

# Item 3.1 – Minutes

## Development Management Sub-Committee of the Planning Committee

10.00 am Wednesday 25 April 2018

### Present:

Councillors Gardiner (Convener), Child (Vice-Convener), Booth, Dixon, Gordon, Graczyk, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler and Staniforth.

### 1. Minutes

---

#### Decision

To approve the minute of the meeting of the Development Management Sub-Committee of 7 March 2018 as a correct record.

### 2. General Applications and Miscellaneous Business

---

The Sub-Committee considered reports on planning applications listed in Section 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the agenda for the meeting.

#### Requests for Presentations

The Chief Planning Officer gave presentations on the following:

Item 4.1 – 50 Baberton Avenue, Juniper Green, Edinburgh (Land 48 Metres West Of) – as requested by Councillors Booth and Staniforth.

Item 4.2 – 50 Broughton Street, Edinburgh – as requested by Councillor Mowat.

Item 4.6 – 37 Drum Street, Candlemaker's Park, Edinburgh (Land 126 Metres North Of) – as requested by Councillor Osler.

Item 4.7 – 236 Gorgie Road, Edinburgh – as requested by Councillor Dixon and Osler.

Item 4.9 – 540A Lanark Road, Edinburgh – as requested by Councillors Mowat and Staniforth.

Item 4.14 – 156, 158B, 160 And 162 Leith Walk, Edinburgh – as requested by Councillors Booth and Staniforth.

#### Decision

To determine the applications as detailed in the Appendix to this minute.

(Reference – reports by the Chief Planning Officer, submitted.)

### **3. 1 Riccarton Mains Cottages, Riccarton Mains Road, Currie (Land 320 Metres Southeast Of)**

---

The Sub-Committee had agreed to hold a pre-determination hearing under the procedures set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedures) (Scotland) Regulations 2008 for consideration of the application for planning permission in principle for proposed residential development (class 9), flats (sui generis) (including affordable housing provision, university halls of residence), neighbourhood centre inc. retail (class 1), services (class 2), food and drink (class 3), non-residential (class 10) and assembly and leisure (class 11) with associated access, parking, open space, public realm and infrastructure works (inc. demolition of overhead and relaying of power lines) at 1 Riccarton Mains Cottages, Riccarton Mains Road, Currie (Land 320 Metres Southeast Of) be dealt with by means of a hearing (application no 16/05217/PPP).

#### **(a) Report by the Chief Planning Officer**

The development of the site for residential purposes was not supported by the Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) and is contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Env 10 (Development in the Green Belt and Countryside).

The site was outwith the West Edinburgh Strategic Development Area (SDA) as defined by the Strategic Development Plan (SDP). As such, its development would be inconsistent with the SDA's spatial strategy which sought to prioritise in the first instance, the development of brownfield land and land within identified SDAs.

The proposal was contrary to LDP Policy Hou 1 (Housing Development). Using the method described in the Housing Land Audit 2017 to assess unconstrained housing land with support, there was a five-year effective housing land supply in the Council's area. Even if there was a deficiency in the five year housing land supply, and considering the proposal against LDP policy Hou1 and the wide aims of the development plan, the proposal was not acceptable. It would have an adverse impact on the landscape setting of the city, would not provide suitable green belt boundaries and would not be in keeping with the character of the settlement and local area. It had poor public transport accessibility for pedestrians and there was no guarantee that this could be improved.

Insufficient information had been submitted to fully assess the transport impacts of the proposal and whether the pylons could be removed and the overhead powerlines could be successfully redirected or buried.

In summary, the proposal was unacceptable in principle, in terms of sustainable location, impact on city setting and area character and setting, and in terms of sufficiency of information.

The proposal was contrary to the development plan and there were no material considerations which justified approval.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/293971](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971)

## **(b) Presentation by Currie Community Council**

Dr Keith Symington and Vivian Granton gave a presentation on behalf of Currie Community Council.

Dr Keith Symington outlined the strategic context, the transport links, education and healthcare and the environment.

