

Development Management Sub Committee

Wednesday 24 April 2019

Application for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions 17/05306/AMC

**At Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road, Edinburgh
Granton Harbour plots 29 and 35: Housing, hotel and
serviced flats development. Application for approval of
matters conditioned regarding the erection of buildings
containing residential flats, hotel and serviced apartments;
formation of road access, parking, and open space (AS
AMENDED)**

Item number	4.9
Report number	
Wards	B04 - Forth

Summary

The proposed uses as hotel, serviced apartments and residential development are compliant with those in the approved masterplan. The uses also accordance with the provisions of LDP policy Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront) and the LDP Edinburgh Waterfront principles for development for Granton Harbour.

However, the proposed layout of the development is contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront) and LDP Policy Des 2 (Co-ordinated Development) as it fails to provide a comprehensively designed proposal which accords with the Edinburgh Waterfront - Principles of Development for Granton Harbour, including the completion of the perimeter block form and providing the relevant section of the waterside promenade.

The proposals for plots 29 and 35 are contrary to LDP Policy Des 3 (Development Design - Incorporating and Enhancing Existing Features) as it has not been demonstrated how the height, positioning and design of these buildings would protect or enhance local views which contribute to the sense of place, in this case at Granton Harbour and waterside locations.

Furthermore, the proposals are contrary to LDP Policy Des 4 (Development Design - Impact on Setting) as it has not been sufficiently demonstrated how the resulting impacts of both buildings' height and massing would impact on their surroundings, including wider townscape and landscape and views.

The lack of active frontages at the proposed hotel development, raises significant concerns regarding opportunities for enlivening the streetscape and providing passive surveillance, as promoted under LDP Policy Des 5 - Development Design- Amenity). The lack of opportunities for passive surveillance at plot 29, also conflicts with the provisions of this policy.

The proposals for plot 35 are also considered contrary to the provisions of LDP Des 1 (Design Quality and Context), owing to the impacts of its substantial height, scale, massing and design and limited active frontage provision on the character, appearance and sense of place at this prominent, waterfront location. The proposals are further contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 10 (Waterside Development) as it has not been found to provide an attractive frontage to the waterside, as provided for under this policy.

The proposals for pedestrian and cycle access are contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 7 (Layout Design) which promotes walking, cycling and the provision of safe and convenient access in and around the development site, with particular regard to the needs of people with limited mobility or special needs, owing to the shortcomings identified.

The proposed level of parking provision throughout the application site, which exceeds the maximum level required in the Edinburgh Design Guidance, is contrary to the provisions of DLP Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking) and fails to comply with the Council's wider strategy of encouraging the use of journeys made by more sustainable transport modes.

The quantity of private open space meets the level of requirement under LDP Policy Hou 3 (Private Open Space). However, the layout of the public open space is considered contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 7 (f) (Layout Design) and LDP Policy Env 20 (Open Space in New Developments) as it fails to provide safe and suitable connections to pedestrian and cycle routes, around the site.

The proposals are also contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 5 (Development Design- Amenity) as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that neighbouring amenity would be adequately safeguarded and that daylight provision for future occupiers would be provided, in accordance with the provisions of the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

Links

[Policies and guidance for this application](#)

NSGESS, NSESBB, LDPP, LDEL01, LDEL03, LDES01, LDES02, LDES03, LDES04, LDES05, LDES06, LDES07, LDES08, LDES10, LEN08, LEN09, LEN13, LEN14, LEN15, LEN16, LEN20, LEN21, LEN22, LHOU01, LHOU02, LHOU03, LHOU04, LEMP10, LTRA02, LTRA03, LTRA04, NSG, NSGD02,

Report

Application for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions 17/05306/AMC

**At Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road, Edinburgh
Granton Harbour plots 29 and 35: Housing, hotel and serviced flats development. Application for approval of matters conditioned regarding the erection of buildings containing residential flats, hotel and serviced apartments; formation of road access, parking, and open space (AS AMENDED)**

Recommendations

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

Background

2.1 Site description

The application site is located at the northern end of West Granton Harbour. The proposal site forms two plots, Plot 35 which fronts onto Granton Harbour and Plot 29, which is located on its western side. The north facing boundary of this plot faces on to a water feature. The two plots measure approximately 1.8 ha in total and are irregular in shape. The site is currently vacant.

There is some road infrastructure in place around the site perimeter, namely Merlin Way and Stopford Way to the south and south west and Stopford Lane West, which runs between these two plots. Stopford Street, on the north west side of plot 29 is also in place.

The category 'B' listed, Western Breakwater (item number 30219, listed 28 November 1989), constructed between 1842 and 1863, lies on the eastern side of plot 35, with part of its eastern flank being located under the application site.

2.2 Site History

Relevant history to the site:

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

RESIDENTIAL - up to 3,396 units;
BUSINESS/COMMERCIAL uses of up to 23,190 sqm (including one 120 bed hotel);
RETAIL units, limited in size to 250sqm, with the exception of one retail unit with a maximum gross floorspace of 1,500 sqm;

4 March 2009 - Application approved to discharge the following reserved matters, (under condition 2): siting and height of development; design and configuration of public and open spaces; access, road layouts; footpaths and cycle routes; (1) existing and finished ground levels. This approval was subject to conditions, requiring further information to be submitted within 1 year, on landscaping of public open space, proposed rock revetment, play equipment, configuration of roads and other access provisions, the proposed drainage scheme and related implementation provisions and maximum unit numbers per plot (Application reference 06/03636/REM).

Note: The illustrative massing plan which was excluded from the approved plans, indicated a maximum of 36 residential units at plot 29. At Plot 35, the location and site area differed, owing to the removal of a previously proposed area of reclaimed land. The relevant proposals included 353 units, 106 of which were for affordable housing provision.

31 January 2014 - Application approved for matters specified in condition 2 as attached to outline permission 01/00802/OUT: covering siting and height of development; design and configuration of public and open spaces; access, road layouts; footpaths and cycle routes. The application (which included revisions to the mix of uses and changes to the layout and phasing programme, from those approved under application 06/03636/REM), was subject to a number of conditions requiring further details to be submitted for approval regarding: car parking, landscaping, and the shared cycle way on Western Harbour Road. The maximum heights of buildings at plot 35 (5-7 storeys) and proposals for Middle Pier were excluded by conditions from this approval. (Application reference 13/04320/AMC).

Note: The maximum number of residential units throughout the masterplan site was reduced from the approved number of 1980 to 1099. This figure included 36 units, within a two to three storey development at plot 29 and a proposed 100 bed hotel and residential flats at plot 35, 50 of which were allocated for affordable housing.

18 November 2015 - Application for approval to discharge a selected number of reserved matters which were attached to the outline planning permission under condition 2, including the siting and height of development; design and configuration of public and open spaces; access and road layouts; and footpaths and cycle routes approved (Application reference 14/05305/AMC).

Note: This revised master plan included a reduced site area for housing but increasing the density. The total number of residential units was increased from 1,980 to 2,094. At plot 35, a 128 suite hotel and serviced apartments was proposed and 1488sqm of commercial floor space. The building height at plot 35 was increased to 5-7 storeys. The number of approved residential units at plot 29 was increased to 76, to be accommodated within a two to three storey perimeter block.

2 February 2017 - Application approved for the approval of matters specified in condition 2, covering siting and height of development, design and configuration of public and open spaces, access, road layouts, footpaths and cycle routes (Scheme 2) approved. However, the matters applied for in relation to plots 8C, 12, 14, 15, 15A, 16, 17, S1, S2 and 35 were not approved. At plot 35 the proposed changes included the removal of all residential accommodation and use of site for a 92 suite hotel with serviced apartments (Application reference 16/05618/AMC).

Note: The proposed changes for Plot 35 were excluded from this approval, owing to design concerns associated with layout and mix of uses. This is the most up to date master plan for the Grantor Harbour area.

