

# Development Management Sub Committee

Wednesday 23 May 2018

**Application for Planning Permission 17/03433/FUL  
At 33 Pinkhill, Edinburgh, EH12 7BF  
Demolition of existing office building and development of  
51 apartments (scheme 2)**

<b>Item number</b>	8.1
<b>Report number</b>	
<b>Wards</b>	B06 - Corstorphine/Murrayfield

## Summary

---

The proposed residential development on the site is acceptable and complies with LDP policies Hou 1 and Emp 9. The density, layout, scale, form and design are appropriate within this sustainable location. The proposal will achieve an acceptable environment for future occupiers and will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Affordable housing will be delivered on and off site through a legal agreement. Other matters relating to transport, drainage, trees and landscape are considered acceptable.

The proposal is acceptable and there are no material considerations which outweigh this conclusion.

## Outcome of previous Committee

---

This application was previously considered by Committee on 9 May 2018.

---

## Links

---

[Policies and guidance for this application](#)

LDEL01, LDES01, LDES03, LDES04, LDES05, LDES06, LDES07, LDES08, LDES11, LEN09, LEN12, LEN16, LEN21, LEN22, LEMP09, LHOU01, LHOU02, LHOU03, LHOU04, LHOU06, LTRA02, LTRA03, LTRA08, LRS01, LRS06, NSG, NSGD02, NSHAFF,

# Report

## **Application for Planning Permission 17/03433/FUL At 33 Pinkhill, Edinburgh, EH12 7BF Demolition of existing office building and development of 51 apartments (scheme 2)**

### **Recommendations**

---

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

### **Background**

---

#### **2.1 Site description**

The site, covering an area of approximately 0.43 hectares, lies to the south of Pinkhill and its current use is an office with an associated parking area. The site is linear and slopes from its northern end at Pinkhill, with a drop in height to the south, into its parking area and Pinkhill Park.

The existing office building has a net internal area of 1,935 sqm, is three storeys in height and is currently vacant. Its main pedestrian entrance is from Pinkhill with a further entrance point at the south from Pinkhill Park. It is a steel frame building consisting of brick, cladding and glazed windows. Trees, landscape planting and grass areas surround the office building. The south section of the site comprises surface car parking.

The site lies within a predominantly residential area which has a variety of housing styles and is suburban in character. The adjacent Pinkhill Park consists of four storey apartments with ground level parking, four storey apartments and three storey town houses, and is located immediately to the east and south of the site. Housing at Traquair Park East and Carrick Knowe Avenue is located immediately to the west. Carrick Knowe Golf Course lies immediately to the south. The north boundary faces on to Pinkhill.

Pedestrian and vehicular access to the site is gained from Pinkhill and Pinkhill Park and there is a disused railway line to the north of the site that is now used as a Core Path (CEC 13 Sighthill to Carrick Knowe) and cycle route.

Corstorphine Road and a number of prominent local features including Edinburgh Zoo, Silvan House and Murrayfield Hospital are all in close proximity to the north of the site.

#### **2.2 Site History**

There is no recent relevant planning history for this site. Previous applications at the site relate to the existing office use.

## Main report

---

### 3.1 Description Of The Proposal

The amended proposal comprises demolition of the existing office building and the development of 51 apartments, including:

- 4 studio apartments measuring 37 sqm;
- 15 one bed apartments measuring 52 sqm;
- 21 two bed apartments measuring from 71 - 79 sqm; and
- 11 three bed apartments measuring from 91 - 96 sqm.

A single building is proposed in a similar location to the existing office. Vehicular access to private car parking is maintained.

The proposed building is five storeys, with the fifth storey set back from the main building line. There is a stepped reduction to four and three storeys at the north elevation and a more pronounced stepped reduction to four and three storeys at the south elevation. The building footprint is similar to the existing office building, but will be located approximately 0.5m further to the east. The southern elevation will be situated approximately 4.7 m further away from apartments at no. 14 Pinkhill Park than the existing office building.

Proposed materials include acid etch sandstone panels, grey timber cladding, natural timber cladding, dark grey zinc like roof, mid-grey coloured energy efficient PVC windows and balconies/terraces with timber decking and structural glass balustrading.

Each of the apartments will have approximately 4 sqm of balcony space or access to terrace space. Ground floor apartments and fourth floor apartments will have access to terrace areas. Large windows are a feature in each of the apartments. Affordable housing will be provided on site.

The south of the site accommodates 43 car parking spaces, including three disabled spaces. Of the 43 car parking spaces, three electric vehicle parking spaces are provided. Within the car park area, 3 motorbike spaces with secure anchor points are provided. The car parking will be controlled with an entrance barrier and spaces will not be allocated. The existing car park barrier will be moved further west to allow for movement of larger vehicles and refuse collection.

A secure bicycle store with capacity for 86 bicycles is integrated within the building at the main access at the south of building. Eight visitor cycle parking spaces are provided externally at the main entrance.

A 438 sqm landscaped formal amenity space is provided at the south of the building in close proximity to the main entrance. A further informal landscaped area measuring 1,068 sqm surround the building and beech hedging at the east of the site will be retained. Two seating areas are proposed: one at the north east boundary and another at the south of the site beside Carrick Knowe golf course.

Four trees and a small group of young trees located at the east and north of the site will be removed, with four replacement trees proposed.

## Scheme 1

The proposal comprised 75 apartments including a mixture of apartment types comprising:

- 19 studio apartments measuring 36 sqm;
- 18 one bed apartments measuring 53 sqm;
- 36 two bed apartments measuring 71 sqm; and
- 2 three bed apartments each measuring 116 sqm.

Scheme 1 was taller at six storeys and had a larger footprint. The proposal was amended to allow for an increase in dual aspect apartments, provision of a new amenity space, a better mix of apartment sizes, increased building distance from TPO trees at the west facade and an overall reduction in height, mass and density.

## Supporting Statement

The applicant submitted a suite of supporting documents and studies in support of the application and these are available on the Planning and Building Standards Public Access facility:

- Design and access statement;
- Planning supporting statement;
- Pre-application consultation report;
- Transport statement and information;
- Daylighting report and sections plan;
- Residential travel pack;
- Drainage information and checklists;
- Flood risk information;
- Air quality statement;
- Sustainability Form S1 and a Low and zero carbon energy report;
- Landscape plan and amenity space plan;
- Landscape and Visual Assessment and view cone assessment;
- Arboricultural impact assessment;
- Arboricultural method statement;
- Construction method statement;
- Target market research report and Executive Summary;
- Bat survey; and
- Refuse plan & swept path analysis.

Supporting information was updated to reflect Scheme 2.

### **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 in this location;
- b) the layout, design and density are acceptable at this site;
- c) whether the proposal provides adequate amenity for future residents or will impact adversely upon amenity of neighbours;
- d) landscape proposals are acceptable;
- e) the proposal raises issues in terms of traffic or road safety;
- f) the proposal has any equalities or human rights impacts;
- g) the proposal is acceptable in relation to other relevant material considerations;
- h) there are any developer contribution requirements;
- i) the proposal meets sustainability criteria; and
- j) material representations or community council comments raise issues to be addressed.

#### a) Principle

The site is located within the Urban Area as identified in the Local Development Plan (LDP). The site is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) as well.

Criterion d), in part 1 of LDP policy Hou 1, gives priority to the delivery of housing at sites in the Urban Area, subject to compatibility with other policies in the LDP. Housing at this site is consistent with LDP policy Hou 1.

Introducing housing at the site in place of the existing vacant office building will not prejudice or inhibit the activities of any nearby employment uses and will contribute to regeneration and improvement in the wider area which meets the requirements of LDP policy Emp 9 a) and b). The site is not greater than one hectare and the proposal is not required to include floorspace for a range of business users; this meets the requirements of LDP policy Emp 9 c). The loss of office space is acceptable.

The principle of residential development at this location is acceptable subject to compliance with other LDP policies.

## b) Layout, design and density

### **Layout & Design**

The existing office building is constructed of a mixture of steel, dark brick and dark glazing. Its appearance does not reflect the predominant character of the majority of surrounding buildings.

The proposal's design and appearance is modern, with the top floor set back and the building stepped down from five storeys to four and three storeys at the north and south facades. The colour and mix of materials proposed will complement the adjacent apartments at Pinkhill Park.

The building is designed to create principal elevations to the public roads to the north and east as well as the redesigned entrance incorporating shared amenity space.

The proposed footprint respects the established layout of buildings in the area. Compared to the existing office, the building line of the proposal has been pulled back at the south façade by 4.7 m to create a dedicated amenity space. This assists in creating a sense of place.