### Strategic Context

- Riccarton Mains Village (RMV) was one of many applications that were not in the Local Development Plan (LDP).
- The Community Council believed that an overarching plan was essential.
- RMV was, therefore, not a sustainable development.

### Transport Links

- RMV was poorly integrated into transport infrastructure
- There was no cycleway to Currie, the consequence of this would be a reliance on cars.
- Lack of integration and transport links outweighed the benefit of development.

### Education and Healthcare

- Currie and Nether Currie primary schools were nearly at capacity.
- The four surgeries within reach were almost at capacity.
- There was no strategic integration.

### Environment

- CCC felt that the large student blocks were inappropriate.
- This development would have a negative impact on Heriot-Watt's "rural" feel.
- There was not enough evidence that the lines could, and would, be sunk.

In conclusion, the Community Council agreed with development in a considered and careful context and the LDP provided this framework. However, RMV was not an expansion of their community, this was a new village on prime farmland in the green belt that was not in the LDP. Therefore, the Community Council agreed with the assessment that this proposal should be refused.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/293971](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971)

## **(c) Presentation by Davidson Robertson Rural**

Martin Hall and Michael Reid Thomas gave a presentation on behalf of Davidson Robertson Rural.

Martin Hall indicated that they objected to the proposed development. (Michel Reid Thomas and Davidson and Robertson had been located at Riccarton Mains since the 1970's and 1990's respectively).

The traffic on Riccarton Mains had increased substantially in recent years and at times was at capacity. This development would add yet further congestion unless an alternative access was used to help alleviate bottlenecks and further road junctions onto Riccarton Mains Road between Herriot Watt and Currie.

Riccarton Mains Road had for many years been quite a dangerous road, with blind corners and an adverse camber. In addition, there was little provision for pedestrians and cyclists to travel safely, with poor connectivity to the railway station.

On this basis they objected to the proposed development. It was their view the if consent was granted then an access to this site should be directly off the existing branches of Riccarton Mains Roundabout. He then thanked the Sub-Committee.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/293971](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971)

**(h) Presentation by Applicant – Tim Ferguson (Ferguson Planning)**

Tim Ferguson (Ferguson Planning) and Alex Ferguson (Transport Planning) gave a presentation on behalf of the applicant the H&H Group PLC.

He advised that the H&H Group were by way of background Property and Farmstock Brokers who operated across Scotland and the north of England.

The H&H Group had acquired the land as part of the overall John Swann takeover back in 2015, but soon realised on the review of their land portfolio that, due to the large overhead pylons and general low quality of the land, that the overall value of the subject site for agricultural purposes was low.

Following the press report on a housing shortfall within the city and in particular in the proximity of the university, park and ride and Currie Train Station. This had led to the appointment of the project team to pursue the Riccarton Mains Village proposal.

It should be noted that the proposal had no direct relationship with the Garden District Proposals. It was a stand-alone village concept that was being promoted by their clients.

The proposal was of a scale that they considered could be delivered within a reasonable time period and that could go towards the growing housing shortfall in the city.

Considerable time and consultation had gone into the provision of detailed supporting documentation on the overall design of Riccarton Mains Village Masterplan. All of which came after any such review of the site during the LDP review.

The proposal again had been subjected to an environmental impact assessment and the design concept together with 3D images were contained within the Design and Access Statement and which had followed core placemaking principles.

The Master Plan was generally made up of three core parts:

- a. Approximately 200 residential dwellings with strong “rural feel” and which would promote high-quality build materials such as stone timber natural slate.
- b. The focal point being a large village green together with a village centre to cater for community needs such a small shops, village hall and space for the GP practice.
- c. University halls of residence again formed a core part given the extreme close proximity to the Heriot Watt Campus and something encouraged by policy Hou 8 of the LDP.

The village was intended to have an extensive boundary woodland which doubled up as informal recreation walkways for local people. It again sought to connect in with the local cycle and footways that bordered the site and which would encourage links on foot to nearby bus and train stops.

