sites. The university’s management measures include: on site staff presence (24 hour in some locations and roving patrols on smaller sites); Resident Assistants ‘living in’ 24/7 who can deal with minor issues which arise and can call upon security as necessary; contracts with students tied to academic activity / participation; a collegiate approach to student accommodation facilities with an emphasis on pastoral care; a strict code of conduct enforced; and, CCTV linked to a security hub.

The applicant has confirmed that parking on-site will be managed via a permit system and enforced by staff based at Pentland House.

As the proposal is for a change of use with no structural amendments to the building’s height or physical footprint there will be no adverse impacts in the local area with regard to overshadowing, daylight, sunlight or privacy. The building is set back from existing housing and is well screened at principal elevations at the ground level.

Implementation of Edinburgh Napier University’s management regime for student accommodation will address concerns raised in representations.

Amenity of future residents

With regard to the amenity of future residents, the applicant proposes sixty four apartments comprising 337 bedrooms in total. The apartments will be a mixture of single aspect and multi-aspect dwellings. The typical bedroom space will be 12.5 sqm with shared living and kitchen spaces varying between twenty one sqm and sixty one sqm, depending on the number of bedrooms in the apartment. There are no minimum standards for room sizes for student accommodation, however proposed room sizes are similar to other student housing developments that have been granted planning permission in the city.

Accessible rooms will be provided in line with technical standards which require a minimum number of fully accessible bedrooms (with en-suites) at a ratio of 1:20, which would be a minimum of 16.85 sqm. The applicant will provide 18 accessible rooms to accommodate this requirement and these will be located throughout the ground floor to the fourth floor. Accessible rooms will be larger at 17.5 sqm.
Additional facilities for residents on the ground floor and an external courtyard to the rear of the property will provide a good level of internal and external amenity within the application site. The proposal is in close proximity to other services in the local area at the Corn Exchange, the neighbouring Edinburgh West Retail Park and Gorgie Road as well.

Noise

The building’s south elevation is immediately adjacent to the delivery and service yard of the Edinburgh West Retail Park. In order to assess the application, a noise impact assessment (NIA) of deliveries and collections and other service yard noise was requested by Environmental Protection. The NIA showed that noise criteria specified in BS8233, was not met through an open window standard on the second to sixth floors of the south facade and the entire west facing facade, which is approximately 40% of the total number of windows in the building. Mitigation measures identified propose that the ground and first floor windows of the south elevation will be protected by a proposed 4m noise barrier.

As this development is for student accommodation, Environmental Protection was willing to compromise to a closed window standard and sealed windows if an alternative means of ventilation was provided. The university has clarified that a sealed window within bedrooms is not compatible with its environmental policy for student accommodation.

The university has proposed that having open-able windows offers a much more pleasant living environment. Whilst this is normally the case, occupants of the affected rooms in the proposed development would have to choose between ventilating their room or being subjected to noise levels above that considered acceptable in BS8233. The applicant has advised that while there would be open-able windows to all rooms they will also be served with mechanically ventilation system, to the affected rooms only. This will provide the satisfactory levels of comfort / ventilation required to operate when the windows are closed. A central Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery unit would be installed within each apartment, with fresh air supplied to the bedrooms and living spaces, and the extract air taken from the en-suite bathrooms and kitchens.

This approach will allow students to have the option to open windows, or close them if so desired. The applicant advises that students occupying potentially affected rooms will be advised of the potential for intermittent noise disturbance relating to deliveries from the neighbouring retail park which is restricted to between the hours of 07.00 and 21.00.

Environmental Protection is satisfied with the proposed mitigation, subject to conditions. Conditions in respect of window specification, ventilation and protection from plant noise are therefore recommended.

Overall, there will be an adequate standard of accommodation for future occupiers of the development, and the amenity of existing residents will not be adversely affected.

The proposals comply with LDP policies Des 5 Development Design - Amenity, Des 12 Alterations and Extensions, Hou 5 Conversion to Housing, and Hou 7 Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas.
d) Traffic & road safety

The applicant submitted a Transport Assessment with the application. The proposal provides 60 car parking spaces in total (including four accessible), 15 motorcycle parking spaces and 150 bicycle parking spaces. A further area is identified to expand bicycle parking spaces by one hundred and eighty if there is adequate demand from future residents. The proposal is located in Zone 3 of the parking standards and the minimum parking provision for such accommodation with staff is 29 parking spaces and the maximum is 58. The Council's guidance on parking also allows for zero parking provision for students accommodation.