Access to the site is taken from Pinkhill Park and maintains the existing arrangements. The presence of an underground sewer in the proposed parking area constrains any development in this area and this is a logical location for parking provision and vehicle access.

The proposal will be five storeys in height and approximately 6 m taller at its highest point than the existing office building. This is 0.2m taller than the ridge height of neighbouring five storey apartments at 1 - 3 Pinkhill Park which consist of undercroft parking at the ground level and four storeys of flats. The proposal's increased height facilitates higher density at the site.

The proposal's stepped reduction in height reflects the varying heights of buildings in the area taking reference from Pinkhill Park. The variation in the proposal's height also creates a transition to lower density housing to the west at Traquair Park East and Carrick Knowe Avenue by reducing height and massing. The topography of the site means that the north of the building which faces on to Pinkhill will appear to be two storeys from the street level which is a suitable scale of development for this part of the site.

By maintaining a similar footprint to the existing office building, the proposal's distance from neighbouring apartments at Pinkhill Park and houses at Traquair Park East is appropriate. This respects the existing urban form and established character of the area. Maintaining the existing urban grain helps to facilitate the proposal's change of use from office to residential and accommodate any effects relating to overlooking and privacy; this matter is further assessed below in Section 3.3 c).

The proposal will retain beech hedging at the east of the site and the majority of TPO trees will be retained to ensure the area's natural environment is retained. Four trees and a small group of young trees at the north of the site will be removed. However, this will not adversely affect the character of the area. The landscaped area surrounding the existing office building will be retained and forms part of the applicant's informal amenity space. Retention of these features will create an attractive residential environment.

The Edinburgh Urban Design Panel (EUDP) considered an early iteration of the proposal at the pre-application stage. Based on the EUDP's comments, the applicant has sought to implement advice provided in relation to the proposal's built form, massing, layout and height.

The layout and design of the proposal are acceptable and will be a positive contribution to the wider townscape.

#### *Mix and size of apartments*

Through LDP policy Hou 2, the Council seeks provision of a mix of house types and sizes to meet a range of housing needs. The proposal comprises a mix of studio, one bed, two bed and three bed apartments. Site constraints including its dimensions, area and presence of a sewer mean it would be difficult to deliver a different type housing. The provision of apartments of varying sizes designed with a range of users is acceptable in this instance. Floorspace requirements for each of the proposed apartment sizes meet the EDG standards.

The EDG states that in developments over 12 units, 20% of proposed units should have a minimum floor space of 91 sqm and be designed for families. The proposal meets this requirement by providing 11 three bedroom apartments measuring 91 sqm or more, equating to 21% of proposed units.

The mix of units proposed is acceptable.

#### *Amenity space*

The proposal includes 438 sqm of formal open space which has been introduced to the site by amending the building line of the south façade. This constitutes approximately 10% of the site. The retention and enhancement of the landscape space surrounding the building provides additional informal amenity space measuring approximately 1,068 sqm which is 25% of the development site. The introduction of south facing amenity space as part of the proposal introduces an area that will receive a good level of sunlight, creating an attractive new space. In addition to the amenity space provided, each apartment will have a dedicated terrace or balcony space to complement external amenity areas.

The proposal incorporates a small area of landscaping with a small bench features at the south of the car park beside Carrick Knowe Golf Course. Objections raise concern that this area will encourage anti-social behaviour. However, there is no evidence to suggest this will occur.

The provision of these private, formal and informal amenity spaces meet the requirement of LDP policy Hou 3 and will create an attractive development with well designed and useable amenity space.

## **Density**

The area surrounding the proposal contains a mixture of high and low densities and varying building footprints. The proposal's footprint is broadly similar to the existing office and apartments in Pinkhill Park and maintains the urban grain in the area.

The proposal for 51 apartments on a site measuring 0.43 hectares equates to approximately 118 dwellings per hectare; this is similar to tenemental densities seen elsewhere in suburban Edinburgh which can be up to approximately 150 dwellings per hectare. Neighbouring dwellings at Pinkhill Park which is a larger site have a density of approximately 70 dwellings per hectare and a broader mix of house types including flats and townhouses. Housing to the west of the site at Traquair Park and Carrick Knowe Avenue consists mostly of two storey detached and semi-detached housing with garden spaces and is more suburban in nature.

The increased height is most noticeable in comparison to neighbouring housing to the west. The proposal would signify a natural transition of higher density at the end of Pinkhill leading in to Traquair Park East and Carrick Knowe Avenue. Stepped reductions at the north and south ends of the proposal ensure it sits appropriately within its context. Although the proposal is higher in part than some properties in the area, it is similar to its immediate surrounding area at Pinkhill Park. The proposal will not damage local character, residential amenity or environmental quality by virtue of its density. The proposal draws on positive characteristics of the area to deliver a density that is suitable for this site.

The proposal's higher density is further justified due to its sustainable location close to a key arterial route to the city (Corstorphine Road) and the surrounding core path and cycle network.

The density of the proposal is acceptable and will not have a detrimental impact on the spatial character of the area or lead to adverse impact on local character. This is consistent with LDP policies Des 1, Des 4, Hou 4 and the Edinburgh Design Guidance (EDG).

## **Conclusion**

The proposal is acceptable in terms of its density, layout and design. It respects the established urban form in the area, its height is similar to neighbouring apartments and town houses with stepped reductions included to provide a suitable transition to lower density housing at Traquair Park East and Carrick Knowe Avenue.

The proposal complies with LDP policies Des 1 Design Quality and Context, Des 4 Development Design - Impact on Setting, Des 7 Layout Design, Des 8 Public Realm and Landscape Design, Hou 2 Housing Mix, Hou 3 Private Green Space in Housing Development, Hou 4 Housing Density and the Council's associated Edinburgh Design Guidance.

### c) Amenity

#### **Neighbouring amenity**

The proposed residential development is compatible with the surrounding area which is residential in character.

The proposal's building line and location is similar to the existing office. The proposal's south façade will be approximately 4.7 m further away from apartments at no. 14 Pinkhill Park. The proposal's west façade is moved 0.5 m to the east compared to the existing office. These changes facilitate increased height in places and reduce any effects on neighbours at no. 14 Pinkhill Park and Traquair Park East in terms of overshadowing and daylight levels.

The applicant provided information to support the proposal against criteria in the EDG relating to sunlight, overshadowing and vertical sky. The proposal will be located at sufficient distances from site boundaries and existing residential properties to ensure that requirements regarding privacy, daylighting, outlook and overshadowing, as set out in the Edinburgh Design Guidance, are met. The shadow plan provided by the applicant shows that there will be negligible effects on gardens of properties at Traquair Park East in comparison to the existing situation.

The change of use from office to residential at the site has most potential to adversely affect privacy and overlooking in gardens at 1 and 1b Traquair Park East. The proposal maintains an acceptable window to window distance from apartments at 1 - 3 Pinkhill (approx. 21 m), apartments at no. 14 Pinkhill Park (approx. 17 m) and houses at Traquair Park East (approx. 12 m). The applicant has sought to minimise any impact on privacy and overlooking by reducing the number of balconies at the west façade of the proposal to five. The floorplan shows that bedrooms are mostly located at the west side of the proposal as well and principal living areas mostly face east. When these design measures are considered in combination with the presence of TPO trees along the west boundary and the existing building, the effects on privacy and overlooking for properties at Traquair Park East is acceptable and neighbours are still afforded a good level of amenity. Neighbouring amenity will not be affected by parking or traffic.

#### **Amenity of future residents**

The internal and external amenity is addressed in Section 3.3 b). In addition the layout of the proposal ensures there is adequate amenity for future residents in relation to privacy, daylight, outlook and overshadowing.

The presence of TPO trees around the site presents a constraint on the site at the west façade in particular. To address this constraint, the applicant has included a number of dual aspect apartments with balcony or terrace spaces. The building line has been moved 0.5m to the east and further away from the semi-mature TPO trees as well. Of the 51 apartments, 27 are dual aspect. This complies with the standards in the EDG which require at least 50% of proposed dwellings to be dual aspect.

The applicant submitted a vertical sky component and average daylight analysis in support of the application which established that all but three of the proposed apartments meet the EDG requirements. The impact of trees on one apartment to the west also has a limited impact on meeting EDG daylighting standards. These four apartments are all located on the ground floor. Despite these four apartments not meeting the EDG requirement, the applicant's assessment states that adequate lux levels are provided in excess of the Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers standards. This minor non-compliance with EDG standards of four apartments is acceptable given the constraint of retaining trees and that the majority of apartments meet requirements.