It was appreciated that the lands in question were designated as green belt, it was important however, to understand whether it would significantly impact on green belt principles. The proposal was a standalone village with significant boundary woodland/landscaping to contain it and ensure it did not significantly impact on the wider landscape or encourage urban sprawl.

In physical terms it could be seen as a form of an extension to the significant build form that neighboured it at the Heriot Watt Campus which again should be noted was allocated outwith the greenbelt.

As shown in the reporter’s finding to the current SESPLAN it was clear that if and when there was a continued housing shortfall, more must be done to meet that shortfall, including allowing further housing sites to come forward on suitable greenfield land. That included looking at sites within the green belt which were considered sustainable located and which would not have significant visual or landscape impacts.

There continued to be both mainstream and affordable housing shortfalls within Edinburgh and there were numerous large housing sites allocated within the LDP that were slow to deliver or constrained and in overall terms, there being an inadequate five and ten year housing land supply. This then continued to push houses prices up locking many out of the housing market. For this site the applicant had committed to 25% affordable housing on site and which would equate to approximately 54 of the 214 units proposed.

The reporter’s conclusions on the green belt when considering the current LDP, was that there was significant time lag in the delivery of sites and that brownfield sites alone were highly unlikely to enable the housing land requirement to be met. The reporter also alluded to ensure a continued compliance with SESPLAN and a continual monitoring of housing delivery and, if required, additional Greenfield sites would need to be considered.

This had been furthered in SESPLAN2, currently at examination. Contrary to the position within the officer’s report, they considered it still be a strong material consideration. SESPLAN2 placed strong emphasis on housing delivery and that it remained under constant review. Reference was made to an annual supply of some 2,662 homes per year being needed between 2018 and 30 should be provided and that a generosity margin should again be applied.

The subject site as shown within their transport assessment could quickly avail of a variety modes of transport other than the private car. Bus provision and a park and ride facility was within 5 minutes' walk from the site. It had a cycle path along its boundary and which acted as a definable edge and again with easy reach was the nearby Currie Tran Station.

The sentiments made with regard to the visual and landscape impact on the proposal had been grossly exaggerated and lacking in true appreciation of the current landscape within which the proposal was set. The site was undulating but largely low lying it was contained within the confines of current built form – that being an existing cycle/footpath and road network together with houses located beyond the site to the north, east and west. Further to this, the development would sit well below and within the wider context of the neighbouring white Oriam Sports Centre which could be seen from a considerable distance.

In addition to this, the landscape right across the subject site was significantly scarred as a result of three extremely high power lines that ran right across it. A landscape impact assessment had been undertaken by independent landscape architects and had shown that the landscape in this area was not of a high quality and while there might be some localised or modest impact – on the whole there would be no significant or detrimental visual impact on the wider landscape.

Significant woodland boundary treatment which would have walkways intertwined would actually enhance one of the green belt principles by providing better recreational access while softening any visual impact. Again, one would note in the SNH consultation no significant concerns regarding visual impact or ecology were raised.

Within reason for refusal 2, there was reference to not demonstrating what additional infrastructure was required and delivery within a reasonable timescale. They presumed this was in reference to the burial of the pylons on the site. They were unclear given this was a PPP Application why such detailed information was being sought and not being conditioned as they had sought.

It was important to point out they provided the Case Officer and Environmental Health Officer an e-mail, showing that dialogue was ongoing with Scottish Power and that the principle of the pylon burial was indeed possible. Desktop investigations had been undertaken and options provided by Scottish Power, all of which gave comfort that the concept was technically viable. The detail of such was a private matter between the landowner and the provider.

To go to the next stage required extremely detailed plans and exact confirmation on position of the built form. That was for the next stage in the planning process. They had provide the Case Officer and Environmental Health Officer with correspondence for Scottish Power and Network Rail had also provided their consultation to this application. Neither raised an issue with the concept of the burial of the pylons. This was what they sought to do and had outlined that within their proposal description and that was what they sought to be conditioned.