The building's current use as an out of centre office includes significantly greater parking capacity, and in this context 60 car parking spaces is suitable at this location for the proposed accommodation. The applicant's Transport Assessment predicts that there will be a net decrease in traffic volumes resulting from the building's change of use and the provision of two spaces above parking standards is acceptable in this case.

Napier University campuses are accessible from the site by walking, cycling and public transport. The applicant's Transport Assessment states that most trips are expected to be made by sustainable transport, and Napier University promotes sustainable travel. Representations raise concern about students parking in nearby streets. The applicant advises that student tenancies state that there are limited car parking spaces at residences and university campuses, and car use is discouraged. Parking on site will also be monitored and managed by Edinburgh Napier University through a permit system and as part of the university's Travel Plan. The Transport Assessment submitted with the application predicts that there will be a decrease in traffic volumes at the site as a result of the proposed development in comparison to the existing situation.

Transport has no objections subject to informatives and conditions relating to progression of a suitable Traffic Regulation Order, introduction of a new toucan crossing at Chesser Avenue and replacement of an existing bus shelter on Chesser Avenue to accommodate expected increase in use of the bus services. The applicant's Transport Assessment predicts that buses will cater for approximately 50% of the resident students at peak times. The bus shelter identified by Transport for upgrading is small in comparison to other bus stops in the area and would benefit from enlargement. A legal agreement is required to secure these interventions, including a sum of £2,000 to progress a suitable order to introduce waiting and loading restrictions as necessary. Edinburgh Napier University intends to implement a Travel Plan as suggested by Transport.

A swept path analysis was submitted with regard to accessing the proposed bin store from Chesser Crescent. This is acceptable to Waste Services subject to a suitable Traffic Regulation Order to prohibit on-street parking opposite the access. It is not proposed to remove the existing barrier between Chesser Crescent and Robb's Loan.

The proposal is acceptable subject to suitable conditions and informatives specified by Transport.

The proposal complies with policies Tra 1 a), b) and c), Tra 2 b), c), and e), Tra 3 and Tra 4 a) and c).
e) Flood risk and drainage

The applicant submitted a Flood Risk Assessment, a Surface Water Management Plan and the Council's self-certification forms in support of the application. Flood prevention were consulted on the proposal and raise no objection.

SEPA was consulted on the proposals as well and raise no objection. The applicant should note best practice advice provided by SEPA with regard to flood risk and drainage.

The proposal complies with LDP policy Env 21 Flood Protection.

f) Issues raised in material representations

Material Representations - Objection:

- The area is unsuitable for this use and the site should not be developed in to student accommodation and the building should be demolished - addressed in Section a);

- Adverse effects on the character of the area and amenity of existing residents relating to noise during the day and at night time, and anti-social behaviour including littering and graffiti - addressed in Section c);

- The inability of the applicant to legally enforce rules related to parking, noise and disturbance, anti-social behaviour and waste, litter and recycling - addressed in Section c);

- Student housing is not appropriate for the area which is mostly inhabited by families and elderly people - addressed in Section a);

- The development will lead to too great a student population for the area with the development being too large - addressed in Section a);

- Introduction of a transient population to the area - addressed in Section a);

- Over-supply of student housing in the area - addressed in Section a);

- Inadequate parking provision for the proposals and impact on parking spaces in the surrounding streets and parking areas - proposals comply with parking standards, addressed in Section d);

- Increase in local traffic from cars, taxis, visitors and delivery vehicles and an associated impact on road safety - addressed in Section d);

- Objection to plans for a Traffic Regulation Order for refuse vehicle access which will remove parking on Chesser Crescent causing parking congestion - addressed in Section d); and

- Impact on local resources and capacity of the bus service which can be very busy - addressed in Section d).
Material Representations - Comments:

- Plans for 24 hour security have eased some initial fears and potential for benefits to the area such as improved amenities and services - addressed in Section c);

- Disappointment that no fully accessible accommodation is being provided - addressed in Sections c) and h);

- Concern with regard to students and visitors using parking at Mercat Loan which is unrestricted and the potential for residents to introduce and pay for new gates/barriers - addressed in Sections c) and d); and

- Request that any residential accommodation should require to meet the same levels of acoustic performance as would be expected from a dwelling house. A noise assessment should be submitted and a condition attached to meet acceptable standards - addressed in Section c).