The provision of dedicated formal amenity space at the south of the building, informal amenity space around the building and private external space in the form of balcony or terrace space affords a good level of amenity.

The proposal is acceptable in terms of providing a suitable level of amenity for future residents in the context of LDP policy Des 5 Development Design - Amenity and the minor infringement of the EDG is acceptable.

## **Summary**

The proposal affords a good level of amenity to future residents and does not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring residents.

The proposal accords with LDP policies Des 5 Development Design - Amenity and is acceptable in terms of the EDG.

## **d) Landscape & Trees**

### *Landscape*

An analysis of key views and a landscape and visual impact appraisal (LVIA) were submitted by the applicant. There will be a negligible effect on key views W06A and W07A identified in the EDG from locations at Carrick Knowe tram overbridge and the nearby Holiday Inn Express on Corstorphine Road from where the proposal will be partially visible. Despite this minor potential to impact on key views, the proposal sits comfortably in the wider context of the area in terms of visibility.

The LVIA concludes that the greatest change and visual impact will be in the immediate area surrounding the site by virtue of its lighter appearance and height in comparison to the current office building. The applicant has sought to mitigate the effects of the proposal on landscape and visual receptors through design measures, for example by reducing the height to match the neighbouring building to the east, stepping the building at the north and south elevations, setting back the fifth storey, moving the western and southern building line and largely following the existing building's footprint. Although the proposal does impact on the immediate views in the surrounding area by virtue of increased height, the proposal draws on the characteristics of the surrounding area and it is considered acceptable in its townscape and landscape context.

Sections 3.3 b) and c) of this report address the proposal's height, design and neighbouring amenity and these features of the proposal are acceptable in terms of the local landscape impact.

The landscape plan and planting schedule identify formal and informal areas for future occupants. These areas make up approximately 35% of the site and provide a good level of landscaping to create a sense of place. Retention of beech hedging to the east of the site and the hard and soft landscape proposals contribute to a good level of amenity. Full hard and soft landscape details and an accompanying planting plan will be secured by condition.

The proposal is acceptable in terms of its visual impact and landscape design and complies with LDP policies Des 1 Design Quality and Context, Des 4 Development Design - Impact on Setting, Des 8 Public Realm and Landscape Design and Des 11 Tall Buildings - Skyline and Key Views.

### *Trees*

The site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order which contains a mixture of nine young, early-mature and mature trees and four groups of trees largely on the site's west boundary. The applicant proposes to remove four trees and a small group of young trees which vary in physical condition. The removal of these trees will not be detrimental the character or amenity value of the site or its surrounding area. Replacement tree planting is proposed in the landscape plan and planting schedule which is acceptable mitigation to offset the loss of trees.

An arboricultural impact assessment and accompanying method statement detailing mitigation measures to protect remaining trees and root protection areas are acceptable. In order to ensure that semi-mature trees have space to grow in future, the applicant has moved the building line of the west façade 0.5 m to the east as well. A number of conditions are recommended to ensure trees are adequately protected.

Whilst the loss of TPO trees is not supported by LDP policy Env 12, the proposed replacement planting and mitigation measures are considered acceptable.

### e) Traffic & road safety

The re-use of the existing car park for residents is a suitable design solution as it is visually unobtrusive and does not compromise pedestrian access to the site. The Council's parking standards for this area (Zone 2) allow for a maximum of 51 parking spaces at this site and require a minimum of three accessible spaces, two motorcycle spaces and seven spaces for electric vehicle charging. Forty three car parking spaces are proposed, including three accessible spaces, three electric vehicle charging spaces and three secure motorcycle spaces. The Roads Authority advises that this vehicle parking provision is acceptable due to the site's proximity to public transport. There is a shortfall of four electric charging spaces. An informative has been added indicating that an additional four spaces should include ducting to allow electric charging capability if required in future. Parking at the proposal would be controlled by use of a barrier, similar to the system in place for the existing office building. Parking will not be allocated.

Two integrated secure bicycle storage areas with capacity for 86 bicycles are located in the building's ground floor. The main storage area is close to the main entrance with a second small store located to the north of the building. Eight visitor bicycle parking spaces are provided at the proposal's main entrance. The Council's parking standards require 99 spaces in total and the proposal is five spaces below this requirement. The Roads Authority is satisfied that the proposed cycle parking is acceptable and represents only a minor departure from the EDG.

The applicant has provided a travel plan for the proposal and this promotes sustainable travel. Environmental Protection advises that the travel plan should be updated when future residents occupy the building and this is covered by an informative. LDP policy Hou 4 c) supports development proposals that are located at sites with good access to public transport. The site is well situated in this regard.

Many objections raise concern with regard to the proposal's potential to impact on parking capacity at Pinkhill as well as associated safety implications. It appears that this issue arises due to a combination of the availability of on-street unallocated parking on Pinkhill and the street's proximity to Edinburgh Zoo, Murrayfield Stadium and Silvan House which can generate parking demand in the area. The Roads Authority raises no concern with regard to parking provision or road safety in the area that would arise as a result of the proposal.

The proposal complies with LDP policies Tra 2 and Tra 3.

f) Other material considerations

*Flood risk and drainage*

Flood Prevention has reviewed supporting information for the proposals against the Council's self-certification forms and is satisfied that the proposal meets all requirements. SEPA was consulted on the proposals and raises 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.

*Ecology*

The applicant submitted a bat survey report in order to establish if any adverse effects would be likely from demolishing the existing office building. The findings of the survey confirm that no evidence for the presence of bats or suitable roosting spaces were at the property. The proposal complies with the requirements of LDP policy Env 16 Species Protection.

## *Air Quality & Noise*

The applicant submitted an Air Quality Statement in support of the application. This statement confirms the site location is outwith the St. John's Road Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and there will be no impact in terms of air quality. Environmental Protection and SEPA are satisfied that the proposal is unlikely lead to adverse effects on air quality. Environmental Protection advises the applicant to produce an up-to-date green travel plan and follow best practice measures by providing adequate infrastructure for electric vehicles.

Environmental Protection advises that construction noise is regulated by Environmental Health Officers and no construction noise is permitted outwith Monday to Saturday 07:00 - 19:00. The applicant's Construction Method Statement further notes that working hours will comply with relevant regulations.

The proposal complies with the requirements of LDP policy Env 22.

## *Ground conditions and contamination*

The proposal involves demolition of the existing office building. Environmental Protection recommends that a survey is undertaken to establish any risk to human health from contaminants. It is recommended that this information is secured through a planning condition.

## *Waste Storage*

An external bin store is provided at the west boundary of the site. Waste Services have confirmed that the layout and provision meets the Council's standards.

## g) Equalities

The proposal has been considered in terms of equalities and no adverse effects are identified. The applicant will be required to comply with the provisions of the Equality Act 2010 and building regulation standards. Three accessible parking spaces are included to comply with parking standards.

## h) Developer Contributions

### *Affordable Housing*

LDP Policy Hou 6 Affordable Housing requires that residential development consisting of 12 or more units should include provision for affordable housing amounting to 25% of the total number of units proposed. For proposals of 20 or more dwellings, the provision should normally be on-site. The Council's non-statutory Guidance on Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery states that where affordable housing cannot be delivered on-site, the payment of a commuted sum may be acceptable. For this application, the 25% contribution on-site equates to 12.75 units.

The applicant has confirmed that the affordable housing contribution of 25% will be secured by providing nine units on site and a commuted sum for the remaining balance of 3.75 units. Affordable Housing is in agreement with this approach.

The amended proposal incorporates a redesigned plan form to provide nine units off a single stair core in a configuration which is acceptable to a Registered Social Landlord (RSL) in terms of future management. The applicant sought to deliver the remaining 3.75 units on site via the Council's Golden Share scheme. However, Affordable Housing confirmed a commuted sum would be preferable in this case as the units did not meet affordability criteria.

The nine RSL apartments are accessed from the north stair core at the building's west façade. This includes three x 3 bed apartments, three x 2 bed apartments and three x 1 bed apartments. The applicant is in advanced discussion with a RSL.

The commuted sum for 3.75 units will be secured through a legal agreement and the contribution value will be calculated using land values in an independent report prepared by the District Valuer which the applicant must provide.

The majority of affordable housing will be provided on site and the proposal complies with LDP Policy Hou 6 and the associated non-statutory guidance subject to a legal agreement.

### *Education and Services*

A number of representations have raised concern about potential overburdening of local services such as schools and medical services.