It was again worthy of note of other greenfield sites that had been granted PPP permission that had pylons running across them.

For example, at Brunstane, on that occasion neither the Environmental Health nor Planning Department sought the detailed investigations that were being sought of them.

Indeed they recommended a condition be applied in relation to such matters relating to pylons.

Reason 3 stated: “The proposal was contrary to the provision of the LDP Policy Tra8 as it had not fully demonstrated the cumulative effects of the proposal and that it could be addressed within a relevant timeframe.” They considered this to be incorrect. An extensive amount of dialogue occurred between the applicants and the Council between 21<sup>st</sup> April 2016, when the first (of two) Transport Assessment scoping meeting was held with CEC.

The protracted nature of this dialogue related to the inclusion of so called “cross border/cross boundary” traffic effects within the Transport Assessment and this had been done in accordance with the Council’s requirements and using data extracted from the Council’s traffic model. Additionally, the site lay within the Calder and Hermiston transport contributions zone as laid out in current developer contribution guidance. This was acknowledged in the transport consultation response to the application and the applicants were content to discuss appropriate contribution in the same manner as many other sites across the City which also lay within transport contribution zones.

Refusal reason 4, an Air Quality Assessment that linked with the Transport Assessment had been undertaken. It showed the existing air quality in the study area was good and well within the statutory ECT limit values and was predicted to comply with all Scottish Air Quality Objectives. SEPA again touched upon the subject of air quality and had no objection on such grounds. Given mitigation measures could be provided, it was again assumed the matter of noise related to the overhead pylons raised by Environmental Health had been addressed previously. They were not seeking that they remained “In Situ” and thus when buried, no such noise issues would arise or indeed the need to be tested.

Clarity was required on the validity or reasoning for refusal 5. The Masterplan had built in a form of Neighbourhood Centre for local people. This included units that could be used of such purposes as a GP practice should the demand be there from doctors wishing to set up in the area. Again, complimentary services were planned to sit alongside this, together with community space.

In relation to refusal number 6, they did not consider the lands in question to be prime agricultural land. The lands were undulating, some of which fell within Grade 3 and this together with the pylons running across the lands could in no way be deemed prime land. This was low level grazing land at best as a result of the aforementioned restrictions.

On refusal reason 7, they acknowledged that the lands were currently not designated but it equally needed to be acknowledged in relation to the Strategic Development Plan that there was a need to meet the growing housing needs and where there was not, consideration of sustainable located greenfield land must be considered.

They considered that there was a growing housing shortfall and that housing identified in the Local Development Plan was not keeping pace with that demand – many being constrained and unable to fully deliver within the LDP timeframe. The proposal was in a sustainable location with no significant impacts. It could be delivered within a reasonable time period and the appropriate flexibility to allow such sites should be applied should be

applied in accordance with SDP principles.

In conclusion, they cited some very strong material considerations that had been given very little coverage within the officer's report. This was the economic benefits that the proposal would bring, which included:

- Approximately 100 million of new capital investment.
- In the region of 495 man years of construction and injecting an additional £22 million pounds into the economy.
- The creation of jobs within the proposed local centre.
- The provision of new community facilities and an additional £2m in retail spend.
- 214 new homes and halls of residence that would bolster existing services in areas such as Currie.
- They had read the detail in the officer's report and on this occasion they considered the reasoning for refusal to be lacking for the reasons outlined.
- Significant detailed and technical documentation had been provided in support of this application and this outlined the compliance with core material considerations and as to why the proposed Riccarton Mains Village should be approved.

They thanked the Sub-Committee for their time and requested that they overturned the recommendations by the Chief Planning Officer and grant the application.

The presentation can be viewed via the link below:

[https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/293971](https://edinburgh.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/293971)

## **Decision**

To recommend to the Council meeting on 31 May 2018 to refuse planning permission in principle as detailed in section 3 in the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

(Reference – report by the Chief Planning Officer, submitted.)

