

Development Management Sub Committee

Wednesday 13 December 2017

Application for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions 17/02865/AMC

At Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road, Edinburgh
Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions on outline application 01/00802/OUT regarding the erection of a healthcare superhub and six units in Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 use (as amended).

Item number	4.12
Report number	
Wards	B04 - Forth

Summary

The proposed uses are acceptable at this location. Fundamentally, the proposal does not comply with the vision for the Edinburgh Waterfront as set out in LDP and the Development Principles set out for proposal EW2c. The proposal does not create a perimeter block urban form and it fails to create a high density urban quarter with a design and layout that promotes a reduction in the influence of the car.

The proposal fails to provide a comprehensive development for this part of the masterplan area, prejudicing the implementation of a proposed east - west route and creating uncertainty as to how it relates to future development on neighbouring sites. This is contrary to LDP Policies Des 2 and Del 3.

The proposed layout is contrary to LDP Policy Tra 4 as it locates surface car parking at front of the building and therefore does not create an active street frontage. It also compromises pedestrian safety because access for service vehicles is taken through the car park.

The proposal is contrary to LDP Policy Des 7 because it does not provide a comprehensive and integrated approach to the layout of the buildings, streets, footpaths, services and surface water management and does not encourage walking and cycling.

The proposal is contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations which justify approval.

It is recommended that the application is refused.

Links

[Policies and guidance for this application](#)

LDPP, LDEL03, LDES01, LDES02, LDES03, LDES04, LDES05, LDES06, LDES07, LDES08, LEN21, LEN22, LHOU10, LRET06, LTRA02, LTRA03, LTRA04, NSG, NSESBA, NSP, NSGD02,

Report

Application for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions 17/02865/AMC

**At Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road, Edinburgh
Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions on outline application 01/00802/OUT regarding the erection of a healthcare superhub and six units in Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 use (as amended).**

Recommendations

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

Background

2.1 Site description

The site, covering approximately 0.55 hectares, is located to the west of Chestnut Street. It is a vacant area of hardstanding currently surrounded by a palisade fence. The site is relatively flat and rectangular in shape, but the ground slopes away on the northern and western boundaries. A cycle path runs along the wide pavement on Chestnut Street. Access to the site is taken from both the southeast and northeast corners.

To the north is Sealcar Street which provides access to an industrial estate to the west of the site. The industrial estate accommodates a number of large, terraced industrial buildings in various uses. An electricity substation is located just outside of the site boundary in the northwest corner.

Further north is a linear area of vacant land and north of this is a residential flatted development on Hesperus Crossway, which rises up to seven storeys. There are also further areas of vacant land that have planning permission for residential development. To the northeast of the site, a planning application has been approved for retirement flats (application number: 17/01219/AMC).

To the east of Chestnut Street is a vacant area of land where a planning application for residential use has been approved (application number: 17/01481/AMC).

To the south of the site are more industrial style buildings comprising car garages and car hire uses.

2.2 Site History

Relevant history to the site:

20 June 2003 - Outline planning permission granted for the Granton Harbour Village, mixed use development comprising residential units, hotel and serviced apartments, shops and retail /services, restaurants /cafes, public houses, general business, leisure facilities and marina. This permission includes a legal agreement to secure contributions towards education and transportation infrastructure, 15% affordable housing, restrictions on future tenancies within Granton Industrial Estate and the long term maintenance and upkeep of the Western Breakwater (application number: 01/00802/OUT).

31 January 2014 - Application approved for matters specified in condition 2 as attached to outline permission 01/00802/OUT: covering siting and height of development; design and configuration of public and open spaces; access, road layouts; footpaths and cycle routes. This was subject to a number of conditions (application number: 13/04320/AMC).

26 August 2016 - 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) approved. Condition 4 states that the reserved matters applied for in respect of plots 12, 14, 15, 15A, 16 and 17 i.e. the large retail/leisure centre are not approved (application number: 14/05305/AMC).

2 February 2017 - 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 2) approved. However, the matters applied for in relation to plots 8C, 12,14, 15, 15A, 16, 17, S1, S2 and 35 are not approved (application number: 16/05618/AMC). This is the most up to date masterplan for the Granton Harbour area.