With regard to medical services, the site is not located within any of the health care contribution zones identified in the Council's draft supplementary guidance for Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery. Therefore, no financial contribution towards medical services is required.

Children and Families confirms that the development will not result in the need to expand local primary or secondary schools based on a calculation of 32 Flats (19 one bedroom and studio flats are excluded) and against criteria in the Council's Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery guidance. On this basis, no financial contribution towards education is required.

### i) Sustainability

The applicant submitted the Council's Sustainability Form S1 and a Low/Zero Carbon Energy Statement with the application. The proposal will utilise a brownfield site within the urban area. The existing office building will be demolished and the applicant has advised that re-use of the building is not feasible for conversion to apartments. The LDP does not require or give priority to the re-use of buildings and the applicant has provided relevant sustainability information.

The proposal is a major development and is assessed against Part B of the standards. The points achieved against the essential criteria are set out in the table below:

<b>Essential Criteria</b>	<b>Available</b>	<b>Achieved</b>
Section 1: Energy Needs	20	20
Section 2: Water conservation	10	10
Section 3: Surface Water run-off	10	10
Section 4: Recycling	10	10
Section 5: Materials	30	20
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>70</b>

The points where the application does not meet the full score for the essential criteria relates to the use of uPVC windows in the scheme. The applicant has included sustainability features such as passive solar design and desirable features such waste water heat recovery or utilisation of low and zero carbon technologies will be explored in compliance with relevant building standards regulations.

The sustainability measures are acceptable.

#### j) Representations

##### *Material Comment*

- Concern was expressed with regard to the proposal's height, impact on the surrounding area's character, parking and traffic, and infrastructure in the area - addressed in Sections 3.3 b), d), e) and g).

##### *Material Representations - Objection:*

- The proposal's height is considered inappropriate and not in-keeping with the local area - addressed in Section 3 b);
- Overdevelopment of the site and inappropriate density in comparison to surrounding buildings - addressed in Section 3 b);
- Traffic generation and congestion that the development would cause and associated safety and noise effects - addressed in Section 3 e);
- Increased pressure on parking in the surrounding area and inadequate provision of parking for the proposals - addressed in Section 3 e);
- Loss of amenity through increased traffic, construction noise and the possibility of antisocial behaviour - addressed in Section 3 c);
- Loss of sunlight, daylighting and overshadowing from the development due to its proximity to existing dwelling houses - addressed in Section 3 c);
- Overlooking and loss of privacy - addressed in Section 3 c);
- Capacity of local services and social infrastructure to accommodate the proposals including schools and GPs - addressed in Section 3 g);
- Flood risk and drainage concerns at the site resulting from the development - addressed in Section 3 f);
- Inadequate ratio of open space on the site for future residents and as well as its partial location at the south of the site - addressed in Sections 3 b), c) and d);
- Loss of employment in the area due to a change of use from business to residential - addressed in Section 3a); and

- The size of the apartments appearing to be too small - addressed in Section 3 b).

*Non-material objections:*

- Dissatisfaction expressed with the pre-application consultation process and its outcome(s) - the applicant completed pre-application consultation (PAC) in line with legislative requirements as detailed in their PAC Report;
- Construction traffic impact on local roads - this is not a planning issue;
- Impact on the nearby Corstorphine Conservation Area - the application site is outwith this area and immediate environs;
- Requests for the existing building to be retained rather than demolished and the use changed to residential - this is a matter for the applicant;
- Alleged inaccuracies in the applicant's supporting information relating to a transport assessment, the developer's transport pack, target market analysis and artists impressions - the information has been assessed by the Council as part of the application determination; and
- The developer seeking to maximise profit - this is not a planning issue.

*Community Council*

The Community Council objects to the proposals on the following grounds:

- The height of the development is out of keeping with the area and is contrary to policies Des 4, Des 11 and Hou 1 - addressed in Sections 3 b) and d);
- Impact on car parking in the area - addressed in Section 3 e);
- Impact on privacy from overlooking due to the proposal's height - addressed in Section 3 c);
- The proposal being out of character with the surrounding area - addressed in Sections 3 b), c) and d);
- Residents request the removal of the set-back fifth storey in the proposals - this is a matter for the applicant to decide upon in their proposals;
- Concern expressed about increase in housing density within the City - each planning application is assessed on its own merits with regard to density. Accordingly, density is addressed in Section 3 b) of this report;
- Impact on air pollution at St. John's Road and Queensferry road - addressed in Section 3 f);
- Impact on overshadowing and privacy - addressed in Section 3 b);
- Density proposed considerably exceeding the level in the area and associated impacts on character, traffic and infrastructure - addressed in Sections 3 b), e) and g); and
- Development should be scaled back to ideally three or four stories to reflect surrounding density - addressed in Section 3 b).

## Conclusion

The proposed residential development on the site is acceptable and complies with LDP policies Hou 1 and Emp 9. The density, layout, scale, form and design is appropriate within this sustainable location. The proposal will achieve a good environment for future occupiers and will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Affordable housing will be delivered on and off-site through a legal agreement and other matters relating to transport, drainage, trees and landscape is considered acceptable.

The proposal is acceptable subject to a number of conditions and the conclusion of a suitable legal agreement. There are no material considerations which outweigh this conclusion.

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

### **3.4 Conditions/reasons/informatives**

#### **Conditions:-**

1. A fully detailed landscape plan, including details of all hard and soft surface and boundary treatments and all planting, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority before work is commenced on site.
2. The trees on the site shall be protected during the construction period by the erection of fencing, in accordance with BS 5837:2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction".
3. Prior to the commencement of development the approved tree protection plan must be implemented in full. Works must be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment report number 10787\_R01b\_GB\_HM (27 July 2017) and the Arboricultural Method Statement report number 10787\_R02c\_HT\_JW (July 2017).
4. Prior to the commencement of construction works on site:
  - a) A site survey (including intrusive investigation where necessary) must be carried out by the applicant to establish, either that the level of risk posed to human health and the wider environment by contaminants in, on or under the land is acceptable, or that remedial and/or protective measures could be undertaken to bring the risks to an acceptable level in relation to the development; and
  - b) Where necessary, a detailed schedule of any required remedial and/or protective measures, including their programming, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.
    - ii) Any required remedial and/or protective measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved schedule and documentary evidence to certify those works shall be provided for the approval of the Planning Authority.

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

**Informatives**

It should be noted that:

1. Permission should not be issued until the applicant has entered into a suitable legal agreement to ensure affordable housing is provided.

The affordable housing contribution shall comprise 9 units on-site. An additional off-site contribution for 3.75 units is also required. The value of the commuted sum for the 3.75 off-site units shall be informed by an independent land valuation set by the District Valuer which shall be provided at the developer's own cost.

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.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.
3. In accordance with the Council's LTS Travplan3 policy, the applicant should submit an updated Travel Plan within 6 months of the development being occupied.
4. 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.

5. The Council's 2017 Parking Standards indicate that seven of the proposed 43 parking spaces should have electric charging capability. In addition to the three electric vehicle charging spaces proposed, an additional four spaces should be ducted to allow electric vehicles to be readily accommodated in the future.
6. No development shall take place on the site until a 'Notice of Initiation of Development' has been submitted to the Council stating the intended date on which the development is to commence. Failure to do so constitutes a breach of planning control, under Section 123(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.
7. As soon as practicable upon the completion of the development of the site, as authorised in the associated grant of permission, a 'Notice of Completion of Development' must be given, in writing to the Council.

## **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.

## 8.2 Publicity summary of representations and Community Council comments

The application was publicised on the weekly list of applications on 31st July 2017. Neighbours were notified of the application on 1 August 2017 and 21 days were allowed for comments. The proposals that formed Scheme 1 received 147 objections, one comment in support, and no general comments.

Neighbours and other interested parties who previously commented on Scheme 1 were re-notified on 20 March 2018 to allow for comments to be submitted on revised plans for Scheme 2. Neighbours were allowed 21 days to comment and other interested parties were allowed 14 days. A total of 150 representations were received for Scheme 2; 149 objections and one general comment.

Corstorphine Community Council submitted representations objecting to Schemes 1 and 2.