## **4. 540A Lanark Road, Edinburgh**

---

The Chief Planning Officer provided details on an application for proposals for extension of existing class 2 use premises to form new Class 3 Hot Food Takeaway (Sui Generis). (Change of Use from Bank Class 2 to Class 1 was permitted development) at 540A Lanark Road, Edinburgh – (Application no. 17/04434/FUL).

## **Motion**

To grant planning permission subject to conditions and reasons and informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Osler.

## **Amendment**

To refuse planning permission as the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan Policy RET 5 (c) due the piecemeal nature of the proposals and the development did not make a positive contribution to the shopping environment and appearance of the centre, and ENV 6 as the proposals were detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child.

## **Voting**

For the motion - 3 votes

(Councillors Booth, Osler and Staniforth.)

For the amendment - 7 votes

(Councillors Child, Dixon, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Mitchell and Mowat.)

## **Decision**

To refuse planning permission as the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan Policy RET 5 (c) due the piecemeal nature of the proposals and the development did not make a positive contribution to the shopping environment and appearance of the centre, and ENV 6 as the proposals were detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

(Reference – report by the Chief Planning Officer, circulated)

## Appendix

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p>Note: Detailed conditions/reasons for the following decisions are contained in the statutory planning register.</p>		
<p><a href="#"><u>Item 4.1 – 50 Baberton Avenue, Juniper Green, Edinburgh (Land 48 Metres West Of)</u></a></p>	<p>Construction of four new dwelling houses, including excavation to level site - application no 17/04719/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>CONTINUE</b> consideration of the matter for the developer to clarify the community benefit derived from the development as defined in policy ENV18</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Item 4.2 – 16 Barnton Park View, Edinburgh</u></a></p>	<p>Create Enclosure (in retrospect) – application no 18/00095/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer and to take <b>ENFORCEMENT ACTION</b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Item 4.3 – 50 Broughton Street, Edinburgh</u></a></p>	<p>Proposed change of use from Grocer's shop to unlicensed takeaway. Fit new door and erection of flue both on rear elevation (as amended) - application no 17/00629/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission for the reason that the proposals were contrary to Local Development Plan policy RET 11 due to the detrimental impact on existing residential amenity.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Item 4.4 – 1 Cliftonhall Road, Newbridge</u></a></p>	<p>Illuminated Hoarding Signs x2 - application no 18/00210/ADV</p>	<p>To <b>GRANT</b> advertisement consent subject to conditions, reasons and informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Item 4.5 – 14 Cumberland Street South East Lane, Edinburgh (Land 8 Metres West Of)</u></a></p>	<p>Construction of mews property for use of Theosophical Society in Scotland Charity SCIO - Class 10 non-residential institution - application no 17/04898/FUL</p>	<p>To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to conditions and reasons and informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer</p>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.6 – 137 Drum Street, Candlemaker’s Park, Edinburgh (Land 126 Metres North Of)</u></a>	Approval of matters specified in conditions application for residential development including associated roads and landscaping (matters listed in condition one of planning consent 14/01238/PPP) - application no 17/05802/AMC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To <b>APPROVE</b> matters specified in conditions as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.</li> <li>2) To include an additional informative to investigate the provision of additional accessible visitor parking spaces throughout the development.</li> </ol>