31 May 2017 - Application submitted for approval of matters specified in condition 2, covering siting and height of development, design, and configuration of public and open spaces, access, road layouts, footpaths and cycle routes at Grantor Harbour, West Harbour Road (Application reference 17/02484/AMC). This application is pending determination. The layout and massing details accord with those in the current application.

2 February 2019 - Planning application submitted for formation of access roads and footways and public realm; and associated quay edge retention scheme, to serve the Grantor Harbour plot 29 (residential development) and plot 35 (hotel development). Application pending determination (Application reference 19/00844/FUL).

Other recent applications within Granton Harbour plots:

16 May 2017 - Application for approval of matters reserved by condition for erection of buildings containing 104 retirement flats and ancillary accommodation; formation of road access, underground parking, internal private open space, and public square. Application site located to south east of current application site granted on 27 November 2017 (Application reference 17/01219/AMC).

15 December 2017 - Application refused for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions, regarding the erection of a healthcare super hub and five units in Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 use on Plot 19B to the east of the site (Application reference 17/02865/AMC).

6 March 2019 - Application for approval of matters for plots 7b a,b,d and 8c under application ref; 01/00802/OUT, (for erection of buildings containing perimeter block residential flats, formation of road access, basement parking and open space) refused (Application reference 18/02812/AMC).

6 March 2019- Application for approval of matters reserved by condition submitted for proposed marina office with associated retail, cafe space and community boat yard (as amended) granted (Application reference 18/02833/AMC).

20 March 2019 - Application for approval of matters conditioned, approved regarding the erection of buildings containing 18 houses and 144 flats; formation of road access, parking, private and public open space approved for Plots K, O, P, Q U, T. (18/02721/AMC).

Main report

3.1 Description Of The Proposal

The proposal seeks to primarily deal with the matters specified in condition 2 of the outline planning permission 01/00802/OUT.

The matters specified in condition 2 include detail of the siting, design and height of development including external features; design and configuration of open spaces; floor levels external finishes and materials; car and cycle parking, access, road layouts and service areas; footpaths and cycle routes; boundary treatments; and hard and soft landscaping details.

Information has also been submitted to deal with other more general conditions on the outline permission. In summary, these include:

3a) *Noise Assessment:*

3b) Site survey and measures relating to landfill gases and any required protective measures.

3c) Site survey relating to contamination and any required remedial/protective measures.

6) Surface Water disposal arrangements.

This application relates to plots 29 and 35.

Plot 29

The proposals for Plot 29 is for the erection of a block of residential apartments and associated open space. The apartment block would be eight storeys in height and the 108 flatted dwellings would comprise 19 x one bedroom, 82 x two bedroom and seven x three bedroom flats. As the submitted accommodation schedule does not match the floor plans, these figures have been taken from the floor plans.

The block is located along the south eastern boundary of the site, with the ground floor level being elevated above the street frontage. The basement area below, which extends across the full width of this plot, accommodates the parking facilities for the proposed flats. An area of amenity space, for the use of both residents and the general public is proposed on the landscaped deck above. The proposed ground floor flats have separate private garden grounds. Balconies have been provided to some of the flats on the upper levels.

It is unclear from the floor plans if the balcony on the seventh floor is a shared terrace or will be divided for use by separate flats. It is also unclear how the terrace will be accessed from each unit.

The proposed facing materials are Jura limestone cladding and white render. The proposed balconies are constructed of frameless coloured glass. The proposed roofing material is grey single ply membrane.

Plot 35

The proposed building at Plot 35 is seven storeys high, with basement parking. It contains a hotel and 98 serviced apartments. Serviced apartments are classed as a sui generis use under the planning regulations and do not constitute mainstream residential accommodation. The hotel accommodation would be provided in the eastern side of the building and comprise 186 hotel rooms. The western wing of the building contains 98 serviced apartments.

In addition to the above, the proposed hotel contains the following ancillary elements:

- Spa and fitness suite 1340 sqm at ground level and 1024 sqm mezzanine
- Function Suite 747 sqm
- Bar and Restaurant 841 sqm
- Bistro 464 sqm
- Retail 108 sqm
- Cigar bar 286 sqm

The hotel building would be finished in dark grey/ brown Corium brick cladding, Jura Stone Exterior cladding, aluminium cladding and black glass curtain walling and black Alucobond roof.

Parking and Access

Parking for both sites is at sub floor level. The car parks would be accessed via vehicle ramp from Stopford Way, with an exit point onto North Breakwater Road, via Stopford Lane West. Hotel drop off would be from lay-bys on the Stopford Lane West and Stopford Parade frontages.

Two principal pedestrian access points are provided to the proposed hotel on the east and west sides of the central building.

Pedestrian access to the frontage of the flats at plot 29 is provided via steps from the footway at street level, leading to a raised footway on Merlin Road.

Pedestrian access to the rear is proposed via steps on Stopford Street to the west, leading to the shared garden grounds and entrances to the rear of the building. Alternative access is proposed, via the pedestrian ramp to the landscaped deck off Stopford Lane West.

Inclusive access to the flats is provided via a platform lift to the north west, on Stopford Street, or the pedestrian ramp leading to the landscaped deck off Stopford Lane West.

There is provision for a total of 313 car parking spaces within the proposed underground car park, serving both plots 29 and 35. This provision can be broken down as follows:

Plot 29 apartments - 108 car spaces - 216 cycle spaces - 5 Motorcycle spaces.

Plot 35 hotel and serviced apartments - 265 car spaces - 216 cycle spaces -14 motorcycle spaces.

8 percent of the parking spaces are suitable for accessible use.

The applicant has indicated that 53 car parking spaces would be fitted with electric charging points.

Landscaping and Open Space

The main area of open space is provided on the landscape amenity deck situated above the underground parking area, to the rear of the proposed apartment block. The area closest to the apartment building is allocated for the use of residents and separated by a 1.2 metre high wall. Gardens to ground floor flats are located behind this semi private amenity space. The remaining area of open space is for use by the general public, including hotel guests and includes a play area. Details of the proposed play equipment have not been submitted. The proposals include a detailed planting schedule. The main surfacing materials include buff gravel, clay pavements and sandstone slabs.

A landscaped courtyard is also provided next to the hotel entrance at the rear of the proposed hotel.

Boundary treatment

The proposals include:

A 1.7 metre high Corium, tiled wall, with a 0.5 metre high frameless, glazed balustrade above, bounding the raised terrace on the hotel frontage;

A 1.7 metre high Jura stone wall with a 0.5 metre high black metal fence above, on the bounding the Merlin Road frontage of the flats, and the perimeter of the open space and shared garden grounds on Stopford Street and part of Stopford Lane West;

A 0.4 metre high seating wall separating the paths and planted areas within the public open space; and

A 1.2 metre high Jura stone wall bounding the shared private garden grounds to the rear of plot 29; and a 1.2 metre high Jura stone wall bounding the shared private garden grounds to the rear of plot 29.

Previous Schemes

The submitted plans have been updated to:

- amend car parking layout;
- update the landscaping and open space detail;
- update the residential floor areas;

- include swept path analysis;
- provide clarification on pedestrian and vehicle access arrangements;
- internal changes to hotel layout;
- show kitchen extraction fan location;
- Include details of external furniture and lighting proposals;
- include additional details of proposed landscape planting scheme and maintenance proposals; and
- provide some detail of play area.

Supporting Statements

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

- Design and Access Statement;
- Daylight and Sunlight Report and additional statements;
- Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Management Plan;
- Energy Statement;
- Sustainability Form;
- Noise Assessment;
- Environmental Risk Assessment; and
- Supporting summary statements on Cycle Parking Provision, Affordable Housing and Daylighting and Sunlight and Design.