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](#)

<b>Statutory Development Plan Provision</b>	The application site is shown to be in the Urban Area in the adopted Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP).
<b>Date registered</b>	24 July 2017
<b>Drawing numbers/Scheme</b>	1,2B,3B,4D,5B,6B,7B,8A,9A,10,11B,12C,13,14,15A,16,17A,18A,19A,20,21A,22-24,

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

Contact: Sean Fallon, Planning Officer  
 E-mail:sean.fallon@edinburgh.gov.uk Tel:0131 469 3723

## **Links - Policies**

---

### **Relevant Policies:**

LDP Policy Del 1 (Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery) identifies the circumstances in which developer contributions will be required.

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 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 11 (Tall Buildings - Skyline and Key Views) sets out criteria for assessing proposals for tall buildings.

LDP Policy Env 9 (Development of Sites of Archaeological Significance) sets out the circumstances in which development affecting sites of known or suspected archaeological significance will be permitted.

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 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 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 2 (Housing Mix) requires provision of a mix of house types and sizes in new housing developments to meet a range of housing needs.

LDP Policy Hou 3 (Private Green Space in Housing Development) sets out the requirements for the provision of private green space in housing development.

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

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 8 (Provision of Transport Infrastructure) sets out requirements for assessment and mitigation of transport impacts of new development.

LDP Policy RS 1 (Sustainable Energy) sets criteria for assessing proposals for environmentally sustainable forms of energy systems.

LDP Policy RS 6 (Water and Drainage) sets a presumption against development where the water supply and sewerage is inadequate.

### **Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines**

**Non-Statutory guidelines** Edinburgh Design Guidance supports development of the highest design quality and that integrates well with the existing city. It sets out the Council's expectations for the design of new development, including buildings, parking, streets and landscape, in Edinburgh.

**Non-statutory guidelines** - on affordable housing gives guidance on the situations where developers will be required to provide affordable housing.

# Appendix 1

## **Application for Planning Permission 17/03433/FUL At 33 Pinkhill, Edinburgh, EH12 7BF Demolition of existing office building and development of 51 apartments (scheme 2)**

### **Consultations**

---

#### **Archaeology comment - 2 July 2017**

*The application site has been significantly affected by recent 20th century development. Given location of the site and the nature and scale of this development, it is considered unlikely that significant archaeological remains will have survived insitu on this site.*

*Accordingly, it has been concluded that there are no known archaeological implications in regards to this application.*

#### **Archaeology further comment - 21 March 2018**

*As stated in response to the original scheme, the application site has been significantly affected by recent 20th century development. As such it was considered unlikely that significant archaeological remains will have survived insitu on this site. These views have not altered since then and therefore it is concluded that there are no known archaeological implications in regards to this second scheme.*

#### **Environmental Assessment comment - 4 August 2017**

*The application site currently houses a 3-storey office block. It was used as an office by ST Microelectronics and has capacity to accommodate circa 200 members of staff. The application site is near the St Johns Road and City Centre Air Quality Management Areas. The proposal is for the demolition of the existing office building and the development of 75 residential apartments with 43 car parking spaces.*

## Local Air Quality

*The car parking provision including 3 electric vehicles charging spaces and a space for a car club are delivered as part of the development. The proposed 43 car parking spaces is five spaces short of complying with the Parking Standards for Development Management. Environmental Protection considers that a five-space shortfall is acceptable. As a car club space is proposed to the east of the entrance barrier and there will be provision for 119 secure bicycle spaces including 8 visitor cycle spaces at the entrance of the development. The applicant has also included a residential travel pack which is good but it is out of date. The eco driving advice is not current as there is no mention of plug-in electric provisions, also the phone numbers for the taxi firm's and car share facilitators are incorrect. The travel pack should provide future tenants with guidance on concepts that may be new to them such as how to operate an electric vehicle charger and how to use car clubs. It is also recommended that free public travel passes are provided to new tenants along with the travel pack.*

*Environmental Protection are satisfied that the impacts of this proposed development will be limited when compared to the current consented use. The applicant has kept the numbers of car parking spaces to a minimum, committed to good cycle provisions, electric vehicle charging facilities and supported with a travel pack. It is recommended that the travel pack is refreshed. Due to the proximity of the air quality management areas Environmental Protection will recommend the electric vehicle charging points are fully installed and operational prior to occupation.*

## Noise

*Environmental Protection have no concerns regarding noise during the operation phase. However, the construction phase of the development may have an adverse impact on neighbouring residential properties. It should be noted that any construction noise is regulated by Environmental Health Officers with no construction noise permitted outwith the falling periods; Monday to Saturday 07:00- 19:00.*

## Contaminated Land

*Ground conditions relating to potential contaminants in, on or under the soil as affecting the site will require investigation and evaluation, in line with current technical guidance such that the site is (or can be made) suitable for its intended new use/s. Any remediation requirements require to be approved by the Planning & Building Standards service. The investigation, characterisation and remediation of land can normally be addressed through attachment of appropriate conditions to a planning consent (except where it is inappropriate to do so, for example where remediation of severe contamination might not be achievable).*

*Therefore, in conclusion Environmental Protection do not object to the application subject to the following conditions;*

## Conditions

1. *Prior to the commencement of construction works on site:*

a) A site survey (including intrusive investigation where necessary) must be carried out to establish, either that the level of risk posed to human health and the wider environment by contaminants in, on or under the land is acceptable, or that remedial and/or protective measures could be undertaken to bring the risks to an acceptable level in relation to the development; and

b) Where necessary, a detailed schedule of any required remedial and/or protective measures, including their programming, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

ii) Any required remedial and/or protective measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved schedule and documentary evidence to certify those works shall be provided for the approval of the Planning Authority.

2. Electric Vehicle charging outlet (wall or ground mounted) shall be located as per drawing number PIN\_APL\_30 dated July 2017 and be of the following standard:

Type 2 (EN62196-2), Mode 3 (EN61851-1) compliant and be twin outlet. With the ability to supply 22 kW (32 Amps) AC - Three Phase power and have the ability to be de rated to supply 11 kW to each outlet when both are in use. Where this is not possible then 7 kW (32 Amps) AC - Single Phase chargers that have the ability to deliver power of 7 kW capacity to each outlet simultaneously.

## **Environmental Assessment comment updated - 20 April 2018**

The applicant has amended the proposed plans. The application site currently houses a 3-storey office block. It was used as an office by ST Microelectronics and has capacity to accommodate circa 200 members of staff. The application site is near the St Johns Road and City Centre Air Quality Management Areas. The proposal is for the demolition of the existing office building and the development of 52 apartments instead of the previously proposed 75 residential apartments with 43 car parking spaces.

### **Local Air Quality**

The car parking provision originally included 3 electric vehicles charging spaces and a space for a car club vehicle delivered as part of the development. The amended application no longer included a car club space which is disappointing. The applicant does has also included a residential travel pack which is good but it is out of date. The eco driving advice is not current as there is no mention of plug-in electric provisions, also the phone numbers for the taxi firm's and car share facilitators are incorrect. The travel pack should provide future tenants with guidance on concepts that may be new to them such as how to operate an electric vehicle charger and how to use car clubs. It is also recommended that free public travel passes are provided to new tenants along with the travel pack.

The applicant had submitted a supporting air quality impact assessment due to the site proximity to the St Johns Road and City Centre Air Quality Management Area. It is noted that the amended air quality impact assessment has not been accurately updated. However, as the parking numbers have not changed then Environmental Protection are satisfied if the applicant commits to installing Electric Vehicle charging point.

*Air quality mitigation for the operational phase can be limited however the applicant must ensure that as a minimum they install electric vehicle charging points in accordance with the Edinburgh Design Standards and install low NOX boiler to the residential properties.*

*Environmental Protection encourage the developer to work with this department to produce an up-to-date Green Travel Plan which should incorporate the following measures to help mitigate traffic related air quality impacts;*

- 1. Keep Car Parking levels to minimum.*
- 2. Car Club facilities (electric and/or low emission vehicles).*
- 3. Provision of rapid electric vehicle charging facilities.*
- 4. Provision of rapid electric vehicle charging facilities.*
- 5. Public transport incentives for residents.*
- 6. Improved cycle/pedestrian facilities and links.*

*The Scottish Government in the 'Government's Programme for Scotland 2017-18 has a new ambition on ultra-low emission vehicles, including electric cars and vans, with a target to phase out the need for petrol and diesel vehicles by 2032. This is underpinned by a range of actions to expand the charging network, support innovative approaches, and encourage the public sector to lead the way, with developers incorporating charging points in new developments.*

*The applicant must be aware that there are now requirements stipulated in the Edinburgh Design Guidance must be achieved. Edinburgh has made progress in encouraging the adoption of electric/hybrid plug-in vehicles, through deployment of extensive charging infrastructure. As plug-in vehicles make up an increasing percentage of the vehicles on our roads, their lack of emissions will contribute to improving air quality especially as this site is located near an AQMA, furthermore their quieter operation will mean that a major source of noise will decrease.*