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.7 – 236 Gorgie Road, Edinburgh</u></a>	Forthcoming application by Scotmid Co-operative / Structured House (Edinburgh West) Ltd for the demolition of existing (Class 1) retail store and erection of purpose-built student accommodation (Sui Generis) with (Class 1) retail on the ground floor level - application no 18/00851/PAN	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To note the key considerations.</li> <li>2) That consideration be given to design, materials and the height of the building.</li> <li>3) Consideration be given to protecting the daylighting to neighbouring gable ends, by recessing upper part of the new building.</li> <li>4) Ensure retention of the active street frontages.</li> </ol>
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.8(a) – 32 -36 Great King Street, Edinburgh</u></a>	Change of Use + alteration of existing hotel to form 9x dwellings; works include single storey extensions to rear + associated external works to form private gardens with access from adjacent parking area (as amended) - application no 17/05879/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to conditions and reasons and informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.8(b) – 32-36 Great King Street, Edinburgh</u></a>	Change of Use + alteration of existing hotel to form 9x dwellings; works include single storey extensions to rear + associated external works to form private gardens with access from adjacent parking area (as amended) - application no 17/05880/LBC	To <b>GRANT</b> listed building consent subject to conditions and reasons and informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.9 – 540A Lanark Road, Edinburgh</u></a>	Extension of Existing Class 2 Use Premises to form new Class 3 Hot Food Takeaway (Sui Generis). (Change of Use from Bank Class 2 to Class 1 is permitted development) - application no 17/04434/FUL	To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission as the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan Policy RET 5 (c) due the piecemeal nature of the proposals and the development did not make a positive contribution to the shopping environment and appearance of the centre, and ENV 6 as the proposals were detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.  (On a division)
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.10 – Leith Street, Edinburgh (Bus Shelters)</u></a>	Double sided advertisement panel forming part of a new bus shelter - application no 17/05303/ADV	To <b>GRANT</b> advertisement consent subject to conditions and reasons as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.11 – Leith Street, Edinburgh (Bus Shelters)</u></a>	Foster bus shelter unit incorporating illuminated double digital display double sided advertising screen - application no 17/05443/ADV	To <b>GRANT</b> advertisement consent subject to conditions and reasons as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.12 – Leith Street, Edinburgh (Bus Shelters)</u></a>	Foster bus shelter unit incorporating illuminated double digital display double sided advertising screen - application no 17/05444/ADV	To <b>GRANT</b> advertisement consent subject to conditions and reasons as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.13 – Leith Street, Edinburgh (Bus Shelters)</u></a>	Foster bus shelter unit incorporating illuminated double digital display double sided advertising screen - application no 17/05445/ADV	To <b>GRANT</b> advertisement consent subject to conditions and reasons as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<p><a href="#"><u>Item 4.14 – 156, 158B, 160 and 162 Leith Walk, Edinburgh</u></a></p>	<p>Forthcoming application by Drum (Steads Place) Ltd for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed use development including affordable housing (flats), post graduate student accommodation, hotel (Class 7), restaurant (Class 3), space for potential community (Class 10 &amp; 11), retail (Class 1), public house or commercial uses (Class 2 &amp; 4). Includes associated infrastructure, landscaping and car parking - application no 18/01015/PAN</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) To note the key considerations.</li> <li>2) That developer provide justification in accordance with policies ENV 2 and ENV 4 for the loss of any buildings in the conservation area.</li> <li>3) Details of the housing mix.</li> <li>4) Consideration be given to potential for developer contributions towards the proposed cycle link and tram.</li> <li>5) That consideration be given to active travel links and the bus network.</li> <li>6) That consideration be given for the provision of smaller commercial hubs for use by business start-ups.</li> <li>7) That consideration be given to the provision of space for a live music venue and other uses that would enhance the cultural life of the area</li> <li>8) That consideration be given to retaining the façade of the red sandstone building on Leith Walk.</li> </ol>