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

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 development complies with the planning permission in principle;
- b) the matters for further approval are acceptable;
- c) there are any other material considerations;

- d) there are any equalities or human rights impacts; and
- e) the representations have been addressed.

a) The development complies with the planning permission in principle

The principle of mixed use development at Granton Harbour was established through the granting of outline planning permission in 2003 (Reference 01/00802/OUT). The proposals comply in general terms with the overall range of uses approved under that consent, which included residential accommodation, and leisure related uses, including a 100 bed hotel.

Proposed Uses

Various masterplans have been approved for Granton Harbour under the terms of the original outline consent.

The proposed uses at plot 35 comply with the Masterplan approved under application number 14/05305/AMC, which provided for a (128 suite) hotel and serviced apartments. Whilst the proposals do not include the 1488sqm of commercial floor space approved under that application, ancillary commercial and leisure uses are proposed at ground and mezzanine levels. They include a spa and fitness suite, function room, bar and restaurant and retail use.

The proposed residential use at plot 29 complies with the masterplan approved under application number 14/05305/AMC and the most recent masterplan (application reference 16/05618/AMC), which provides for residential units at plot 29. However, the number of residential units at 108 rather than the approved 79, increases the density of that site.

Based on the above considerations, the proposed uses as residential development on plot 29 and a hotel and serviced apartments on plot 35 accords with the original outline consent although it differs from subsequent approval of matters conditions.

Layout, Height and Massing of Development

There have been a number of planning applications which included height and massing details for plots 29 and 35 in the proposed layout. These include:

- Planning permission reference 13/04320/AMC, which included two to three storey buildings around the full perimeter of plot 29. However, the proposed development at plot 35, which was six to seven storeys on the quayside frontage and five to six storeys to the sides and rear was excluded from that consent.
- Planning permission reference 14/05305/AMC the heights of the buildings at plot 29 remained two to three storeys on the full perimeter. The heights of the hotel at plot 35 was seven storeys at the front and five to six storeys on its sides, with no development to the rear.

- Planning permission reference 16/05618/AMC also included two to three storeys buildings on the full perimeter of plot 29. However, the proposed layout and storey heights for the building at plot 35, which was identical to that approved under application 14/05306/AMC, was excluded from the planning consent. This was largely to address concerns regarding the potential for overshadowing of residential properties on that part of the plot. The current proposals, exclude the previously proposed built frontage on the eastern boundary of plot 29.

The layout currently being considered for plot 29 excludes the previously proposed development on the east and northwest sides of this plot, removing the full perimeter coverage on this part of the masterplan site, which is contrary to all approved masterplan layouts.

Although the proposed hotel building at plot 35 generally accords with the positioning and storey levels indicated on the massing plan approved under application 14/05306/AMC, the massing arrangement to the rear differs. The floor plan at first floor level occupies a much larger proportion of the rear courtyard than previously. The area of public open space at this location is therefore smaller in scale. The roofs of this additional ground floor hotel accommodation are identified as terraced areas. Furthermore, the approved massing plan did not specify detailed building heights.

At eight storeys in height, the block of flats at plot 29 is significantly greater in height and scale than the two to three storeys indicated in all previous masterplans. Instead of being positioned around all sides of the perimeter block, the proposed development is now all concentrated within a single block of flats facing onto Merlin Road.

The impacts of the proposed layout, siting, massing, design and materials of each plot is assessed in turn below.

b) Matters for Further Approval

Plot 29 - Building Layout and Siting

LDP Policy Des 2 (Co-ordinated Development) provides for a comprehensive approach to redevelopment, based on the masterplan strategy or development framework, as identified in the LDP Edinburgh Waterfront (Granton Harbour) Development principles (EW 2C). In terms of development layout, the principles provide for the formation of a perimeter block form.

As previously mentioned, the proposed layout on plot 29 is a deviation from previous versions of the masterplan, which included built frontages on all sides of plot 29. The lack of built frontages to the sides and rear of plot 29 would compromise the integrity of the existing perimeter block urban form, which is expected to be delivered through the Edinburgh Waterfront Development Principles for Granton Harbour under LDP EW2c. The proposals are therefore contrary to LDP Policy Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront), as it fails to provide a comprehensively designed proposal which accords with the Granton Waterfront Development principles. Furthermore, the resulting open ended form of this layout would restrict opportunities to provide a good standard of community safety and well defined open space provision for future residents, contrary to the relevant provisions of LDP Des 5 (Development Design- Amenity). This impact is considered further, under section 3.3 (b) Residential Amenity).

The impacts of the proposed layout on the pedestrian and cycle network, part of which is identified under the Granton Waterfront Development Principles, and is also a requirement of LDP Des 7 (Layout Design, are addressed in section 3.3b) (Access and Parking).

Plot 29 - Building Height

The substantial increase in height at plot 29 from that approved under previous applications has been the subject of significant representation from surrounding property owners and occupiers. The roof height is mainly 28.42 metres high (34.42 metres AOD). It is greater than the 5 storeys approved at the adjacent plot to the east. The visual impact of this large building mass has been slightly mitigated through the incorporation of a 'saw tooth' shaped, central section of roofline which provides some articulation and visual interest to the building profile at this prominent, waterside location. However, it is not significant enough to reduce the visual impacts of the building height and massing on the streetscape. There are existing and proposed buildings within the Masterplan area, (including those approved for plots 26, 27 and 28 to the south) which already reach or exceed this height in places. However, these buildings are generally narrower in profile, or the height and massing are modulated to achieve a more varied townscape and skyline.

At over 30 metres in height there is a risk that this building would impact on CEC key view 32c (Firth of Forth), as identified in the Edinburgh Design Guidance, due to its prominent position, height and massing. However, as no details of impacts on verified views have been addressed in the submissions, it is not possible to ascertain the extent of any such potential impacts on the city's landscape backdrop. The proposal is therefore contrary to LDP policy Des 4 (Development Design- Impact on Setting) which requires that development should have a positive impact on its surroundings, including impacts on the character of the wider townscape and landscape, including existing views.

Furthermore, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated how the scale and positioning of such a large building would protect or enhance local views, including the waterfront and canal-side, which contribute to the sense of place at this waterside location. The proposals are therefore considered contrary to LDP Policy Des 3 (Development Design- Incorporating and Enhancing Existing and Potential Features). The resulting amenity impacts of the building height are addressed in other sections of this report.

Plot 29 - Design and Materials

Notwithstanding concerns regarding height and scale, the building design detailing, including façade treatment, fenestration and roof profile design, are similar to those on neighbouring buildings and are compatible with the emerging character of this new city area. The grouping of the windows in double columns, together with other vertical features on the frontages and at roof level, to some extent, serve to break up the effects of the building's significant horizontal massing on this waterside frontage.

The provision of small front gardens bounded by walls and railings, have the potential to enhance the streetscape and this canal-sides setting. However, the significant level of underbuilding required in order to accommodate the underground car park and guard against the risk of flooding, has resulted in an equivalent difference in height between the footway at street level and the ground floor level of the flats. The street will effectively be adjoined by a high wall, reducing the effectiveness of this enhancement and related opportunities for passive surveillance. As no detailed sections have been provided for this element of the development, it is not possible to establish the full extent of such impacts.

Further consideration is given to the impacts of the proposed built frontages at street level, when addressing the effects of the development on residential amenity, in section 3.3 b) (Access and Parking) of this report.

The use of Jura stone in the finalised scheme and white render on the external walls provides visual coherence between plot 29 and surrounding plots. The glazed balustrades are in keeping with the building's contemporary style and with that of other buildings in the locality. The proposed materials for this building are generally appropriate within the context of the site and the surroundings, in accordance with the relevant provisions of LDP policy Des 4 (Impact on Setting) and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

If the committee is minded to grant the application, the use of a condition, requiring the submission of full specifications and samples of all proposed external facing materials, will be required to ensure that the detailed specifications are acceptable. The merits of the proposed open space and landscape design associated with this plot are considered under section 3.3 b) (Landscape) below.