Non-material objections:

- Disruption from construction activities - this is not a planning issue;

- Alleged inaccuracies in the applicant's transport statement - Transport do not object to the information submitted, addressed in Section d);

- Object to the removal of the existing barrier between Robb's Loan and Chesser Crescent - the applicant does not propose to remove this feature, addressed in Section d);

- Dissatisfaction with the level of publicity and transparency about the application - the applicant has complied with legislative requirements as evidenced in the applicant's Planning Statement;

- The developer's intention to make money - this is not a planning issue;

- Negative impact on house values - this is not a planning issue;

- Dumping of unwanted household goods/items - this is not a planning issue;

- Alleged over-provision of student residences in Edinburgh that are currently vacant - not a planning issue; and

- Suggestions received for alternative sites such as Chesser House or a derelict site at Calder Road/Broomhouse next to Napier University - site selection is a matter for the applicant.
Community Council

Hutchison Chesser Community Council requested to be a statutory consultee and for an extension of the time period to provide comments. The community council objects on the following grounds:

- Concern at impact from change of use - addressed in Section a);
- Impact on residential amenity - addressed in Section c);
- Traffic impact and on-street parking - proposals comply with parking standards, addressed in Section d); and
- The proposal is contrary Student Housing Guidance requirements which seeks to ensure that developments of this scale are mixed-use - addressed in Section a).

g) Sustainability

The applicant has submitted Part A of the Council's Sustainability Statement Form. The applicant proposes to include photovoltaic panels on the roof of the building, and dedicated areas are identified for the storage of recycled and food waste. Sustainable transport modes will be promoted through a Travel Plan.

The proposal is acceptable with regard to sustainability.

h) Equalities

The applicant has advised that proposals will accord with legislation and good practice guidance on equality and diversity including building regulation standards and the Equality Act 2010.

Eighteen fully accessible bedrooms will be provided in the building and these will be 17.5 sqm in size. The building and the courtyard areas will be fully accessible and four accessible parking spaces will be provided on site as well.

There are no adverse impacts identified with regard to equalities and human rights.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the site does not deliver housing as required by policy Hou 1 d) and the non-statutory Student Housing Guidance, however the proposal for purpose built student accommodation accords with policy Hou 8 Student Housing in terms of location and concentration levels of accommodation in the area.

On balance, the proposal is acceptable in this location and meets the wider objectives of the LDP including the dispersal of purpose built student accommodation to sustainable locations throughout the city.
For these reasons, the non-provision of housing as part of the proposal is acceptable.

It is recommended that this application be Granted subject to the details below.

3.4 Conditions/reasons/informatives

Conditions:-

1. A four metre high noise barrier shall be installed in the position as shown highlighted in blue in the plan within RMP’s Technical Report No. R-7914-ST4-MI, 7th November 2017, Appendix E, p16. The noise barrier, including its design and aesthetics is required to be agreed to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. The noise barrier shall be constructed from a material with a minimum surface density of 15kg/m³ and have no gaps between boarding. This shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the student accommodation building.

2. Glazing installed in the properties in floors above the first floor and shown to be highlighted in red within RMP’s Technical Report No. R-7914-ST4-MI, 7th November 2017, Appendix E, p16 & p17, shall meet the following specification: 4/20/4mm, (Window unit Rw+CTR of 29 dB). This shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the student accommodation building.

3. A central Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery unit shall be installed in the properties in floors above the first floor and shown to be highlighted in red within RMP’s Technical Report No. R-7914-ST4-MI, 7th November 2017, Appendix E, p16 & p17. This shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the student accommodation building.

4. The approved tree works shall be carried out prior to the commencement of all other site operations and in accordance with BS 3998:2010, ‘Tree Work Recommendations’. No other tree works or removal shall be carried out without the written approval of the local planning authority. If any unauthorised tree work, tree removal or damage to trees occurs then replacement tree planting and any other operations necessary to mitigate any adverse impacts which will result from these actions will be required.

5. The completed landscape scheme shall be maintained by the applicants and their successors in accordance with the approved landscape management plan. This shall include the replacement of any plant stock which fails to survive for whatever reason within 5 years from implementation, to ensure its establishment in accordance with the approved landscape scheme.