*The Sustainable Energy Action Plan is the main policy supporting the Council's Electric Vehicle Framework. Increasing the number of plug-in vehicles and charging infrastructure in Edinburgh will provide substantial reductions in road transport emissions.*

*To ensure that the infrastructure required by the growing number of electric vehicles users is delivered, one of every six spaces should include a fully connected and ready to use electric vehicle charging point, in developments where ten or more car parking spaces are proposed. Electric vehicle parking spaces should be counted as part of the overall car parking provision and not in addition to it.*

*Due to the proximity to the AQMA as a minimum Environmental Protection would recommend that 7Kw charging provision will be required for all residential properties. Information on chargers is detailed in the Edinburgh Design Standards Technical Information Design Standards.*

*Environmental Protection are satisfied that the impacts of this proposed development will be limited when compared to the current consented use. The applicant has kept the numbers of car parking spaces to a minimum, committed to good cycle provisions, electric vehicle charging facilities and supported with a travel pack. It is recommended that the travel pack is refreshed. Due to the proximity of the air quality management areas Environmental Protection will recommend the electric vehicle charging points are fully installed and operational prior to occupation serving 100% of the spaces.*

#### *Noise*

*Environmental Protection have no concerns regarding noise during the operation phase. However, the construction phase of the development may have an adverse impact on neighbouring residential properties. It should be noted that any construction noise is regulated by Environmental Health Officers with no construction noise permitted outwith the falling periods; Monday to Saturday 07:00- 19:00.*

#### *Contaminated Land*

*Ground conditions relating to potential contaminants in, on or under the soil as affecting the site will require investigation and evaluation, in line with current technical guidance such that the site is (or can be made) suitable for its intended new use/s. Any remediation requirements require to be approved by the Planning & Building Standards service. The investigation, characterisation and remediation of land can normally be addressed through attachment of appropriate conditions to a planning consent (except where it is inappropriate to do so, for example where remediation of severe contamination might not be achievable).*

*Therefore, in conclusion Environmental Protection do not object to the application subject to the following conditions;*

#### *Conditions*

*1. Prior to the commencement of construction works on site:*

*a) A site survey (including intrusive investigation where necessary) must be carried out to establish, either that the level of risk posed to human health and the wider environment by contaminants in, on or under the land is acceptable, or that remedial and/or protective measures could be undertaken to bring the risks to an acceptable level in relation to the development; and*

*b) Where necessary, a detailed schedule of any required remedial and/or protective measures, including their programming, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.*

*ii) Any required remedial and/or protective measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved schedule and documentary evidence to certify those works shall be provided for the approval of the Planning Authority.*

*2. All residential parking spaces shall be served by 7Kw electric vehicle charging sockets and shall be installed and operational in full prior to the development being occupied.*

## **SEPA comment - 14 August 2017**

*We have no objection to the proposed development. Notwithstanding this we would expect Edinburgh Council to undertake their responsibilities as the Flood Prevention Authority.*

*This advice is given without prejudice to any decision made on elements of the proposal regulated by us, which may take account of factors not considered at the planning application stage.*

### *Advice for the planning authority*

#### *1. Flood Risk*

##### *Technical Report*

*1.1 We have reviewed the information provided in this consultation and it is noted that the application site (or parts thereof) lies within the medium likelihood (0.5% annual probability or 1 in 200 year) flood extent of the SEPA Flood Map, and may therefore be at medium to high risk of surface water flooding.*

*The proposed finished floor levels are quoted at 97.2 m. The footprint of the development is located between the 40 mAOD and 50 mAOD contours therefore this proposed FFL refers to a temporary bench mark. We also note that drainage calculations refer to manhole covers set at 97.05 m which again must be related to a temporary bench mark. To ensure that the development is constructed according to its intended design we strongly recommend that all critical design levels are quoted in metres above Ordnance Datum.*

*1.3 As the general area appears to be vulnerable to surface water flooding we advise that minimum FFL's should be set above surrounding ground levels to reduce the risk of flooding from ponding surface water. We advise that drawings show the car park to slope towards the development with the lowest part at the southern side of the development. We would strongly recommend that drainage measures are put at the front of the building to mitigate any surface water ponding. We note that drainage calculations have been submitted. However we would advise that the rainfall depth duration frequency data used in these calculations has been superseded by FEH13. The M5-60 (mm) index rainfall used in these calculations is 12% lower than the updated figure for this location. We strongly recommend that the most up to date FEH13 rainfall data is applied in a review of these calculations.*

#### *2. Surface Water Drainage*

*2.1 In accordance with the requirements of The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011, also known as The Controlled Activity Regulations (CAR) surface water runoff arising from the hardstanding areas, inclusive of roads and roofs will require to be collected, treated and disposed of using sustainable drainage techniques.*

2.2 We have reviewed the relevant information provided in relation to the provision of SUDS on site. Based on the design details provided within the report we are satisfied that the applicant is proposing to provide the required level of treatment as required. The applicant will be required to ensure compliance with General Binding Rule 10 & 11 as outlined in the SUDS Manual (C697).

2.3 We have not considered the water quantity aspect of this scheme. Comments from Scottish Water, where appropriate, the Local Authority Roads Department and the Local Authority Flood Prevention Unit should be sought on any water quantity issues including the acceptability of post-development runoff rates for flood control.

Detailed advice for the applicant

### 3. Flood Risk Caveats & Additional Information for the applicant

3.1 The SEPA Flood Maps have been produced following a consistent, nationally-applied methodology for catchment areas equal to or greater than 3km<sup>2</sup> using a Digital Terrain Model (DTM) to define river corridors and low-lying coastal land. The maps are indicative and designed to be used as a strategic tool to assess flood risk at the community level and to support planning policy and flood risk management in Scotland. For further information please visit <http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/water/flooding/flood-maps/>

3.2 Please note that we are reliant on the accuracy and completeness of any information supplied by the applicant in undertaking our review, and can take no responsibility for incorrect data or interpretation made by the authors.

3.3 The advice contained in this letter is supplied to you by SEPA in terms of Section 72 (1) of the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 on the basis of information held by SEPA as at the date hereof. It is intended as advice solely to Edinburgh Council as Planning Authority in terms of the said Section 72 (1). Our briefing note entitled: "Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009: Flood risk advice to planning authorities" outlines the transitional changes to the basis of our advice in line with the phases of this legislation and can be downloaded from <http://www.sepa.org.uk/environment/land/planning/guidance-and-advice-notes/>

### **SEPA comment - 04 April 2018**

We have no objection to this planning application, but please note the advice provided below.

We were consulted on this proposal last year. In our response of 14 August 2017 (our reference PCS/154344). The application has been amended to reduce the proposed number of flats from 75 to 51. A revised Air Quality Statement has also been submitted.

#### 1. Air Quality

1.1 We are in agreement with the City of Edinburgh Council: an air quality impact assessment has not been submitted. It is not possible, therefore, to quantify the potential impacts of the proposed development on the St John's Road Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

1.2 We note, however, that the Air Quality Statement outlines some commitment to good practice for air quality mitigation in the operational phase of development. This includes a secure cycle store and a car club parking space which we support. We would also encourage the planning authority to request that the applicant installs electric vehicle 7Kw chargers in addition to measures already proposed.