Plot 35 - Building Layout and Siting

The positioning of the hotel building on this prime waterside location, accords with the Edinburgh Waterfront Development principles. The increased massing of the building to the rear, in comparison with that approved under application 14/05305/AMC, has resulted in an equivalent loss of open space on this plot. The merits of the proposed public open space provision which is now being provided at plot 29 is considered in the Open Space Provision and Landscaping section of this report.

The omission of the waterside promenade to be provided on the hotel frontage from these proposals has prevented the opportunity for the important relationship between this building and its waterside setting to be considered in a co-ordinated manner and to ensure that this crucial section of Edinburgh Promenade is delivered in a timely manner. In this respect the proposals fail to meet the provisions of LDP Policy Des 2 (Co-ordinated Development), in terms of providing a comprehensive approach to redevelopment, based on the masterplan strategy or development framework, which in this case are identified in the LDP Edinburgh Waterfront (Granton Harbour) Development principles (EW 2C).

The related application reference 19/00822/FUL, which is currently under consideration, includes provision for this promenade, along with those for the missing section of road to the west of this site. If the committee are minded to grant the current application, a condition would be required, to ensure that no development commences until planning consent has been granted for the installation of the relevant section of promenade and road on the west side of this plot, together with the reinforcement of the quayside at this location.

The position of the proposed taxi drop off facility to the rear of the hotel, opposite the entrance to the public open space, has the potential to impact on pedestrian and cycle safety as considered further under section 3.3b) Access and Parking).

Plot 35 - Building Height

The proposed height of the hotel on its front elevation is approximately 32.5 metres AOD, which is similar to that proposed in the massing plans for applications 13/004320/AMC, 14/03505/AMC and 16/05618/AMC. The building design for plot 35 was specifically excluded from the matters approved under both the 2013 and 2016 applications, due to amenity concerns related to the combined impacts of height and layout at this plot and plot 29. However, the massing was approved under the 2014 application.

At over 30 metres AOD, there is a risk that this building would impact on CEC key view 32c (Firth of Forth) due to its height, scale and uniform massing. However, as no details of impacts on verified views have been addressed in the submissions, it is not possible to establish whether the proposed building would intrude on such views and cause any negative impacts on the city's wider landscape. It is acknowledged that the proposed hotel has been envisaged as a landmark building in this area. However, in the case of Edinburgh, landmark buildings are generally characterised by having a relatively slim, or more articulated profile, unlike this building. The proposals are therefore considered contrary to LDP policy Des 4 (Impact on Setting) which requires that proposals for new developments should demonstrate that they will have positive impact on their surroundings, including the character of the wider townscape and landscape and impact on views.

Furthermore, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated how the height and positioning of this key, waterfront building will impact on local views, including of the Granton Waterfront, which contribute to the sense of place at this focal location within the masterplan area. The opportunity has not been taken for its substantial, monolithic form to be articulated more carefully, in order to respond positively to the character of the surrounding townscape. The proposals therefore fail to demonstrate that the development provides for the protection of landscape character and views, as required through the provisions of LDP policy Des 3 (Incorporating and Enhancing Existing and Potential Features).

Plot 35 - Building Design and Materials

The proposals have been amended to include some building materials which are generally more consistent with the emerging character of the Granton Harbour area. The use of grey corium brick panels and Jura stone cladding has been used elsewhere in the masterplan area and would provide some visual connection between the developments on adjacent plots. These materials are considered consistent with the provisions of LDP 4 (d) Development Design - Impact on Setting) in respect of the use of materials. The use of contrasting black glazing would serve to differentiate this hotel building from the neighbouring residential developments. However, it is not clear how its appearance on this conspicuous waterfront facade would enhance the area's sense of place or enliven the streetscape. It will reduce the opportunities to animate the public realm at this key waterfront location. This would be more readily achieved through the use of transparent glazing, particularly at ground floor level. More detailed specifications for this glazing and other materials would be required by condition, should this application be approved.

The entertainment and commercial frontages associated with the proposed hotel are raised above street level, in order to safeguard against flooding and to accommodate the underground car park. This configuration has limited the opportunities to create an active frontage on this building and to enliven the street scene at this prominent waterfront location. The provision of a raised terrace, on this frontage to be used as sitting out areas for the proposed bar and leisure uses, would create some opportunity to enliven this frontage. However, although open to the promenade, this relatively narrow terrace is approximately 1.6 metres above ground level, which also restricts its potential to activate this waterside frontage and provide passive surveillance.

The rear elevations of the hotel on Stopford Lane have no active frontages at lower level and fail to enhance or enliven this key route to the public open space and the waterfront, or provide opportunities for natural surveillance. In this respect the proposals fail to meet the relevant requirements of LDP Policy Des 5 (Development Design - Amenity).

It is further found that the hotel frontage has not been designed in a manner which would provide an attractive frontage to the waterside, as required through the provisions of LDP Policy Des 10 (Waterside Development). The lack of active frontages at street level generally, is also contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 5 (c).

Given the concerns associated with its substantial height scale and massing and lack of articulation and active frontage provision, it is not accepted that this building would complement the harbour's historic character or reinforces its context, as maintained in the Design and Access Statement. The proposals are therefore considered contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context).

Roads Layout, Pedestrian and Cycle Routes and Parking and Servicing

Roads Layout

LDP Policy Des 7 (Layout Design) seeks a comprehensive and integrated approach to building layouts, streets, footpaths, cycle paths, public and private open spaces, with new layouts designed to encourage walking and cycling, and minimising the potential conflict with motorised traffic. It further promotes safe and convenient access around the development, especially with regard to the needs of people with limited mobility or special needs.

LDP Policy Des 5 (Development Design - Amenity) provides that community safety will be promoted by providing active frontages to more important thoroughfares and designing for natural surveillance over all footpaths and open spaces.

The application site includes incorporates the footways of public roads on the periphery of the application site, but not the road carriageways themselves. The only exception is Stopford Lane West, which is already in place, but would require reconfiguration. The proposed roads on the quayside frontage (Stopford Parade) and on the northern side of block 35 (North Breakwater Road) are the subjects of planning application reference 19/00844/FUL, which is currently under consideration. Other roads bounding the site were approved under application reference 05/00500/AMC. Cumulatively these roads would complete the street layout for this development phase, and would generally be compatible with the overall grid layout within the masterplan area, as specified in the Development Principles for Granton Harbour under LDP Proposal EW2c.

If the committee is minded to approve this application, a condition would be required, to ensure that no development commences on site until planning permission for the additional roads infrastructure required has been granted.

Pedestrian and Cycle Routes

In terms of pedestrian and cycle movement, the applicant submitted plans showing the possible pedestrian and cycle movements within and between the two plots. This includes details of disabled accessed to the areas of public open space. The details are referred to in the Proposals section of this report.

The proposals for pedestrian and cycle access facilities raise a number of matters of concerns relating to accessibility and quality of public realm. These include:

- a) Difficulties for pedestrians using the public footway on the perimeter of the proposed hotel building, owing to the presence of the ground floor terrace and steps serving it and related drop off laybys.
- b) Inconvenient, unwelcoming and potentially unsafe pedestrian and cycle access provision, particularly for those with mobility limitations, or special needs, to the public open space. (This is via the ramp at either end of the road between plots 29 and 35, with an entrance at a poorly overlooked location which is dominated by the hotel drop off facility).
- c) A generally unwelcoming and potentially threatening pedestrian environment, due to significantly raised height of ground floor windows, in relation to public footways.

As previously stated, this application also fails to incorporate provision for the completion of the relevant section of the dedicated cycle route and Waterfront promenade, as identified in LDP Proposals EW2c (Granton Waterfront) and T7. The safeguarding of these routes are provided for through the provisions of LDP Policy Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront). Although application reference 19/00844/FUL, which is currently under consideration, includes provision for this section of the route, this application has yet to be determined.