6. The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented within six months of the completion of the development.

7. A detailed specification, including trade names where appropriate, of all the proposed external materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority before work is commenced on site; Note: samples of the materials may be required.
Reasons:-

1. In order to protect the development's occupants and human health.
2. In order to protect the development's occupants and human health.
3. In order to protect the development's occupants and human health.
4. In order to ensure that a high standard of landscaping is achieved, appropriate to the location of the site.
5. In order to ensure that a high standard of landscaping is achieved, appropriate to the location of the site.
6. In order to ensure that a high standard of landscaping is achieved, appropriate to the location of the site.
7. In order to enable the planning authority to consider this/these matter/s in detail.

Informatives

It should be noted that:

1. Consent shall not be issued until a suitable legal agreement, including those requiring a financial contribution payable to the City of Edinburgh Council, has been concluded in relation to transport infrastructure.

   The legal agreement should be concluded within 6 months of the date of this notice. If not concluded within that 6 month period, a report will be put to committee with a likely recommendation that the application be refused.

The applicant will be required to:

a. Contribute the sum of £2,000 to progress a suitable order to introduce waiting and loading restrictions as necessary;
b. Build a new toucan crossing at Chesser Avenue as close to Chesser Crescent as possible in consultation with the City of Edinburgh Council at no cost to the Council.
c. To replace the existing bus shelter with ID 36253497 on Chesser Avenue with a bigger capacity to accommodate the expected increase in use of bus services

The above sum is to be: indexed linked and the use period to be 10 years; from date of payment.
2. In accordance with the Council’s LTS Travplan3 policy, the applicant should consider developing a Travel Plan including provision of pedal cycles (inc. electric cycles), secure cycle parking, public transport travel passes, a Welcome Pack, a high quality map of the neighbourhood (showing cycling, walking and public transport routes to key local facilities), timetables for local public transport. The applicant should also consider the provision of car club vehicles to support the site. A contribution of £1,500 per order and £5,500 per vehicle would be required. This is not a requirement.

3. The electric vehicle charging outlet should be of the following standard:
   - 70 or 50kW (100 Amp) DC with 43kW (63 Amp) AC unit. DC charge delivered via both JEVS G105 and 62196-3 connectors, the AC supply by a 62196-2 connector. Must have the ability to be de-rated to supply 25kW to the AC and either of the DC outlets simultaneously.

4. It is recommended that additional ducting and infrastructure is installed to allow more electric vehicle charging bays to be readily accommodated in the future.

   It is also recommended that consideration is given to the installation of electric charging points within the cycle parking provision, for ebikes.

5. Tree protective measures to BS 5837:2012 and in accordance with the approved Tree Retention and Removal Plan will be implemented prior to the commencement of development and shall be maintained to specification for the duration of the construction period. No materials, equipment or building shall be stored or located within the construction exclusion zone, nor shall any access or trenches be taken through it.

Financial impact

4.1 The financial impact has been assessed as follows:

There are no financial implications to the Council.

Risk, Policy, compliance and governance impact

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

Equalities impact

6.1 The equalities impact has been assessed as follows:

The application has been considered 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.

Public Exhibition

A public consultation event took place on Tuesday 27 June 2017 at Unit 4, EWRP, Chesser Avenue, to the south of the application site, between 3pm and 7pm. Details of this event are included in the applicant's Planning Statement.

8.2 Publicity summary of representations and Community Council comments

The application was advertised on 21 August 2017 and a 31 letters of representation were received. Two representations made comments on the application and twenty nine objected. These included comments from Hutchison Chesser Community Council. Four late objections were received raising one additional matter.

A petition objecting to proposals with 161 signatures was received at the pre-application stage but was not re-submitted after the planning application was lodged.

A full assessment of the representations can be found in the main report in the Assessment section.

Background reading/external references

- To view details of the application go to Planning and Building Standards online services
- Planning guidelines
- Conservation Area Character Appraisals
- Edinburgh Local Development Plan
- Scottish Planning Policy
The application site is shown to be in the Urban Area in the adopted Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP).

Date registered: 7 August 2017

Drawing numbers/Scheme: 1-6, 7A, 8-9, 10C, 11A, 12A, 13B, 14-16, 17A, 18,

Relevant Policies:

LDP Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context) sets general criteria for assessing design quality and requires an overall design concept to be demonstrated.

LDP Policy Des 2 (Co-ordinated Development) establishes a presumption against proposals which might compromise the effect development of adjacent land or the wider area.