31 May 2017 - Application submitted for approval of matters specified in condition 2 of outline application 01/00802/OUT covering siting and height of development, design, and configuration of public and open spaces, access, road layouts, footpaths and cycle routes at Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road (application number: 17/02484/AMC). Not yet determined.

Other recent applications on neighbouring plots:

3 August 2017 - Application approved for matters specified in condition 2 of application 01/00802/OUT for the erection of a 3/7 storey residential development of 302 units with associated roads, car parking and landscaping on plot S1 and S2 (S) to the east of the site (application number: 17/01481/AMC).

3 August 2017 - Application submitted for the change of use of building and land from Class 6 to Class 5 to include building operations and siting of plant to permit use of existing warehouse building as a micro distillery at 29 Sealcar Street to the west of the site (application number: 17/03297/FUL). Not yet determined.

22 November 2017 - Application approved for matters specified in conditions of application 01/00802/OUT for the erection of buildings containing 104 retirement flats and ancillary accommodation, formation of road access, underground parking, internal private open space and a public square on Plots 9A and 9B to the northeast of the site (application number: 17/01219/AMC).

Main report

3.1 Description Of The Proposal

The proposal seeks to deal with the matters listed in condition 2 of planning permission 01/00802/OUT in relation to Plot 19B. The matters specified in condition 2 include siting, design and height of development, including design of all external features and glazing specifications, design and configuration of public and open spaces, external lighting, all external materials and finishes, including their colour; car and cycle parking, access, road layouts and servicing areas; hours of operation and servicing; footpaths and cycle routes; boundary treatments; floor levels including (including the submission of all calculations to support the levels, and including a report on sea levels, with climate change, storm surge and wave action); and hard and soft landscaping details, which shall include layout plans to provide full details of ground preparation.

As well as these matters, the application also seeks to satisfy conditions 3 and 14 of the 01/00802/OUT application. In summary, these are:

- 3a) Noise assessment;
- 3b) Site Survey and measures relating to landfill gases and any required protective measures; and
- 14) Drainage.

Condition 3c) also requires that any reserved matters application shall be accompanied by a site survey relating to contamination and any required remedial/protective measures. The applicant contends that as the site has been previously developed these issues would have been detected and no such problems are evident. This information has therefore not been submitted.

The proposal is for the erection of a health centre, incorporating GP practice and dentist surgery alongside six smaller shop units including a pharmacy and other Class 1 (shops), Class 2 (financial, professional and other services) or Class 3 (food and drink) on Plot 19B of Granton Harbour.

The proposed building is set back from Chestnut Street by approximately 20 metres. The health centre element is a two storey box like building of 1,394 sqm. A parade of smaller, single storey units adjoins the health centre running in a linear manner to the north. Six units are proposed, all 83.6sqm in size, with a pharmacy located adjacent to the health centre with a dispensing hatch linked to the larger building.

The east and south elevations of the two storey health centre are to be clad in a synthetic stone rainscreen system in a buff sandstone colour, with a dark grey brick base course and standing seam zinc cladding panels. A large double height glazed element is proposed at the entrance.

The single storey retail units and the rear elevation of the health centre are proposed to be clad in white fibre cement rainscreen panels. The shop unit fronts are predominately glazed with brick infill panels between the glazing. The window frames are to be grey in colour.

Vehicle access is taken from a central point on Chestnut Street leading to car parking and emergency services vehicle bays. Further car parking is proposed along the southern and northern parts of the site. A service/delivery yard is proposed to the rear of the building. Access to the yard shares the same vehicle access point from Chestnut Street. Fifty-three car parking spaces are proposed in total. Cycle storage comprising 10 covered spaces at the front of the building for visitors and 10 secure spaces to the rear of the development for staff.

Two pedestrian/cycle crossing points are proposed from the east and south of the site. A planting plan and schedule has been provided.

Hours of operation are to be between 08:00 and 23:00.

Supporting Statements

The following documents have been submitted in support of the application:

- Design and Planning Statement;
- Noise Impact Assessment;
- Flood Risk Assessment;
- Simplified Building Energy Model (SBEM) Specification Information; and
- Environment Report.

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

Previous Schemes

Scheme 1

The description of development incorrectly stated the proposal is for five units, rather than the six shown in the drawings. This has been altered to reflect the drawings. The proposed building was set back from Chestnut Street by approximately 33 metres, the main material was a grey/white powder coated cladding and there were 72 car parking spaces.