The proposals therefore fail to meet the relevant provisions of LDP Des 7 (Layout Design), in terms of:

Encouraging walking and cycling, and minimising potential conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and motorised traffic and ensuring that pedestrian and cycle paths are overlooked by surrounding properties, providing safe and convenient access and movement around the development, especially for people with limited mobility or special needs and ensuring that public open spaces and the cycle routes are connected with the wider pedestrian and cycle network, where the opportunity exists.

Concerns have been raised in the letters of representation regarding the impact that the development on both plots will have on the quality of streetscape. Given the prominence of the site at this key waterfront location within the masterplan area, the surrounding streets are important routes both for pedestrians and motorists. It is considered that opportunities to activate these frontages and enhance community safety have not been fully addressed. The proposals fail to satisfy the provisions of LDP policy Des 5 (C) (Development Design Amenity) in this respect.

Car and Cycle Parking

LDP Policy Tra 2 (Private car parking) states that planning permission will be granted for development where proposed car parking provision complies with and does not exceed the parking levels set out in Council Guidance. The Edinburgh Design Guidance provides maximum levels for car parking within development proposal. It also requires justification for the numbers proposed.

In this instance, the guidance would require a total maximum of 257 spaces, 52 associated with the apartments and 205 associated with hotel and serviced apartments.

The applicant has proposed the following breakdown of car parking across both sites:

- Plot 29 - 108 parking spaces.
- Plot 35 - 205 (112 for serviced apartments and 93 for the hotel).

The number of accessible spaces (31 at basement level and two at street level) provided is compliant with the requirement for 8%.

In terms of justification the applicant has advised that the additional spaces are required to provide for the marina. Given that a masterplan wide parking strategy or plan has never been submitted for the area and that other plots have all been assessed on an individual basis, this justification has not been accepted. The provision of parking within the plots exceeds the maximum stipulated in the design guidance and is therefore unacceptable.

In terms of cycle parking, motorcycle spaces and electric charging points these are all in accordance with the design guidance. However, if the application is approved, full details of the external cycle parking facilities will be required by condition.

Overall, the proposals for parking fail to comply with the Council's wider strategy of encouraging the use of sustainable non car modes of transport. The proposals are therefore contrary to the provisions of LDP Tra 2, as the proposed level of car parking is significantly in excess of the maximum level required in the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

Concerns have been raised by an objector that the proposals would give rise to cumulative impacts on local infrastructure, as a result of the increased density proposed through this application and in other recent applications. However, it is estimated that the capacity within masterplan area is below that approved under the original outline consent. Any further applications within the masterplan area will fall outwith the scope of the outline consent and will require a full assessment in terms of transport impacts.

Servicing

The proposal includes two bin stores within the residential development on Plot 29. The proposal has been reviewed by the Council Waste Services Team and an agreed Waste Strategy is in place. Given that the development on Plot 35 is entirely commercial private waste collection arrangement will be required.

Open Space Provision and Landscaping

Private Open Space

LDP Policy Hou 3 (Private Green Space) seeks to ensure that development makes adequate provision of green space to meet the needs of future residents. It states that for flatted developments should be at least 10 sqm of open space provision per flat except where private space is provided.

At plot 29 the ground floor flats have access to private gardens. The Edinburgh Design Guidance (EDG) requires that private gardens be at least three metres deep. The north-west facing gardens fronting the communal open space would comply with this requirement. However, the south eastern facing gardens fronting Merlin Road would not meet this requirement.

However, the communal open space measures approximately 1983sqm which is in excess of the EDG requirement. Furthermore, a number of the apartments also have balconies at first floor level and above which provides an element of private outdoor space to future residents. Consideration of the design of the communal open space is considered in the landscaping section of this report. This plan differs in its layout from that approved under the latest masterplans in which the private open space at plot 29 is enclosed by a full perimeter block. This proposed layout affords less privacy to future occupiers than the approved scheme.

There is no private amenity space associated with the serviced apartments as it would not be required for that use.

The proposals are considered to meet the requirements of LDP Hou 3, in terms of quantity of private green space provision, albeit that this provision is mainly located on a landscaped deck area.

Public Open Space

Policy Env 20 (Open space in New Developments) promotes the provision of new publically accessible and useable open space in new developments when appropriate. Public open space is proposed throughout the masterplan area. With respect to this proposal, the applicant submitted a plan detailing the location of all public and private amenity space proposed. The location of the public open space differs from that approved under application 14/05306/AMC, where it was all located within the rear courtyard of the proposed hotel. Its allocation is now split between the two plots and separated by Stopford Lane.

Approximately 4283 sqm of space is proposed within plots 29 as public amenity space. This space is to be landscaped and accessed from Stopford Street. Stairs and lift access are to be provided from Stopford Street. Given that more than 20% of plot 29 is made up of open space it is generally in accordance with the EDG guidance in terms of quantity. The design of the open space is considered further in the landscaping section.

However, it is questionable whether this space is fit for purpose, in terms of its location, quality and character. Its elevated location above street level, and lack of good connections with key pedestrian routes, fails to meet the requirements of LDP Policy Des 7(f) (Layout Design) and limits the opportunities for natural surveillance, in accordance with the requirements of LDP Des 5 (Development Design - Amenity).

With regard to plot 35, the applicant has identified the central courtyard area as public open space. It is accepted that this space is open to the public. However, the raised terracing on the front of the hotel entrance on Stopford Parade, adjoins the proposed restaurant and café uses within the hotel and are not considered public open space.

On balance, given the overall extent of both public and private open space across both plots, the proportion of open space is considered appropriate. However, the location of this open space gives rise to significant concerns associated with its accessibility, as referred to further in section 3.3b) (Access and Parking). The proposals have failed to fully accord with the requirements of LDP Policy Env 20 Open Space - New Developments), owing to the difficulties identified in accessing this space. Furthermore, the approach to this open space fails to adequately address the provisions of LDP Policy Des 8 (Design Layout), in terms of providing for natural surveillance, over all footpaths and open areas.

Landscape Design

LPP Policy Des 8 (Public Realm and landscape Design) provides for development where all external spaces and features, including streets, footpaths, civic and green spaces, boundary treatments and public art have been designed as an integral part of the scheme.

The design and specifications for the landscaped areas to the rear of plots 29 and 35 and their boundary treatments are considered generally acceptable and appropriate for this location. Full details of the planting schedule and outdoor furniture and fixings and boundary treatment have been provided. However, insufficient details of existing and proposed ground levels have not been included with the landscape plans. It is therefore not possible to assess the full visual impacts of the proposals, or any barriers to accessibility, due to changes in level. If the application is approved, details of these levels, which are a requirement of Condition 2(i) of the Outline Consent, would be required through the use of a further planning condition. Furthermore, no specifications have been included for the proposed play area within the public open space at plot 29. If the application is approved, these details required under condition 2(iv), would also be required by planning condition.

The proposals for boundary treatment within the landscaped areas are generally suitable in appearance. However, it is noted that the proposed 1.2 metre high perimeter wall with railings, on the boundary of the public and private open space, would not fully protect the privacy of future occupiers.

The only details of on-street tree planting proposed under this application comprise those identified on the boundary with the public open space on Stopford Lane. However, the accompanying application reference 19/00844/FUL makes some provision for such planting on the waterfront and on North Breakwater Road, in accordance with the relevant proposals for the masterplan.

In conclusion, the quality of the landscape design, planting details and external materials are considered appropriate for this location and in keeping with the area's character. In these respects they meet the relevant provisions of LDP Des 8. However, as the majority of the proposed landscape works are located at a relatively enclosed location between these blocks, the planting scheme will contribute little to the enhancement of the wider public realm in this area, or to make a significant contribution to place making.