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.15 – Lochside Way, Edinburgh (Land Adjacent To)</u></a>	Forthcoming application by Parabola Edinburgh Ltd for PPP proposing the development of the southern phase of Edinburgh Park to comprise a mix of uses including offices (Class 4), residential (Class 9 houses & Sui Generis flats), creche (Class 10) leisure (Class 11), hotel (Class 7), ancillary Class 1, 2 and 3, energy centre, car parking, landscaping and associated works - application no 18/01012/PAN	To note the key considerations
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.16 – 142 Lothian Road, Edinburgh</u></a>	Erection of additional office floor with adjusted elevational details and plant area - application no 17/05827/FUL	To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.17 – 6-8 Market Street, Edinburgh</u></a>	Application to Discharge the Planning Obligation (Section 75 Agreement) attached to granting of planning permission 14/04962/FUL - application no 17/03909/OBL	To <b>ACCEPT</b> the application to discharge the planning obligation as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.18 – New Street, Edinburgh (Land Adjacent To)</u></a>	To discharge various obligations in S75 agreement (2013) - application no 17/05746/OBL	To <b>ACCEPT</b> the application to discharge the planning obligation as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.19 – New Street, Edinburgh (Land Adjacent To)</u></a>	To discharge various obligations in S75 agreement (2014) - application no 17/05747/OBL	To <b>ACCEPT</b> the application to discharge the planning obligation as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.20 – 80 Newcraighall Road, Edinburgh (Proposed Advertising 69 Metres North Of)</u></a>	Internally illuminated LED 48 sheet advertisement hoarding in landscape orientation - application no 18/00810/ADV	To <b>GRANT</b> advertisement consent subject to conditions and reasons and informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.21 – 63 Nile Grove, Edinburgh</u></a>	Sub-divide basement from ground floor to form separate dwelling. Internal alterations to basement floor layout. Form external glazed french doors from ground floor with new access staircase to rear garden. Form new entrance doorway from enlarged existing window opening at basement level - application no 18/00594/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.22 – 6 Pilton Drive North, Edinburgh (Advertising Hoarding 8 Metres North Of)</u></a>	Internally LED illuminated 48 sheet digital advertisement in landscape orientation - application no 18/00526/ADV	To <b>NOTE</b> the application had been withdrawn
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.23 – 67 Whitehill Street, Mussleburgh (Newcraighall Primary School)</u></a>	Installation of modular unit building to provide 3 no. classrooms and associated ancillary spaces. Demolition of existing temporary unit with area made good to form additional play area (as amended) - application no 17/05955/FUL	To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to conditions and reasons and informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer
<a href="#"><u>Item 4.24 – West Register Street, Edinburgh</u></a>	Stopping Up Order - reference no PO/18/01	To <b>CONFIRM</b> to stopping up order

Agenda Item No. / Address	Details of Proposal/Reference No	Decision
<a href="#"><u>Item 5.1 – GF 2 Stoneycroft Road, South Queensferry</u></a>	Demolition of existing building on site and erection of five terraced townhouses on sloping site- application no 16/04716/FUL	To <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
<a href="#"><u>Item 6.1 – 1 Riccarton Mains Cottages, Riccarton Mains Road, Currie (Land 320 Metres Southeast Of)</u></a>	Protocol Note by the Head of Strategy and Insight	Noted.
<a href="#"><u>Item 6.2 – 1 Riccarton Mains Cottages, Riccarton Mains Road, Currie (Land 320 Metres Southeast Of)</u></a>	Residential development (class 9), flats (sui generis) (including affordable housing provision, university halls of residence), neighbourhood centre inc. retail (class 1), services (class 2), food and drink (class 3), non-residential (class 10) and assembly and leisure (class 11) with associated access, parking, open space, public realm and infrastructure works (inc. demolition of overhead and relaying of power lines)– application no 16/05217/PPP	To recommend to the Council meeting on 31 May 2018 to <b>REFUSE</b> planning permission in principle as detailed in section 3 in the report by the Chief Planning Officer.
<a href="#"><u>Item 7.1 – 1 Craigpark, Ratho, Newbridge (Craigpark Quarry)</u></a>	Outdoor leisure complex incl. water sport and training facilities infrastructure, access (pedestrian and vehicular), landscaping and ancillary works (full planning permission), ancillary class 1 (retail)+class 3 (food and drink) uses, tourism accommodation facilities (PPP) – application no 17/02471/FUL	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To <b>GRANT</b> planning permission subject to conditions and reasons and informatives as detailed in section 3 of the report by the Chief Planning Officer</li> <li>2. The Chief Planning Officer to communicate with local members/community council re the phasing details of the development.</li> </ol>