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 development is acceptable on this site;
- b) the design, scale and layout are appropriate to the site;
- c) there are any transport and parking issues;
- d) the proposal will result in an unreasonable loss to neighbouring amenity;
- e) any other material considerations;
- f) any impacts on equalities or human rights are acceptable; and
- g) comments raised have been addressed.

a) Principle

Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) Policy Hou 10 Community Facilities sets out that planning permission for housing development will only be granted where there are associated proposals to provide any health and community facilities relative to the impact and scale of development proposed. The intention of this policy is to ensure that new housing development goes hand in hand with the provision of a range of community facilities.

LDP Policy Del 3 supports proposals which meet a number of requirements, including the provision of a series of mixed use sustainable neighbourhoods that connect with the waterfront and the provision of local retail facilities.

The site is located within the Granton Harbour Area at Granton Waterfront, as identified in the LDP. It is covered by Proposal EW2c for housing led mixed use development.

The most recent masterplan (application number 16/05618/AMC) proposes 2,235 residential units in total. The accompanying masterplan drawing to that application shows indicative plans for units consisting of 250 sqm retail use, 500 sqm leisure use and 500 sqm health use on this plot. Such uses are acceptable in principle at this location, in line with the outline permission (application number: 01/00802/OUT) and subsequent approved masterplans.

No information has been provided to support the size of the proposed healthcare element. The plans show that the internal layout is indicative and that the first floor dental treatment facility is only an option shown for illustrative purposes. The applicant states that there is occupier interest.

The LDP Action Programme (December 2016) contains a healthcare action to provide a new practice to mitigate the impact of new residential development in Granton Waterfront. An option being explored is to co-locate this with a new waterfront primary school.

Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership (EHSCP) is responsible for the planning and development of GP practices in Edinburgh. Its strategic plan includes the need for a new practice to provide for approximately 10,000 people (as per the LDP Action Programme). Exploratory discussions between the applicant and the EHSCP have taken place, but no commitment has been given to the applicant about the suitability of the proposals at this stage.

The proposed health centre is a Class 2 (financial, professional and other services) use. If given approval, the 1,394 sqm unit could be changed into a Class 1 (shops) use under permitted development rights. Condition 19 of the outline planning permission restricts the gross floor area of each retail unit to 250 sqm, with the exception of one larger retail unit restricted to a maximum of 1,500 sqm. If such a change took place, then this would account for the one larger unit permitted under the terms of this condition.

The principle of the proposed uses are acceptable.

b) Design, Scale and Layout

LDP Policies Des 1 - Des 8 set a requirement for proposals to be based on an overall design concept which draws on the positive characteristics of the surrounding area with the need for a high quality of design which is appropriate in terms of height, scale and form, layout, and materials.

The LDP also sets out the aims of the long-term strategies for the Edinburgh Waterfront. This vision includes transforming the waterfront into one of the city's landmark features, attract high quality developments and create distinctive high density urban quarters and build exemplar sustainable communities with a reduction in the influence of the car in design and layout.

Design and Scale:

The design of the building is utilitarian in its form and execution with an emphasis on function and limited detailing. There is the lack of a design concept to set out the design process behind the proposed development. Although the building has been moved forward within the site from scheme 1, it retains the same basic form and scale. The buildings are lacking in any architectural merit, with limited consideration for the emerging masterplan or recent developments.

The Edinburgh Design Guidance indicates that materials should normally harmonise with those used on surrounding buildings. The wider area is characterised by a number of different building types and materials, both in terms of the current industrial ones and the existing and proposed residential developments. There is no overarching design code for the area.

The proposed cladding has been altered from the previous scheme to provide synthetic stone cladding on the east and south elevations, with the addition of some zinc panels to aid in providing more interest. The single storey elements utilise fibre cement panelling with large glazing elements.

For what in essence will be a public building, the design lacks any distinctiveness and is dull and industrial in appearance. The design and materials create uninteresting elevations which are visible from existing properties and will create unattractive edges to the adjoining masterplan area.

As a proposed two storey building (with single storey elements) in an area where higher rise residential development exists (and are proposed), the building height will not impact on adjacent existing buildings. A mixed-use development with residential use on the upper floors could provide a more efficient and appropriate design solution for the site. The design of the building as proposed is unacceptable at this location. The proposal is not of a high quality and it does not aid in creating a high density urban quarter.