Residential Amenity

LDP Policy Des 5 Development Design - Amenity, requires that all new developments that it will not adversely impact of the amenity of new occupier or neighbouring properties.

The applicant has submitted a Daylight and Sunlight report in support of the application. The report provides assessment of the impact that the proposed development on Plot 29 would have on the amenity of existing neighbours and future occupiers. It is noted that no assessment has been provided for daylight impact to the serviced apartments on Plot 35. Should the apartments be used for residential purposes in the future it would be necessary to submit this information as part of a change of use application.

Therefore given the intended uses on Plot 35, hotel and serviced apartments, this section of the report only relates to the residential component of the application proposed at Plot 29.

Daylight

In terms of daylight, the applicant has not used the 'No Skyline' methodology for assessment of daylight provision to new development as recommended in the Edinburgh Design Guidance (EDG). Instead the Vertical Sky Component method (VSC) has been used. This methodology, which is recommended for use when assessing the impacts on existing development, states that the resulting VSC should be more than 27 percent or 0.8 of its former, pre-development value.

With regard to plot 29 the submitted report provides figures on the expected VSC level for the windows of the proposed flatted dwellings at plot 29. Of the 42 ground floor windows assessed, 28 complied with the EDG. The level of compliance varied from a minor infringement of a proposed VSC of 25.95 to 12.99. On the first level 84 windows were assessed and 56 were found to be VSC compliant. The range of infringement varied from 26.38 to 3.12.

A further daylight statement indicated that out of the 42 windows at plot 29 which failed to meet the EDG standards, eight relate to rooms with only one window, six of which serve bedrooms (where daylight requirements are lower). The statement concludes that only two of the remaining windows fail to meet relevant daylight standards.

The statement further explains that 16 of the non-compliant windows relate to rooms with more than one window, neither of which achieve the 27% value sought through the EDG. The consultants consider that when taken together, these rooms are 'likely to be compliant' with the EDG.

They also advise that a further 18 of the non-compliant windows serve a room with another window which meets compliant standards. In this case they conclude that the rooms would meet the relevant daylight standards. As a result they concluded that there are only two living rooms or kitchens within the proposed residential development which fail to meet the EDG standards. However, no follow up, Average Daylight Factor test was carried out, in accordance with the provisions of the EDG, in order to verify the conclusions of this study and fully establish the extent of non-compliance with the Council's standards for daylight provision.

Based on the information provided, it is not possible to establish the overall standard of daylight provision which would be afforded to future occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to the LDP Policy Des 5 and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

An assessment on the impacts of the proposed development on daylight to surrounding buildings at ground and first floor level, including plots 26, 27, 30 and 31 was carried out using the VSC methodology. The results were as follows:

- At plots 26 and 27 to the south, the assessment found that 93% and 89% respectively of rooms met the requirements of the EDG. It was advised that the impacts at these rooms is mitigated as they all serve rooms with either more than one window and/or contain at least one large window.
- At plot 30 to the North West, the assessment found that 87% of the tested windows, identified in the floor plans met the EDG requirements. The other affected rooms were either identified as bedrooms or circulation spaces with lower or no daylight requirements. This statement cannot be verified as no detailed plans have yet been submitted for this plot.
- At plot 31 to the south east the study, which was based on draft plans, found that 76% of the tested windows would meet the EDG standards. It was concluded that for the rooms not meeting this standard, the impact would be mitigated, in most cases, because these windows serve rooms with more than one window and/or are dual aspect.

The applicant states that: 'the proposals achieve a very high level of compliance with the daylight targets required in the Edinburgh Design Guidance' and are 'comparable with the results for high density urban developments with similar characteristics.' However, as no follow up ADF test was undertaken on rooms failing to meet the VSC test, in accordance with the requirements of the EDG it is not possible to ascertain the overall level of compliance of the affected windows at all these plots. Based on the information provided, it is not possible to establish the overall impacts on daylight provision to neighbouring occupiers, as a result of the proposed development. The proposal is therefore contrary to the LDP Policy Des 5 and the Edinburgh Design Guidance, in this respect.

Sunlight

In terms of sunlight to new gardens, the EDG requires that at least half of new garden spaces should be capable of receiving sunlight during the spring equinox. The submitted report found that 44% of the semi-private open space associated with Plot 29 would receive adequate sunlight during the equinox. This is an infringement to the EDG standards. However, given the density of the development and its masterplan compliant, perimeter block layout, this minor infringement is acceptable in this instance, when taking townscape characteristics into account.

The public open space identified in Plot 35 would comply with the EDG with 56% of the area receiving adequate sunlight or three hours or more during the spring equinox. With regard to sunlight to existing gardens and spaces given the proximity and distance of the proposal from existing garden ground at neighbouring plots, the proposal will not have an unreasonable impact on amenity in terms of sunlight.

Privacy

In terms of privacy, the Edinburgh Design Guidance requires that all new windows be located and spaced to achieve a reasonable level of privacy for neighbouring and future residents.

Given the orientation of the flats on plot 29 and the distance between the proposed development and that on adjacent plots the proposal does not raise any concerns regarding privacy.

It is found that the proposals would result in standards of daylight which are lower than sought under the EDG, for the occupiers of at least two flats at plot 29. Furthermore they would have the potential to provide lower standards of daylight than sought under the EDG at a number of further flats. However, without these impacts being fully tested, in accordance with the guidance in the EDG, it is not possible to establish the full extent of non-compliance.

It is further found that the proposals would have the potential to impact adversely on a number of ground and first floor level rooms at a number of neighbouring properties. However, again without these impacts being fully tested, in accordance with the guidance in the EDG, it is not possible to establish the full extent of non-compliance.

It is therefore concluded that the proposals are contrary to LDP Policy Des 5 (Development Design- Amenity) and the Edinburgh Design Guidance, as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the amenity of neighbouring occupiers would be adequately safeguarded or that the standards of amenity for future occupiers, in terms of daylight, sunlight would be acceptable.

Housing Mix and Size

In terms of housing mix, LDP Policy Hou2 Housing mix seeks to ensure a provision of a mix of housing types and sizes and where practical, that meets a range of housing needs. Furthermore, the Edinburgh Design Guidance (EDG) expects that 20% of units should be homes for growing families with at least three bedrooms.

Of the 108 residential units proposed on plot 29, 19 are one bedroom units, 82 are two bedroom units and seven are three bedroom units. This equates to approximately 6% of the units being three bedroom or more contrary to the Edinburgh Design Guidance. The applicant has advised that this mix responds to the overall housing provision across the masterplan area. They have advised that family housing in the form of town houses are to be provided on other plots and this layout best reflects the most recently approved masterplan.

It is noted that planning application reference 18/02721/AMC, for plots K, O, Q, U and T, approved in March 2019, provides for 38 three bed flats, representing 23 percent of the overall housing mix proposed for those plots, which slightly exceeds the EDG.

However, the revised Masterplans approved under applications 16/05618/AMC and 14/005306/AMC, reduced the number of residential units from 2,102 to 1,951 at those plots. The main changes were:

- Plot 8C now shows 23 houses instead of 37 houses.
- Plots 9A and 9B now shows 88 retirement flats instead of 72 family flats.
- Plot 13 (S1) now shows 60 flats instead of 87.
- Plot 35 now has no residential flats.

The significant shortfall in the provision of family sized dwellings at plot 29 is a matter of concern, particularly when taking into account the general trend for a reduction in this size of accommodation across the masterplan area. The opportunity has not been taken to provide more family sized properties within this substantial sized flatted development, and to accord with the requirements of LDP Policy Hou 2 (Housing Mix).