### **Corstorphine Community Council - 01/04/2018**

*We have had representations from residents local to this development whose main concern is the limited amount of car parking provision and impact on surrounding streets etc. should the development go ahead with the proposed numbers of flatted accommodation.*

*The developers have submitted a lengthy traffic report in which they admit that the provision of car parking spaces falls short by 7 places of the minimum number suggested in Design standards but stress the proximity to modes of public transport and provision for cycle and motorcycles etc.*

*Given the relatively restricted types of accommodation proposed most of the flats offered are likely to be for rent to a relatively young and 'floating' population rather than settled families or elderly - those most likely to wish access to motorised transport.*

*The developers have indicated that in their 'Welcome Packs' notification will be given of the limitation of parking spaces but I would ask if there likely to be a possibility of legal restrictions within the deeds of conditions in the sale or renting of these dwellings limiting or prohibiting car ownership?*

### **Corstorphine Community Council further comment - 2 April 2018**

*Since the launch of the Planning Application Notification and the application itself we have had discussions with the developer; agents acting on their behalf and received various representations from local resident groups wishing to express objections to the proposal.*

*We have held several informal meetings with representatives of these groups and a formal presentation at our scheduled public meeting held on Wednesday 16th August 2017.*

*The objections presented by local residents can perhaps be summarised as follows -*

*Height of the development with implications for over shading and privacy issues - the height of existing flatted properties in the locality and elsewhere in most of the outer City suburban area is four stories whereas this development is for six and would tend to dominate the immediate vicinity and surroundings with negative effect on its general character and be considered inappropriate. They also consider that the proposed large window sizes on the development would have adverse privacy effects on existing residential properties.*

*The density of housing on the proposed footprint exceeds considerably that of the surrounding residential area and the Corstorphine locality - there is an ongoing general objection to increasing developmental density on grounds of impact on area character & general environment, car parking, traffic flows, infrastructure etc. which is well documented.*

*The other major concern is the impact on the existing car parking situation given the development of 75 additional housing units. The developers themselves admit that the proposed car parking provision falls short of the City Design Guidance requirements by some 7/8 places and have attempted mitigation by posting on the Planning portal website a lengthy transport document extolling the location with its propinquity to public transport, cycle and motorcycle parking facilities, walkways and general nodal interconnectivity.*

*The residents complain that present car parking provision is problematical with competition for daytime spaces on the nearby adopted public roads and disputes within the existing flatted area.*

*There is thus a justified perception of a likely adverse change in parking pattern from one with a considerable daytime element to a larger evening / overnight with the demise of local employment and replacement with a residential requirement. It is noted that the proposed accommodation is marginally above minimum living space and internal storage requirements and thus less suitable for long - stay family usage but more attractive to a short term renting and leasing population of which a considerable proportion are likely to be possessed of four wheeled vehicles.*

*The developers themselves acknowledge this problem by highlighting the limited car parking but extolling the cycle / motorcycle provision in their advertising literature and 'Welcome Packs' but it seems doubtful that any legal constraint could be imposed on car ownership and Edinburgh City Council themselves admit that the 'Car Habit' is difficult to break.*

--

*The considered view of Corstorphine Community Council is that -*

*o The Community Council do not oppose the proposed housing development per se but request that the scale be modified to accord with present surrounding density; ideally three stories and no more than four stories in height. We are conscious that we will shortly be asked for views on another proposed development of three stories in Pinkhill. While we accept that each development requires to be accessed on its individual merits we are looking to the City Council for consistency in approval of the height of buildings in our area;*

*o The Community Council continually receive complaints from residents concerning parking issues. These include recent allowed developments where the impact of additional parking demands was a material objection. Therefore we request that car parking provision for the proposed development be within at least the technical guide lines. The reduction in the height of the building (and consequent reduction in the number of flats) should help facilitate this;*

*o The Community Council welcomes the developer's decision to provide facilities for residents who are cyclists. We are committed to supporting changes in behaviours that encourage the use of the abundant public transport; cycling and walking.*

## **Transport comment - 26 September 2017**

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

- 1. 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;*
- 2. In support of the Council's LTS Cars1 policy, the applicant should contribute the sum £7,000 towards the provision of car club vehicles in the area;*
- 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 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.*

*Note:*

*The applicant proposes 42 parking spaces in addition to a car club space which is 5 spaces short of the 47 spaces required based on the Council's parking provision for zone 3. The 42 parking provision for the development is considered acceptable due to the site's accessibility by public transport; and also the provision of car club space is considered to reduce the level of car ownership. The applicant proposes 119 secure cycle storage with 8 visitor spaces which complies with the Council's parking standards for cycle storage.*

## **Transport updated comment - 20 April 2018**

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

- a. 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;*

b. 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.

c. The Council's 2017 Parking Standards requires 7 of the proposed 43 parking spaces to have electric charging capability. The 7 parking spaces should at least be ducted to allow electric vehicles to be readily accommodated in the future, which is not the case as part of the applicant's current proposals;

Note:

The applicant proposes 43 car parking spaces and 3 motorcycle spaces and complies with the Council's 2017 Parking Standards in Zone 2 which sets a maximum provision permissible of 51 parking spaces and a minimum of 2 spaces respectively for car and motorcycle parking. The applicant proposed 3 accessible parking provision. The 43 car parking spaces proposed for the development is considered acceptable due to the site's accessibility by public transport. The applicant proposed 86 internal secure cycle parking provision and 8 visitor cycle parking and is 5 spaces short of the minimum provision required by the Council's 2017 parking standards in Zone 2 but is considered acceptable.

## **Affordable Housing comment - 27 September 2017**

### *1. Introduction*

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

*o 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.*

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

### *2. Affordable Housing Provision*

*This application is for a development consisting of 75 homes and as such the AHP will apply. There will be an AHP requirement for a minimum of 25% (18) homes of approved affordable tenures. We request that the developer enters an early dialogue with the Council:*

*o The tenure of the affordable housing must be agreed by the Council and;*

*o The Council will identify the Registered Social Landlord(s) (RSLs) to take forward the affordable homes, and deliver a well integrated and representative mix of affordable housing on site.*

*The applicant has stated that the affordable housing will account for 25% of the new homes. This is welcomed by the department. The applicant has not identified the location and mix of affordable homes. The applicant has proposed to deliver a mix of studio, one, two and three bedroom flats. As studio apartments are not suitable for affordable housing we ask the applicant to discuss the provision of the onsite housing for this development. We also ask the applicant to provide the location and design standards proposed for the affordable housing as 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. An equitable and fair share of parking for affordable housing, consistent with the parking requirements set out in the Edinburgh Design Guidance, is provided.*

*In terms of accessibility, the affordable homes must be situated within close proximity (within 400 metres) of regular public transport links and are located next to local amenities. It is important that an equitable and fair share of parking for affordable housing, consistent with the parking requirements set out in the Edinburgh Design Guidance, is provided.*

### 3. Summary

*The applicant has made a commitment to provide 25% on site affordable housing and this is welcomed by the department. These will be secured by a Section 75 Legal Agreement. This department welcomes this approach which will assist in the delivery of a mixed sustainable community.*

- o The applicant is requested to enter into an early dialogue with the Council who will identify Registered Social Landlord(s) (RSLs) to deliver the affordable housing.*
- o The location and tenure of the affordable housing must be agreed with the Council.*
- o The affordable housing must include a variety of house types and sizes to reflect the provision of homes across the wider site and must be agreed with the council.*
- o All the affordable homes must meet the Edinburgh Design Guidance and also meet the relevant Housing Association Design Guidance size and space standards.*
- o 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".*
- o An equitable and fair share of the parking for affordable housing, consistent with the parking requirements set out in the Edinburgh Design Guidance, is provided.*
- o The applicant will be required to enter into a Section 75 legal agreement to secure the affordable housing element of this proposal.*

## **Affordable Housing further comment - 11 April 2018**

### 1. Introduction

*I refer to the consultation request from the Planning Department about this planning application.*

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

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

## *2. Affordable Housing Provision*

*This application is for a development consisting of 51 homes and as such the AHP will apply. There will be an AHP requirement for a minimum of 25% (12.75) homes of approved affordable tenure.*

*The applicant has stated that the affordable housing will account for 25% of the new homes, which will consist of 9 homes for the Lars Housing trust (a RSL) and a commuted sum of 3.75. This is welcomed by the department. The applicant has proposed to deliver the on-site housing as a mix of one and two bedroom flats for Mid-Market rent, this is welcomed by the department. We ask the applicant to ensure that the affordable housing 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.*

*In terms of accessibility, the affordable homes must be situated within close proximity (within 400 metres) of regular public transport links and are located next to local amenities. It is important that an equitable and fair share of parking for affordable housing, consistent with the parking requirements set out in the Edinburgh Design Guidance, is provided and we would ask the applicant to reach an agreement with the RSL regarding the parking provision for the affordable housing.*

## *3. Summary*

*The applicant has made a commitment to provide 25% affordable housing with a mix of on-site housing and a commuted sum, and this is welcomed by the department. These will be secured by a Section 75 Legal Agreement. This department welcomes this approach which will assist in the delivery of a mixed sustainable community.*

- o *The applicant has identified the Registered Social Landlord (RSLs) as who will deliver the 12.75 affordable housing requirement as follows;*
  - *9 homes for mid-market rent*
  - *Committed sum for 3.75 homes*
- o *The on-site affordable housing will a mix of one and two bedroom flats.*
- o *All the on-site affordable homes must meet the Edinburgh Design Guidance and also meet the relevant Housing Association Design Guidance size and space standards.*
- o *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".*
- o *An equitable and fair share of the parking for affordable housing, consistent with the parking requirements set out in the Edinburgh Design Guidance, is provided.*
- o *The Committed sum amount for the 3.75 homes is to be based on independent valuation as provided by a District Valuer.*