Layout:

LDP Policy Tra 4 Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking sets out that where off-street parking is acceptable, a number of design considerations will be taken. This includes that surface car parks should not be located in front of the building where the building would otherwise create an active frontage onto a street and main entrances should be located as close as practical to the main site entrance. Structural planting should be provided to minimise the visual impact and the design of car parking should not compromise pedestrian safety.

The proposed primary elevation of the building is set back by approximately 20 metres from Chestnut Street, one of the main routes through the wider Granton Harbour area. Car parking and drop off bays are proposed between the street and the building. This does not comply with Policy Tra 4 and the proposals do not provide any active frontage and limited interaction with Chestnut Street. The proposals will have a negative impact on the townscape of the area and it compromises co-ordinated development.

LDP Policy Des 7 Layout Design states, amongst other matters, that permission will be granted where the layout will encourage walking and cycling. The car parking levels have been reduced from the previous scheme to be just slightly over those in the parking standards. Pedestrian and cycle routes have been provided into the site from Chestnut Street, but those at the northern and southern ends are of an inadequate width to meet the minimum dimensions contained within the guidance.

The applicant has stated that the proposed layout is required for specific needs of the operator. Furthermore, by pulling the building forward from the original position, compromises have been made which may not be in the best interests of the operation of the health centre. But, limited information has been provided. The proposed dental treatment element is also shown as for illustration purposes only. The applicant has not submitted detailed information explaining the rationale for the proposed building's position within the site and how this has been developed through the design process.

The most recently approved masterplan (planning application 16/05618/AMC) shows a building with some car parking to the front. However, the masterplan drawing is annotated to say that the proposed buildings on Plot 19B are indicative, not part of that application and would be subject to a detailed planning submission. Consequently, little weight can be given to this.

It has also been pointed out that an earlier masterplan from 2014 approved Hesperus Square with parking in front of the proposed building in close vicinity of the site (application number 13/04320/AMC). This showed eleven car parking spaces set around an area of greenspace. The spaces were away from Hesperus Crossway and orientated towards Plot 9A. This situation is similar to that which exists within the high quality spaces within the New Town and city centre. This is not a comparable situation.

Servicing is to the rear of the building, with access to the service yard taken through the car park from the single vehicular site entrance. This arrangement would compromise pedestrian safety by bringing all servicing vehicles through the site contrary to LDP Policy Tra 4. A shared space is proposed to be as pedestrian friendly as possible, but no additional features have been provided (other than crossing points) to demonstrate how this would work in practice.

Planting has been provided, with seven trees largely located around the periphery of the site. A landscaped strip of approximately six metres has been introduced along the interface of the site with Chestnut Street. This is predominately shrub planting and a beech hedge. Although it would aid in providing some screening of the car park and provide greening, it is not an adequate substitute for providing a building frontage onto the street.

The proposal fails to provide an integrated approach to the layout of the building and other features. It also does not promote safe and convenient access and movement in and around the development as there will be conflict between servicing and pedestrians contrary to LDP Policy Des 7. The pedestrian/cycle access is contrary to LDP Policy Tra 4 as it is substandard in parts and does not promote safety.

Co-ordinated development:

The most recently approved masterplan shows a proposed road (Ross Kestrel Road) running through the southern part of the application site and linking into a large circus (roundabout) surrounded by proposed housing. This proposed route will provide a link between proposed housing in the western part of Granton Harbour to the proposed local centre in the south east. This application proposes car parking and access to the service yard on the route of the proposed Ross Kestrel Road.

A context masterplan has been provided to show a future scenario for when/if Ross Kestrel Road is built. It will result in the loss of some of the proposed car parking in the future, which given the proximity to bus stops and the tram safeguard a lower level of parking would be supported. However, this application does not accord with the current masterplan and may prejudice the delivery of the proposed road and pedestrian link. The applicant has not demonstrated how the proposed Ross Kestrel Road could be delivered, if this application was approved. The context masterplan shows the building having a poor relationship with the neighbouring sites and land.

The proposal is contrary to LDP Policy Des 2 Co-ordinated development as it compromises the effective development of adjacent land and limits the comprehensive regeneration of the area by not providing a design that creates well defined and cohesive streets and spaces.