With regard to housing size, the Edinburgh Design Guidance requires that minimum floor areas for dwellings be achieved in order to ensure satisfactory amenity. With the exception of one two bedroom flat on the first floor all of the apartments within Plot 29 comply with this requirement. Overall, the proposed space standards for the types of flats proposed are considered acceptable and in accordance with the standards included in the Edinburgh Design Guidance. (There is no requirement for the serviced apartments to meet this standard).

The proposed housing mix fails to comply with the full provisions of LDP Policy Hou 2 (Housing Mix) owing to the shortfall of three bed sized family housing proposed.

Affordable Housing

The legal agreement attached to the outline permission requires 15 percent affordable housing provision across Granton Harbour. The most recently approved master plan proposes 2,235 residential units in total. Fifteen percent of this constitutes a total of 335 units.

Planning permission has now been granted for affordable housing at plots 2 (104 units) S1 and S2 (302 units) and 27 (132 units) which in total exceeds the 15% requirement. Therefore no affordable housing is required throughout the site subject to the outline permission. The proposals therefore comply with the provisions of LDP policy Hou 6 (Affordable Housing).

Noise Protection

Condition 3a) of planning permission reference 01/00802/OUT requires that a Noise Impact Assessment be provided. The applicant submitted a Noise Impact Assessment and a further subsequent statement, along with amendments to internal plans, in response to address concerns raised by Environmental Protection.

The information submitted with the application address the impacts of all uses proposed on both the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring developments and at the proposed development. If the Committee is minded to grant planning permission, a condition would be required to ensure that the measures outlined in the applicant's Noise Impact Assessment are put in place, before the building is occupied. This will ensure that the proposals safeguard neighbouring amenity, in accordance with the requirements of LDP Policy Des 5 - Amenity.

c) Other Material Considerations

Site Investigation

The application has submitted site investigation information, as required to be accompanied with any AMC application, under the provisions of condition number 3 of the outline planning consent. This is currently being assessed by Environmental Protection. Once Environmental Protection has assessed the information accessibility of the relevant information this condition may be discharged.

Flooding and Drainage

The outline permission requires that floor levels and associated information to support the levels be submitted. Furthermore, Condition 6 on the outline permission relates to surface water disposal arrangements and condition 14 relates to sustainable urban drainage.

The applicant has provided the relevant flood risk assessment and surface water management information for the site as part of the self-certification (with third party verification) process. The proposals meet the Council's requirements and no concerns have been raised from Flood Planning.

SEPA have no objection to the proposal on flood risk grounds. The proposed finished floor levels which are set at a minimum of 6.0m which is above SEPA's previously recommended level of 5.07 AOD and above that recommended in the submitted flood risk assessment. SEPA has further advised that the underground car park should be tanked and pumps installed, as a precaution against sea water ingress in cases of storm conditions. No such details are shown on the submitted plans.

An underground storage tank is to be located beneath landscaped area as part of the SUDS proposals. However, no details are provided regarding its exact location or dimensions. This information would be required by planning condition. The applicant states that this facility would be privately maintained.

The information submitted would partially deal with this reserved matter and conditions 6 and 14 for the application site. However, an additional condition would be required if this application is approved, to ensure that full details of the underground tank are provided, prior to commencement of development. However, without such details being available at this stage, it is not possible to ascertain whether the SUDS proposals can be accommodated within the proposed development, which includes an underground car park below most of the landscaped areas.

The proposals for flood defence and site drainage are acceptable in principle, and would meet the provisions of LDP Env22 (Pollution, Air, Water and Soil Quality), subject to the provision of further details relating to the underground retention tank. If approved, a condition would be required, to ensure this information is submitted.

Archaeology

LDP policy Env 9 stipulates that planning permission will be granted on sites of known or suspected archaeological significance if it can be concluded that there will not be a significant impact on archaeological features.

The Council's Archaeologist has reviewed the submitted information and noted that although the main building block will be constructed back from the main wall, the inner foundations for the listed Victorian breakwater will be impacted upon by the insertion of foundations piles. Accordingly, the construction of plot 35 is considered to have a low-moderate archaeological impact.

Should the Committee be minded to grant consent, it is recommended that a programme of works is undertaken, during works adjacent to and affecting this historic breakwater, in accordance with the City Archaeologist's recommendations. This will ensure that this listed structure is safeguarded, complement the finding of CFA's earlier 2008 report (CFA report 1581, OASIS Ref cfaarcha1-52857) undertaken during test trenching along the line of the breakwater and recording of its upper superstructure.

Micro- climate

Concerns regarding the potential creation of wind tunnels as a result of the height and orientation of the proposed buildings. It is acknowledged that there may be some increased risk of changes to wind patterns, as a result of this waterfront development. However, as no relevant information has been submitted with the application, it is not possible to estimate such potential effects.

Wildlife

Concerns regarding impacts on wildlife have been raised in association with this application, the site of which lies close to the Site of Special Scientific Interest on the Firth of Forth. Scottish Natural Heritage was consulted and raised no concerns in this respect, as it considered that these matters have been addressed under the previous masterplans for Granton Harbour.

Sustainability:

The applicant submitted a sustainability statement in support of the application. The proposed development will meet current Building Standards, will be constructed on brownfield land and will meet a 30% carbon reduction. The development will include combined heat and power generators, photovoltaic systems. The proposal is classed as a major development and has been assessed against Part B of the sustainability standards. The points achieved against the essential criteria are set out in the table below:

Essential Criteria	Available	Achieved
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	30
Total points	80	80

The proposal meets the essential criteria. In addition, the applicant has provided a commitment to further sustainability measures as set out in the desirable elements sections. The proposals for sustainability are in compliance with the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

d) Equalities

This application has been assessed in terms of equalities and human rights.

It has been found that the proposed access provision throughout the site, would give rise to potential difficulties for those with limited mobility, or other needs and potentially for those with young families, as a result of the limited facilities for inclusive access provision (as explained in section 3.3 b) (Transport)

e) Public Comments

Matters Raised in Representations

Material Considerations

- Increase in density and height of development on Plot 29 inappropriate and contrary to Local Plan - addressed in Section 3.3b) (Building Layout, Scale and Massing).
- Cumulative impact of increased density within the surrounding area - addressed in Section 3.3 b) (Access and Parking) and 3.3c) Education and Other Services).
- Proposal inconsistent with approved Masterplan - addressed in Section 3.3 b) (Building Layout, Scale and Massing).
- The infrastructure to support the development is insufficient - addressed in Section 3.3b) (Transport) and 3.3c) (Education and other services).
- Impact on protected skyline views - addressed in Section 3.3 b) Building Layout, Scale and Massing).

- Proposal does not integrate the plots with the rest of the Harbour Masterplan area - addressed in Section 3.3b) (Building Layout, Scale and Massing).
- Impact on wind patterns - addressed in Section 3.3 c) (Other Material Considerations).
- Provision of open space - addressed in Section 3.3 b) (Private and Public Open Space).
- Impact on flooding - addressed in Section 3.3c) (Other Material Considerations) - (Flooding and Drainage).
- Provision of pedestrian footpaths and cycle links though the site - addressed in Section 3.3b) (Transport).
- Impact on amenity, namely daylight, sunlight and privacy - addressed in Section 3.3b) (Residential Amenity).
- Impact on wildlife habitat - addressed in Section 3.3 c) (Impact on Wildlife).
- Unclear of changes to Plot 35 following refusal of 16/05618/AMC - addressed in Sections 2.2 (Site History), 3.3a) (Principle) and 3.3 b) (Building Layout, Scale and Massing).
- Proposed building heights and siting of buildings has adverse impact on the character of the surrounding area - addressed in Section 3.3b) (Building Layout, Scale and Massing).
- Insufficient open space associated with residential development - addressed in Section 3.3b) Private and Public Open Space.
- The impact on the surrounding water features - addressed in Section 3.3b) (Building Layout, Scale and Massing).

Non-Material Considerations

- Impact on views from adjoining plots.
- Noise from additional residents.