LDP Policy Des 3 (Development Design - Incorporating and Enhancing Existing and Potential Features) supports development where it is demonstrated that existing and potential features have been incorporated into the design.

LDP Policy Des 4 (Development Design - Impact on Setting) sets criteria for assessing the impact of development design against its setting.

LDP Policy Des 5 (Development Design - Amenity) sets criteria for assessing amenity.

LDP Policy Des 6 (Sustainable Buildings) sets criteria for assessing the sustainability of new development.

LDP Policy Des 7 (Layout design) sets criteria for assessing layout design.
LDP Policy Des 8 (Public Realm and Landscape Design) sets criteria for assessing public realm and landscape design.

LDP Policy Des 12 (Alterations and Extensions) sets criteria for assessing alterations and extensions to existing buildings.

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

LDP Policy Env 16 (Species Protection) sets out species protection requirements for new development.

LDP Policy Env 21 (Flood Protection) sets criteria for assessing the impact of development on flood protection.

LDP Policy Emp 9 (Employment Sites and Premises) sets out criteria for development proposals affecting business and industrial sites and premises.

LDP Policy Hou 1 (Housing Development) sets criteria for assessing the principle of housing proposals.

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

LDP Policy Hou 5 (Conversion to Housing) sets out the criteria for change of use of existing buildings to housing.

LDP Policy Hou 6 (Affordable Housing) requires 25% affordable housing provision in residential development of twelve or more units.

LDP Policy Hou 7 (Inappropriate Uses in Residential Areas) establishes a presumption against development which would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of nearby residents.

LDP Policy Hou 8 (Student Accommodation) sets out the criteria for assessing purpose-built student accommodation.

LDP Policy Tra 1 (Location of Major Travel Generating Development) supports major development in the City Centre and sets criteria for assessing major travel generating development elsewhere.

LDP Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking) requires private car parking provision to comply with the parking levels set out in Council guidance, and sets criteria for assessing lower provision.

LDP Policy Tra 3 (Private Cycle Parking) requires cycle parking provision in accordance with standards set out in Council guidance.

LDP Policy Tra 4 (Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking) sets criteria for assessing design of off-street car and cycle parking.
Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines

Non-statutory guidelines Student Housing Guidance interprets local plan policy, supporting student housing proposals in accessible locations provided that they will not result in an excessive concentration.

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, parking, streets and landscape, in Edinburgh.
Appendix 1

Application for Planning Permission 17/03675/FUL
At Pentland House, 47 Robb's Loan, Edinburgh
Change of use of existing office building and redevelopment to form student residences with associated landscaping, parking, ancillary facilities and construction of new build element to incorporate plant, cycle and bin stores (as amended).

Consultations

Waste Services comment

Waste Management Responsibilities

The Waste and Cleansing Services will be responsible for managing the waste from households and any Council premises only. I am assuming this would include this development.

Although it does not appear to be pertinent for this case, for completeness, it would be the responsibility of any third party commercial organisations using the site to source their own trade waste uplifts. Architects should however note the requirement for trade waste producers to comply with legislation, in particular the Waste (Scotland) Regulations which require the segregation of defined waste types to allow their recycling. This means there would need to be storage space off street for segregated waste streams arising from commercial activities.

Any appointed waste collection contractors, appointed to manage commercial waste, could be expected to have similar requirements to the Council in terms of their need to be able to safely access waste for collection.

Compliance with Waste Strategy (Domestic Waste Only)

The provision of a full recycling service is mandatory in Scotland, so developers must make provision for the full range of bins.

The waste collection teams will require safe and efficient access to these from the earliest occupation, and therefore cognisance must be taken of my comments below in relation to operational viability.

For high density properties such as these student residences, we would recommend communal waste containers for landfill waste, mixed recycling for paper and packaging, glass, and food. The number of bins required is calculated on the number of properties/beds using each bin store, therefore, if the number of student beds is to be 337, this will require:
16 x 1280L residual
13 x 1280L mixed recycling
 3 x 500L food
 3 x 660L glass

It is important to contact us at the planning stage to ensure each bin store is of adequate size. These must be stored off street in a suitable storage area, in compliance with our instructions.