The layout represents a low density, placeless solution which is not aligned with the regeneration supported by the LDP. The proposal is therefore also contrary to LDP Policy Del 3 Edinburgh Waterfront as it fails to provide a comprehensively designed proposal which maximises the development potential of the area. It is also contrary to the Granton Harbour (EW 2c) Development Principles by failing to provide a perimeter block urban form and the proposed design and layout is inappropriate to the site in terms of placemaking.

In summary, the general design of the building is lacking in design merit with a functional approach taken with a desired end user. It contributes little to placemaking in this part of the city. The layout of the development does not comply with LDP Policy Tra 4 as it results in a surface car parking in front of the proposed building, providing no active frontage to Chestnut Street and does not provide safe and convenient movement for pedestrians. The proposal does not provide a comprehensive and integrated approach to the layout of the site contrary to LDP Policy Des 7. The proposal fails to deliver co-ordinated development and prejudices the comprehensive regeneration of the wider area, contrary to LDP Policies Des 2, Del 3 and the development principles set out for proposal EW2c.

c) Transport Matters

The access from Chestnut Street is acceptable.

The 2009 Parking Standards in place when the application was submitted, allow for between 44 and 51 spaces. The 53 spaces proposed are only marginally over this and have been reduced from the original 72 spaces. The recently approved parking standards in the 2017 Edinburgh Design Guidance would allow for a maximum of 45 spaces. This is based on 28 spaces for the 1,394 sqm of Class 2 use and 17 spaces for the 501.6 sqm in the small units (assuming Class 1 use).

On balance, the level of car parking proposed is acceptable when assessed against the standards in place when the application was submitted. However, given the access to existing and future public transport in the area less car parking would be more favourable.

It is noted that at a future point, if the Ross Kestrel Road is provided, this would result in the loss of some spaces. But the phasing of development is not clear. It is also not clear how the delivery of this road could be secured, if approval was given for this proposal.

The most recently approved masterplan shows access to Plot 19b from Sealcar Street to the north of the site. This road is currently used to access existing industrial units to the west of the site. The applicant was asked why service vehicle access for the proposal is not taken from Sealcar Street as shown in the masterplan as this could address concerns regarding service access through the car park and the provision of Ross Kestrel Road. No explanation was provided.

Environmental Protection encourages car parking numbers to be kept to a minimum to limit any potential air quality issues through the wider Granton Harbour area. It recommends that electric vehicle charging points should be provided. The layout plan shows two ducts for car charging points. The 2017 parking standards states that one of every six spaces should feature an electric charging point. For 53 spaces this would be nine.

Bus stops are located next to the site on Chestnut Street and on Hesperus Crossway. Further stops lie close to the south of the site on Waterfront Avenue. There are a number of Lothian Bus Services (numbers 24 and 47) that provide links to and throughout the city. Further buses are also available from Granton Square (numbers 16, 19 and 32). Accordingly the site can be easily accessed via buses.

There is also a tram safeguard along West Harbour Road and Waterfront Avenue, with a tram stop at Granton Square also indicatively identified. This would improve accessibility to the area and site if the route is progressed at this location.

Twenty cycle spaces have been provided in the proposed development. The number is acceptable, but it is not clear what the design specification is. Further details would be required to approve this reserved matter, if this application is approved.

The levels of car and cycle parking proposed are acceptable for the development, subject to further details on cycle parking. Matters in relation to the layout of the car parking, access to the service yard and the future implementation of Ross Kestrel Road have been considered above in section 3.3b).

d) Amenity

The principle of retail, health and leisure uses has been established on the site, although the location of any proposed building is not fixed.

Currently the development is mostly surrounded by industrial uses, though there is proposed residential development to the west and east. Existing residential development is to the north.

Generally, the proposed development will have limited impact on adjacent uses. There will be some negative impact on visual amenity as existing and potentially future residential development will overlook a car park and service yard. Environmental Protection has raised some concern regarding the potential impact on the proposed residential development to the west from the proposed service/delivery yard associated with this application.