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

### **Flood Prevention comment - 17 November 2017**

*Flood Planning have reviewed the information supplied by the developer. We are satisfied that Flood Planning requirements have been met and we have no objections to the proposals.*

### **Flood Prevention further comment - 10 April 2018**

*Flood Prevention have no further comment for determination.*

### **Communities and Families comment - 22 March 2018**

*The Council has assessed the impact of the growth set out in the LDP through an Education Appraisal (January 2018), taking account of school roll projections. To do this, an assumption has been made as to the amount of new housing development which will come forward ('housing output'). This takes account of new housing sites allocated in the LDP and other land within the urban area.*

*In areas where additional infrastructure will be required to accommodate the cumulative number of additional pupils, education infrastructure 'actions' have been identified. The infrastructure requirements and estimated delivery dates are set out in the Council's Action Programme (January 2018).*

*Residential development is required to contribute towards the cost of delivering these education infrastructure actions to ensure that the cumulative impact of development can be mitigated. In order that the total delivery cost is shared proportionally and fairly between developments, Education Contribution Zones have been identified and 'per house' and 'per flat' contribution rates established. These are set out in the draft Supplementary Guidance on 'Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Delivery' (January 2018).*

#### *Assessment and Contribution Requirements*

*Assessment based on:*

*32 Flats (19 one bedroom and studio flats excluded)*

*This site falls within Sub-Area W-4 of the 'West Edinburgh Education Contribution Zone'.*

*Using the pupil generation rates set out in the Supplementary Guidance, the development of 32 flats is expected to accommodate one additional primary school pupil but is not expected to generate at least one additional secondary school pupil.*

*The Council's Action Programme does not identify a need for additional primary school infrastructure within this Sub-Area. Although the Appraisal did not take account of the proposed development, no additional education infrastructure will be required to mitigate the impact of the additional primary school pupil.*

*No contribution towards education infrastructure will therefore be required.*

## **Waste Services comment - 20 April 2018**

### *Provision and collection of waste containers*

#### *Bin store - 51 properties*

*7 x 1280 litre Residual  
5 x 1280 litre Mixed Recycling  
2 x 660 litre Glass  
2 x 500 litre FW*

*However, it should be noted that due to changes within the service over the next three years, the bin requirements will change, and you should review these with us prior to starting work.*

#### *Access and servicing the bins*

- o All roads requiring access by waste collection vehicles will be built to an adoptable standard.*
- o Standard yellow line marking should be provided where vehicle access to bin storage areas will be required. It will be the architect's responsibility to contact city development if line markings are required.*
- o The maximum distance a vehicle will reverse along an access road is 15 metres where a turning area is not provided and this should be evidenced on the swept path analysis.  
As the reversing distance along the access road is almost the maximum allowed, the double yellow lines must be provided along the access road leading to bin store to prevent car parking and to allow safe access to the bin store.*
- o The distance for the transportation of communal waste containers from the collection point to the vehicle should be kept to a minimum, a straight pull of 10 metres is the maximum acceptable distance.*
- o Drop kerbs should be provided for any route from the bin store to the collection vehicle.*
- o Budget locks should be fitted on all doors to bin stores.*
- o Temporary street signage should be installed if permanent signage will be unavailable at the time of delivery/servicing.*

## **Edinburgh Urban Design Panel - 22 February 2017**

### *Summary*

*The Panel welcomes the opportunity to review the proposal.*

#### *1 Recommendations*

*1.1 In developing the design, the Panel supports the following aspects and therefore advocates that these should remain in the proposals:*

- o The loss of the existing office building*
- o The proposed residential use*

*1.2 In developing the proposals the Panel suggests the following matters should be addressed:*

- o *Comprehensive urban analysis*
- o *Reduction in the built form and density*
- o *Reconsider the proposed unit mix and tenure*
- o *Re-design of the siting, height, mass and form of the development*
- o *Reduction in carparking and redesign of parking areas*
- o *Usable and sunlit open /private space to be provided*

## *Main Report*

### *2 Introduction*

*2.1 The proposal is to demolish the existing office building and replace with a five/six storey residential development. The site, covering an area of approximately 0.49 hectares, lies to the south of Pinkhill. There is a three-storey office building on the site. Pinkhill Park is to the east of the site. Houses on Traquair Park East and Carrick Knowe Avenue back on to the west of the site. Carrick Knowe Golf Course lies to the south. There are trees subject to a tree preservation order on site.*

*2.2 This is the first time that the proposals have been reviewed.*

*2.3 No declarations of interest were made by any Panel members in relation to this scheme.*

*2.4 This report should be read in conjunction with the following pre meeting papers; Planning Issues Paper prepared by City of Edinburgh Council and presentation material prepared by the presenting team.*

*2.5 This report is the view of the Panel and is not attributable to any one individual. The report does not prejudice any of the organisations who are represented at the Panel forming a differing view about the proposals at a later stage.*

### *3 Use*

*3.1 The Panel supported the proposed residential use for the site. However, they were of the view that the proposed unit mix is not appropriate for this part of the city and that that given the context more family and affordable units should be provided.*

*3.2 The Panel supported the loss of the office use and existing building as it did not make a positive contribution to the character of the local area.*

### *4 Layout, Height and Mass*

*4.1 The Panel considered that this proposal represented an overdevelopment of the site.*

4.2 The Panel noted that a detailed urban analysis is required to be carried out to support a design for the site. This analysis should take account of the site constraints which includes the mature and TPO trees some of which are not on the application site. Also, the site is very constrained given its orientation and width. With respect to this analysis it was acknowledged by the Panel that there is variety and fragmentation in the existing urban context. This in itself presents a challenge with a proposal looking to repair the urban grain.

4.3 It was also noted in the discussions, that the provision of east / west sections would assist understanding of the level changes across the site and the relationship of the existing built form of neighbouring properties and resultant open space with respect to these edges and the mature trees.

4.4 The proposed six/five storey option was not supported by the majority of the Panel. The Panel were of the view that six/five storey design is too high for the site and therefore should be reduced to reflect the prevailing height in the area. However, the Panel noted that taking reference from the context of the adjacent mature trees it may be possible for some parts of the development to be six storeys high however not in the current mass and form.

4.5 The Panel considered the design to be monolithic in form and was not supported. It was suggested that a more broken form and or two buildings should be considered for the site. This form of development could allow dual aspect units, more units with a south facing aspect and open/green social space for the residents.

4.6 Single aspect dwellings are generally not encouraged by the Panel. They noted that even if designed with large areas of glazing they still do not provide the quality of accommodation afforded by dual aspect properties.

4.7 The Panel encouraged the presenting team to consider the provision of on-site affordable units.

4.8 The Panel encouraged the presenting team to consider moving the building footprint to the east which could result in the loss of some trees. However, this may assist to resolve access to the building and provide more usable open space to the west with better amenity.

4.9 The Panel referred the presenting team to a development in Ravelston which has limited open /private space and has provided well-designed usable open space.

## 5 Transport and Movement

5.1 The site is well connected and in close proximity to public transport routes.

5.2 The Panel recommended that a traffic survey should be carried out. The data from this survey should help inform a car parking strategy for the site.

5.3 The Panel were split with respect to how parking if any should be provided on the site. Some Panel members were of the view that given how well connected this site is it could be a car free development while other panel members were of the view that this approach was impractical given its location and potential attraction to families.

5.4 *Given the site constraints the Panel encouraged the presenting team to consider underground or under-croft parking which could release areas of the site for open space. If parking is to be provided at below the Council's minimum requirements, then some contributions to sustainable transport via a S75 agreement would be expected, and necessary.*

## 6 *Open/Green Space*

6.1 *The Panel noted that a tree survey should be carried out as soon as possible and will inform the design for the site.*

6.2 *The Panel noted their disappointment at the lack of usable open space/social areas on the site. The site layout provides very little usable open space for residents with carparking taking up the majority of the south facing part of the site. The Panel noted that the proposed location for the car parking could potentially be designed as south facing open space for the development while also forming a link to the wider network and golf course.*

## 7 *Materials*

7.1 *To assist with integrating the proposal with the context the Panel noted that the materials should take reference from this context.*

## 8 *Sustainability*

8.1 *The Panel encouraged the use of renewable on the site but noted the difficulties in their use due to the orientation of the site.*

## Location Plan

---



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