Key points are:
- The maximum size of a food bin is 500 litres; and that of a glass bin is 660 litres, which are both smaller than the 1280 litre bins used for other types of waste due to weight issues
- A straight pull of 10 metres is the maximum walking distance from bin storage area to the vehicle, and bins will only be wheeled over, and lifted from, hard standing surfaces.
- Provision must be made for the storage and disposal of bulky wastes such as furniture produced by the residents, and indeed access to those by our collection teams.

Developers can either source their own bins in line with our requirements, or can arrange for us to do so and recharge the cost.

Operational Viability

Developers need to ensure that services are accessible so that our collection crews can provide the service in a safe and efficient manner, taking account of turning circles, length and width of vehicles, distance bins must be pulled, surfaces, slopes and so on. Obviously sufficient capacity must also be provided to allow separate collection of each segregated waste stream.

A swept path analysis will be required to show suitable access for a refuse vehicle to safely enter the site from Robb's Loan, access the bins within a 10 straight pull, and exit.

We would strongly recommend early contact with us to ensure adequate provision of segregated household waste bins include all of the above and suitable access for the refuse collectors is arranged.

Further Waste Services comment

I can confirm that Waste Services requirements have been met by the applicant's revised design proposals. We would expect to see more detailed information covering the points raised in the attached checklist at a later date. More information on these points is in the Architects' Instructions. If any clarification is required, the developer should contact me.
Archaeology comment

Prior to the construction of the current offices the site remained undeveloped. General Roy's 1750's Military Survey depicts a large settlement comprising several buildings in the vicinity of this site, which recorded on the 1849 OS map which does however depicts a large linear feature crossing the car park. Given the history of the site it is regarded as occurring within an area of archaeological potential. However given the significant ground reduction occurred as a result of the construction of Pentland House it is considered unlikely that significant archaeological remains will have survived in situ.

Accordingly we have concluded that there are no archaeological implications regarding this application.

Flood Planning comment

Flood Prevention are happy that this application meets our requirements with regards to flood risk and surface water management. We have no further comments on this application.

Hutchison Chesser Community Council response

HUTCHISON CHESSER COMMUNITY COUNCIL OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT PENTLAND HOUSE, 47 ROBB’S LOAN; Reference 17/03675/FUL

At a meeting of the Hutchison Chesser Community Council it was decided to submit an objection to the proposed development of Pentland House into 337 student flats for the following reasons:

1. At the HCCC meeting on 11 September a number of residents attended who were very concerned about the change in use and its impact in the area. However, it was also emphasised that many of the local residents are very elderly, without online access, and who found it difficult to get information about the proposal or to submit their views.
2. Residents fear the impact on residential amenity given the close proximity of a young and short term population with a settled population of families with children and older people: impacts include noise in the neighbourhood, especially late at night.
3. Residents are concerned about traffic impact and impact on adjacent on-street parking, given that only limited parking is provided on-site.
4. The proposal is contrary to the council's student guidance (2016) which seeks to ensure that developments of this scale are mixed-use.

It is the wish of HCCC that this objection is lodged and is taken into serious account in coming to a recommendation and in the committee deliberations.
Affordable Housing comment

Housing and Regulatory Services have developed a methodology for assessing housing requirements by tenure, which supports an Affordable Housing Policy (AHP) for the city.

The AHP makes the provision of affordable housing a planning condition for sites over a particular size. The proportion of affordable housing required is set at 25% (of total units) for all proposals of 12 units or more.

This is consistent with Policy Hou 7 Affordable Housing in the Edinburgh City Local Plan.

An equitable and fair share of parking for affordable housing, consistent with the relevant parking guidance, is provided.

Affordable Housing Provision

This application is for 337 room spread over 64 ‘clusters’. The 2016 Student Housing Planning Guidance stipulated that where a development on a site is greater than 0.25ha a 50% proportion must be designated for housing. If a development is considered to fall within this remit then an Affordable Housing Provision requirement of 25% (8 homes) will apply to the general housing element of the application. The designation of the application as student or residential housing, as set out in the Student Planning Guidance, lies outwith the department.

If an affordable housing provision is required then it will be subject to the usual standards. The affordable homes are required to be tenure blind, fully compliant with latest building regulations and further informed by guidance such as Housing for Varying Needs and the relevant Housing Association Design Guides.

Parking must be provided to give a reasonable and equitable balance between privates and social residents. In terms of accessibility, the affordable homes are situated within close proximity of regular public transport links and are located next to local amenities in London and Easter Road.