The applicant's noise consultant has indicated that future residential phases could be designed to consider potential noise implications or alternatively a close-boarded acoustic barrier would be recommended to mitigate any potential noise issues. As the application is not recommended for approval, this matter has not been progressed further. A condition relating to noise impact could be utilised if Committee were minded to approve the application. However, it should be noted that without this level of detail it is not possible to assess if the acoustic mitigation would compromise the appropriate development of adjoining land.

e) Other Material Considerations

Archaeology:

There are no significant archaeological impacts associated with the application.

Contaminated land:

Condition 3a) of the outline application requires a conceptual model and site investigation/remedial works to be submitted. A conceptual model has been submitted and Environmental Protection are still considering the information.

As the condition is not a reserved matter itself, this could be discharged for the site once Environmental Protection has assessed its acceptability.

Condition 3b) of the outline application requires a site survey relating to contamination and any required remedial/protective measures. This information has not been submitted as part of the application and this would need to be resolved either through this application or via a condition if Committee was minded to grant the application.

Flooding and Drainage:

The applicant has provided a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for a number of plots within the Granton Harbour Area. This covers the application site (Plot 19B). However, it has not been submitted in the appropriate manner with the relevant self-certification checks. Accordingly, Flood Prevention has not assessed the information.

This issue would need further consideration if Committee was minded to approve the planning application to deal with the reserved matter on floor levels and associated calculations.

The FRA does conclude that there should be a minimum finished floor level of 4.85m AOD with a freeboard of 600mm. The finished floor levels show a level of 6.20 AOD or above. The report does note that higher levels may be required to provide effective surface water drainage measures or achieve mitigation from other sources of flood risk.

No information has been provided on surface water management. Condition 6, which applies to the outline permission, still requires details of surface water disposal arrangements to be submitted. Condition 14 also requires sustainable urban drainage to be incorporated into each development. However, such details have not been provided as part of this AMC.

Sustainability:

A Sustainability Form has not been submitted with the application as per normal procedures. It is not a reserved matter on the application and if submitted as a standalone application would not be considered a major application. However, it is expected that Part A of the form should be provided to indicate how Section 6 (energy) of the 2010 Building Regulations can be met. A Simplified Building Energy Model (SBEM) has been provided to demonstrate this.

f) Equalities and Human Rights

The application has been assessed in terms of equalities and human rights. The proposal will develop a vacant area of land for healthcare uses and other services. The application raises no overriding concerns in relation to equalities and human rights.

g) Public Comments

No public comments received.

Conclusion

The proposed uses are acceptable at this location. However, the proposal does not comply with the vision for the Edinburgh Waterfront as set out in LDP and the Development Principles set out in EW2c. The proposal does not create a perimeter block urban form and it fails to create a high density urban quarter with a design and layout that promotes a reduction in the influence of the car.

The proposal fails to provide a comprehensive development for this part of the masterplan area, prejudicing the implementation of a proposed east - west route and creating uncertainty as to how it relates to future development on neighbouring sites. This is contrary to LDP Policies Des 2 and Del 3.

The proposed layout is contrary to LDP Policy Tra 4 as it locates surface car parking at front of the building and therefore does not create an active street frontage. It also compromises pedestrian safety because access for service vehicles is taken through the car park.

The proposal is contrary to LDP Policy Des 7 because it does not provide a comprehensive and integrated approach to the layout of the buildings, streets, footpaths, services and surface water management and does not encourage walking and cycling.

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

3.4 Conditions/reasons/informatives

Reason for Refusal:-

1. The proposal is contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Des 2 Co-ordinated Development and Del 3 Edinburgh Waterfront as the proposed layout compromises the regeneration and development potential of the wider area. The proposal conflicts with the current masterplan by prejudicing the implementation of a proposed road and creating uncertainty as to how it relates to future development on neighbouring sites.

2. The proposal is contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 4 Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking because it locates the surface car park to the front of the proposed building, failing to create active frontage onto the street and compromises pedestrian safety by providing inappropriate access for service vehicles. It does not accord with the Granton Harbour Development Principles (EW 2c) which states that proposals are expected to complete the approved street layout and perimeter block urban form.
3. The proposal is contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 7 Layout Design as the layout does not provide a comprehensive and integrated approach to the layout of buildings, streets, footpaths, services and SUDs features and does not promote safe and convenient access and movement in and around the site

Financial impact

4.1 The financial impact has been assessed as follows:

There is an existing legal agreement in place - no contributions are required.

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:

This application was assessed in terms of equalities and human rights. The impacts are identified in the Assessment section of the main report.

Sustainability impact

7.1 The sustainability impact has been assessed as follows:

A Simplified Building Energy Model Specification has been submitted, but no Sustainability Form.

Consultation and engagement

8.1 Pre-Application Process

Pre-application discussions took place on this application.

8.2 Publicity summary of representations and Community Council comments

No representations have been received.

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](#)

**Statutory Development
Plan Provision**

The site is located within the Urban Area as shown on the Local Development Plan proposals map. The land is identified as being within Edinburgh Waterfront. Proposal EW 2c (Granton Harbour) states that the area is for a housing-led mixed use development. It sets out a number of Development Principles. These include that proposals will be expected to:

- Complete the approved street layout and perimeter block urban form.
- Provide a housing mix that is appropriate in terms of place-making and would maximise completions within this urban regeneration proposal within the plan period.

Date registered 21 June 2017

Drawing numbers/Scheme 01,02A,03,04A,05,06A,07,

Scheme 2

David R. Leslie
Chief Planning Officer
PLACE
The City of Edinburgh Council

Contact: Kenneth Bowes, Senior Planning Officer
E-mail:kenneth.bowes@edinburgh.gov.uk Tel:0131 529 6724

Links - Policies

Relevant Policies:

Relevant policies of the Local Development Plan.

LDP Policy Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront) sets criteria for assessing development in Granton Waterfront and Leith Waterfront.

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

LDP Policy Env 22 (Pollution and Air, Water and Soil Quality) sets criteria for assessing the impact of development on air, water and soil quality.

LDP Policy Hou 10 (Community Facilities) requires housing developments to provide the necessary provision of health and other community facilities and protects against valuable health or community facilities.

LDP Policy Ret 6 (Out-of-Centre Development) identifies the circumstances in which out-of-centre retail development will be permitted.

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

NSESBA - **Non-statutory guidelines** Part A of 'The Edinburgh Standards for Sustainable Building' requires new development in Edinburgh to reduce their carbon emissions in line with the current Building Regulations.

Non-statutory guidelines on 'PARKING STANDARDS' set the requirements for parking provision in developments.

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 Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions 17/02865/AMC

**At Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road, Edinburgh
Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions on outline application 01/00802/OUT regarding the erection of a healthcare superhub and six units in Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 use (as amended).**

Consultations

Archaeology response - dated 3 July 2017

Further to your consultation request I would like to make the following comments and recommendations in respect to this application for approval of matters specified in conditions of outline application 01/00802/OUT regarding the erection of a healthcare superhub and five units in class 1, class 2 and class 3.

I refer you to my earlier comments in response to 01/00802/OUT, 06/03636/REM, 13/01013/AMC & 13/04320/AMC & 14/05305/AMC which outlined the archaeological significance of the site and mitigation requirements. As such this application, must be considered therefore under terms the Scottish Government Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement (HESPS) 2016, Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), PAN 02/2011 and CEC Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies DES 3, ENV4, ENV8 & ENV9.

An archaeological mitigation strategy was agreed for the redevelopment of Granton Harbour in response to the original 2001 Outline application. Although various elements have been undertaken in the intervening period, principally by CFA Archaeology, with the last element of field work to the Western Harbour was undertaken in 2008.

Not all of the required mitigation has been undertaken to date, however this site occurs out with the areas requiring further detailed mitigation. As such it has been concluded that there are no known archaeological implications regarding this planning application.

Environmental Protection

We are currently assessing the submitted ground investigation report and noise impact assessment that have been submitted as part of this AMC application. Please advise if there are any other areas you required us to assess. Environmental Protection do have issues with the submitted noise impact and are not convinced that the proposed service yard would not adversely impact the proposed residential properties to the west of this development site. For example the source noise levels used from a historic measurement have been taken at a 50m distance from the source noise. The modelled number of service vehicles is low. The applicant has proposed a 1.8m timber fence however this is not an acoustic barrier.

Environmental Protection have raised concerns regarding the potential impacts this larger master planned development may have on local air quality. This was due to the increase in numbers of car parking spaces. Environmental Protection encouraged the applicant to keep parking numbers to a minimum and make provisions for electric vehicle (EV) charging throughout the development. Environmental Protection also advised the applicant that all CHP/energy plant units must comply with the Clean Air Act 1993 and that Environmental Protection will not support the use of biomass.