Summary development

Should general housing provision, as set out in Student Housing Guidance, be required then the 25% AHP will apply.

The applicant must enter into an early dialogue with the Council to identify a Registered Social Landlord(s) (RSLs) to deliver the affordable housing.

The tenure of the affordable housing must be agreed with the Council.

The affordable housing must include a variety of house types and sizes to reflect the provision of homes across the wider site.

All the affordable homes must meet the Edinburgh Design Guidance and also meet the relevant Housing Association Design Guidance size and space standards.
In the interests of delivering mixed, sustainable communities, the affordable housing policy units will be expected to be identical in appearance to the market housing units, an approach often described as 'tenure blind'.

The applicant will be required to enter into a Section 75 legal agreement to secure the affordable housing element of this proposal.

Environmental Assessment comment

To the west, the development site is located adjacent to an existing modern 4 storey residential flatted development and a small single storey building which is used as a Cadet Centre. To the north, the area is residential use with predominantly 2 and 2½ storey, 4-in-a block flats. To the east, the housing is predominantly detached bungalows.

The south of the development site is a retail park with a number of supermarkets and other businesses. The service yard area is immediately adjacent to the development site. A complaint has already been received regarding deliveries to Aldi by an existing resident to the west, at Chesser Crescent.

In order to assess the application, a noise impact assessment (NIA) of deliveries and collections and other service yard noise was requested and received. However, the NIA showed that the noise criteria; BS8233, was not met through an open window standard on the second to sixth floor of the south and east facing facades. Whereas the ground and first floor properties are protected by a proposed 4m noise barrier. As this development is for student accommodation, Environmental Protection were willing to compromise to a closed window standard and sealed windows if an alternative means of ventilation was provided. However, the agent clarified that a sealed window within bedrooms is not compatible with the applicant’s environmental policy.

The agent suggests that having open-able windows offers a much more pleasant living environment. Whilst this is normally the case, occupants of the affected rooms in the proposed development would have to choose between ventilating their room or being subjected to noise levels above that considered acceptable in BS8233. Trickle vents are not considered to provide satisfactory levels of ventilation. In addition, if the windows are openable, this increases the risk of the existing businesses generating a noise complaint and being subject to enforcement action, thus potentially curtailing their activities.

For the above reasons, Environmental Protection cannot support this application in its current form and therefore recommend that it is refused.

Environmental Assessment updated comment

To the west, the development site is located adjacent to an existing modern 4 storey residential flatted development and a small single storey building which is used as a Cadet Centre. To the north, the area is residential use with predominantly 2 and 2½ storey, 4-in-a block flats. To the east, the housing is predominantly detached bungalows.
The north of the development site is a retail park development with a number of supermarkets and other businesses. The service yard area is immediately adjacent to the development site. A complaint has already been received regarding deliveries to Aldi by an existing resident to the east, at Chesser Crescent.

In order to assess the application, a noise impact assessment (NIA) of deliveries and collections and other service yard noise was requested and received. However, the NIA showed that the noise criteria; BS8233, was not met through an open window standard on the second to sixth floor of the south and east facing facades. Whereas the ground and first floor properties are protected by a proposed 4m noise barrier. As this development is for student accommodation, Environmental Protection were willing to compromise to a closed window standard and sealed windows if an alternative means of ventilation was provided. The applicant has clarified that a sealed window within bedrooms is not compatible with the applicant's environmental policy.

The applicant has proposed that having open-able windows offers a much more pleasant living environment. Whilst this is normally the case, occupants of the affected rooms in the proposed development would have to choose between ventilating their room or being subjected to noise levels above that considered acceptable in BS8233. The applicant has advised that while there would be openable windows to all rooms they will also be served with mechanically ventilation system, to the affected rooms only. This will provide the satisfactory levels of comfort / ventilation required to operate when the windows are closed. A central Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery unit would be installed within each cluster apartment with fresh air supplied to the bedrooms and living spaces, and the extract air taken from the en-suite bathrooms and kitchens. Although this is not desirable taking into consideration that only a few of the properties are affected and the proposed end use Environmental Protection are satisfied with this proposed mitigation in this case.

Therefore, Environmental Protection offer no objection to this application subject to the following conditions;

Conditions

1. A 4m high noise barrier should be installed in the position as highlighted in blue in the plan within RMP's Technical Report No. R-7914-ST3-MI, 17th October 2017, Appendix E, p16.