It is highlighted in Edinburgh's Local Transport Strategy 2014-2019 that the Council seeks to support increased use of low emission vehicles and support the extension of the network of EV charging points.

The City of Edinburgh Parking Standards for Development Management also now encourages the use of EVs. It states that the Council is likely to introduce a requirement for EV charging infrastructure which depends on how charging technology evolves this includes:

- o Dedicated parking spaces with charging facilities.*
- o Ducting and infrastructure to allow electric vehicles to be readily accommodated in the future.*

Developers should now consider the potential for EV charging as they develop their proposals. Based on currently available technology Environmental Assessment recommends that at least two Electric vehicle charging outlet should be of the following standard:

70 or 50kW (64 Amp) DC with 43kW (100 Amp) AC unit. DC charge delivered via both JEVS G105 and 62196-3 sockets, the AC supply by a 62196-2 socket. Must have the ability to be de-rated to supply 25kW to any two of the three outlets simultaneously.

It should be noted that support is available to developers to adopt EV's through the Energy Saving Trust's Sustainable Transport Advice Service and Interest Free Low Carbon Loans.

Grants are also available for the installation of EV charge points for workplaces, with funding currently available for installations. More information can be found at <http://www.energysavingtrust.org.uk/scotland/Organisations/Transport/Electric-vehicles/Electric-Vehicle-Charge-Point-Funding>

The Scottish Government and Local Authorities are working to decrease their fuel-based vehicles, replacing them with electric vehicles. Scottish Government funding has enabled the purchase of hundreds of vehicles for the public sector fleet including many Lothian based NHS Scotland vehicles which would make good use of a charging point at this 'superhub' location.

The applicant should commit to installing EV charging points and provide details of where they will be located.

If class 3 uses are being proposed the termination points of the kitchen extracts will need to be carefully considered in relation to the proposed and existing neighbouring uses.

Roads Authority Issues - date 7 November 2017

The application should be refused.

Reasons:

It is acknowledged that changes have been made to the original proposals set out in application Ref.17/01080/AMC. However, the proposed layout, parking and access arrangements are still considered to be unacceptable as set out below. As previously stated, the proposed use, medical and retail, is considered acceptable.

i. The proposed layout is considered to be contrary to policy Tra 4 Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking (LDP p.128) which states:

a) "surface car parks should not be located in front of buildings where the building would otherwise create an active frontage onto a public space or street, and main entrances to buildings should be located as close as practical to the main site entrance";

a) the design of surface car parking or entrances to car parking in buildings should not compromise pedestrian safety and should assist their safe movement to and from parked cars, for example, by the provision of marked walkways";

The proposed layout locates the car park on the street frontage and access to the main entrance is not considered to promote safety and is inconvenient.

Should you be minded to grant permission, the following should be included as conditions or informatives as appropriate:

1. 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 but this does not require to be included in any legal agreement. All disabled persons parking places must comply with Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 regulations or British Standard 8300:2009 as approved;

2. In accordance with the Council's LTS Travplan3 policy, the applicant should consider developing a draft Travel Plan prior to first occupation and a final Travel Plan within 12 months of that date. The Travel Plan should include consideration of 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 and a monitor within the property capable of displaying real time public transport information as appropriate;

3. Electric vehicle charging outlets should be considered for this development including dedicated parking spaces with charging facilities and ducting and infrastructure to allow electric vehicles to be readily accommodated in the future.

Note:

a. The 2009 parking standards for development in this area (Zone 5c) permit between 44 and 51 spaces as follows:

Medical centre:

o 45 staff - 1 per 3 staff = 15 spaces

o 17 consulting rooms - 1.5 per room = 25.5 spaces

Retail, 501.6m²:

o First 500m² - between 1 per 150m² and 1 per 50m² = 3.3 to 10 spaces

o Over 500m² - between 1 per 60m² and 1 per 35m² = 0

The proposed revised total provision of 53 spaces is considered to be acceptable (formerly 76 spaces). Cycle parking provision of 10 visitor spaces and 6 staff spaces is considered acceptable.

b. It is understood that a legal agreement was signed in connection with this site and was discharged by agreement with Forth Ports in 2012. Therefore, no further transport contributions are appropriate.

Location Plan



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