2. The noise barrier should be constructed from a material with a minimum surface density of 15kg/m3 and have no gaps between boarding.

3. The glazing installed in the properties in floors above the first floor and highlighted in red within RMP's Technical Report No. R-7914-ST3-MI, 17th October 2017, Appendix E, p16 & p17, should meet the following specification: 4/20/4mm, (Window unit Rw+CTR of 29 dB).


5. One electric vehicle charging outlet should be of the following standard;
70 or 50kW (100 Amp) DC with 43kW (63 Amp) AC unit. DC charge delivered via both JEVs G105 and 62196-3 connectors, the AC supply by a 62196-2 connector. Must have the ability to be de-rated to supply 25kW to the AC and either of the DC outlets simultaneously.

Informative

It is recommended that additional ducting and infrastructure is installed to allow more electric vehicle charging bays to be readily accommodated in the future.

It is also recommended that consideration is given to the installation of electric charging points within the cycle parking provision, for ebikes.

Environmental Assessment further comment

Environmental Protection offer no objection regarding the changes to the acoustic barrier subject to the suggested conditions.

Roads Authority Issues

ROADS AUTHORITY ISSUES

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

1. The applicant will be required to:
   a. Contribute the sum of £2,000 to progress a suitable order to introduce waiting and loading restrictions as necessary;
   b. Build a new toucan crossing at Chesser Avenue as close to Chesser Crescent as possible in consultation with the City of Edinburgh Council at no cost to the Council.
   c. To replace the existing bus shelter with ID 36253497 on Chesser Avenue with a bigger capacity to accommodate the expected increase in use of bus services.

2. In accordance with the Council's LTS Travplan3 policy, the applicant should consider developing a Travel Plan including provision of pedal cycles (inc. electric cycles), secure cycle parking, public transport travel passes, a Welcome Pack, a high quality map of the neighbourhood (showing cycling, walking and public transport routes to key local facilities), timetables for local public transport. The applicant should also consider the provision of car club vehicles to support the site. A contribution of £1,500 per order and £5,500 per vehicle would be required. This does not require to be included in any legal agreement;

3. All disabled persons parking places should comply with Disabled Persons Parking Places (Scotland) Act 2009. The Act places a duty on the local authority to promote proper use of parking places for disabled persons' vehicles. The applicant should therefore advise the Council if he wishes the bays to be enforced under this legislation. A contribution of £2,000 will be required to progress the necessary traffic order. All disabled persons parking places must comply with Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 regulations or British Standard 8300:2009 as approved;
Note:

a. The applicant proposes 60 parking provision for the 337 student accommodation which meets the Council’s current parking standards for the area in Zone 3. The minimum parking provision for such accommodation with 4 staff is 29 parking spaces and the maximum is 58. The Council’s guidance on parking also allows for zero parking provision for students accommodation.

b. The university survey shows that 19% of the students travel by car which translates to 64 parking level of provision; however, the location of the proposed development to the various University Campuses is accessible by walking, cycling and public transport hence most trips expected to be made by sustainable transport and reduce the need to travel by car.

c. The applicant proposes 150 high quality, secure cycle parking spaces which will be increased by a further 180 spaces should demand exceeds the initial provision. A total of 15 motorcycle parking will be provided by the applicant.

Further Roads Authority Issues

In response to the transport consultant’s comments below; there is a proposed cycle lanes on each side of Chesser Avenue that runs from its junctions with Gorgie Rd to the A70 to be installed by the end of December 2017, therefore that is the justification for the toucan crossing. There is also proposed D island crossing on Chesser Avenue adjacent the Kwik Fit sign; all to be implemented by the close of 2017. This requires that the proposed location for the toucan crossing be discussed with CEC but our initial preference location will be at south of Chesser Loan on Chesser Avenue but close as possible to Chesser Loan. This will also help with the use of the two bus stops further south.

'Our transport consultant has reviewed the response and has noted that the Transport Statement proposed a refuge island and dropped kerbs on Chesser Avenue in close proximity to the bus stops. We would like to make the point that there may be difficulty in fitting in a Toucan crossing on the main pedestrian desire line, given the frequency of private driveways on Chesser Avenue and amount of on-street parking activity. We would also question the requirement for this. Happy for our transport consultant to discuss this direct with Kofi Appiah or if you wish to pick this up direct and feedback through ourselves'.