Community Council

The community council did not comment on the application.

Conclusion

The proposed uses as hotel, serviced apartments and residential development are compliant with those in the approved masterplan. The uses also accordance with the provisions of LDP policy Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront) and the LDP Edinburgh Waterfront principles for development for Granton Harbour.

However, the proposed layout of the development is contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront) and LDP Policy Des 2 (Co-ordinated Development), as it fails to provide a comprehensively designed proposal which accords with the Edinburgh Waterfront - Principles of Development for Granton Harbour, including the completion of the perimeter block form and providing the relevant section of the waterside promenade. However, it is acknowledged that a separate planning application, which is currently under consideration includes related details.

This proposal for plots 29 and 35 are contrary to LDP Policy Des 3 (Development Design - Incorporating and Enhancing Existing Features), as it has not been demonstrated how the height positioning and design of these buildings would protect or enhance local views which contribute to the sense of place, in this case at these Granton Harbour and waterside locations.

Furthermore, the proposals are contrary to LDP Policy Des 4 (Development Design - Impact on Setting) as it has not been sufficiently demonstrated how the resulting impacts of both buildings' height and massing would impact on their surroundings, including wider townscape and landscape and views.

The lack of active frontages at the proposed hotel development, raises significant concerns regarding opportunities for enlivening the streetscape and providing passive surveillance, as promoted under LDP Policy Des 5 - Development Design- Amenity). The lack of opportunities for passive surveillance at plot 29, also conflicts with the provisions of this policy.

The proposals for plot 35 are also considered contrary to the provisions of LDP Des 1 (Design Quality and Context), owing to the impacts of its substantial height scale and massing and design and limited active frontage provision, on the character, appearance and sense of place at this prominent, waterfront location. The proposals are further contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 10 (Waterside Development) as it has not been found to provide an attractive frontage to the waterside, as provided for under this policy.

The proposals for pedestrian and cycle access are contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 7 (Layout Design), which promotes walking, cycling and the provision of safe and convenient access in and around the development site, with particular regard to the needs of people with limited mobility or special needs, owing to the shortcomings identified.

The proposed level of parking provision throughout the application site, which exceeds the maximum level required in the Edinburgh Design Guidance, is contrary to the provisions of DLP Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking) and fails to comply with the Council's wider strategy of encouraging the use of journeys made by more sustainable transport modes.

The quantity of private open space, meets the level of requirement under LDP Policy Hou 3 (Private Open Space). However, the layout of the public open space is considered contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 7 (f) (Layout Design) and LDP Policy Env 20 (Open Space in New Developments), as it fails to provide safe and suitable connections to pedestrian and cycle routes, around the site.

The proposals are also contrary to the provisions of LDP Policy Des 5 (Development Design- Amenity) as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that neighbouring amenity would be adequately safeguarded and that daylight provision for future occupiers would be provided, in accordance with the provisions of the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

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

3.4 Conditions/reasons/informatives

Reasons:-

1. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policies Del 3 in respect of Edinburgh Waterfront, and Des 2 Co-ordinated Development, as it fails to provide a comprehensively designed layout, in accordance with the provisions of the Edinburgh Waterfront Principles of Development for Granton Harbour, as specified under Proposal EW c) of the Development Plan, which includes the provision of a perimeter block layout.
2. The proposals for plot 35 are contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Des 1 in respect of Design Quality and Context, as the proposed building, which fails to draw upon the positive characteristics of the surrounding area, would be damaging to the character and appearance and sense of place, at this prominent waterfront location, owing to the combined effects of the excessive scale, massing and layout of the proposed building, and the limited provision of active frontages.
3. The proposals for plot 35 are contrary to the provisions of Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 10 in respect of Waterside Development, as owing to its inappropriate massing and design, and limited of active frontage, it fails to provide an attractive frontage to the Granton waterfront.
4. The proposals for both plots are contrary to the provisions of Edinburgh Local Development Plan Des 3, in respect of Development Design, Incorporating and Enhancing Existing and Potential Features, as it has not been adequately demonstrated how the buildings would protect or enhance local views, which contribute to the sense of place, at these prominent Granton waterfront and waterside locations.
5. The proposals are contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Des 4 in respect of Development Design - Impact on Setting, and the Edinburgh Design Guidance, owing to their failure to demonstrate how the combined impacts of the buildings' height and massing would impact on the views of the wider townscape and landscape, which at this site would include the City of Edinburgh Council, key view 32c (Firth of Forth).
6. The proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 5 (a) in respect of Development Design - Amenity, as it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed residential development at Plot 29 or that the development at both plots would ensure that acceptable daylight provision would be maintained for neighbouring residents, in compliance with the standards of the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

7. The proposals are contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Des 5 (c) in respect of Development Design - Amenity, as they fail to promote community safety, owing to the lack of provision of active frontages or for the designing for natural surveillance on important routes through the site.
8. The proposals are contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Des 7 (Layout Design) and policy Env 20 (Open Space in New Developments) as the design of the layout, including the location of the public open space, fails to make adequate provision for the encouragement of walking and cycling, or ensuring that such routes are overlooked by surrounding properties and providing safe and convenient access in and around the site, with particular regard for the needs of people with limited mobility and special needs.
9. The proposals are contrary to Local Development Plan Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking) as the proposed level of parking provision exceeds the maximum level specified in the Edinburgh Design Guidance and fails to comply with the Council's wider strategy of encouraging sustainable, non-car transport modes.

Financial impact

4.1 The financial impact has been assessed as follows:

Communities and Families has advised that the contribution set in the approved consent will result in a funding shortfall with regard to the delivery of the education infrastructure required in this Education Contribution Zone.

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 assessed 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 advertised on 1 December 2017 and attracted 43 letters of objection.

The application was then re-notified on 6 August 2018. An additional six letters of representation were received to the application.

The representations are addressed in the Assessment Section of the report.

Background reading/external references

- To view details of the application go to
- [Planning and Building Standards online services](#)
- [Planning guidelines](#)
- [Conservation Area Character Appraisals](#)
- [Edinburgh Local Development Plan](#)
- [Scottish Planning Policy](#)

**Statutory Development
Plan Provision**

The site is located within the Urban Area as shown on the Local Development Plan (LDP) proposals map. It is identified as being within the Edinburgh Waterfront.

LDP Policy Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront) supports the creation of new urban quarters at Granton Waterfront and includes requirements for maximising the potential development of the site, in accordance with any relevant development principles. Development brief or other guidance.

LDP. Proposal EW 2c (Granton Harbour) states that the area is proposed for a housing-led mixed use development. It sets out a number of Development Principles. These include that proposals will be expected to:

- Complete the approved street layout and perimeter block urban form.
- Provide a housing mix that is appropriate in terms of place-making and would maximise completions within this urban regeneration proposal within the plan period.
- Complete the relevant section of the waterside Edinburgh Promenade.
- Include tourism and water front related leisure and entertainment uses.

Date registered

15 November 2017

Drawing numbers/Scheme

53C,54B,55A, 56-58,59B,60-67,68A,69-71,
,
01A,02A,03C,04C,05D,06B-
12B,13C,14D,15C,16C,17B,
38B-41B,42A,43B,44B,45C,46A,47,
48x,49A,50B,51,52,
18B,19C,20D-23D,24C,25C,26A,27C-32C,33F,34D-
37D,,

Scheme 3

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

Contact: Carla Parkes, Senior Planning Officer
E-mail: carla.parkes@edinburgh.gov.uk Tel: 0131 529 3925

Links - Policies

Relevant Policies:

Non-statutory guidelines 'The Edinburgh Standards for Streets' sets out principles and guidance whose aim is to achieve a coherent and enhanced public realm.

NSESBB Non-statutory guidelines Part B of 'The Edinburgh Standards for Sustainable Building' sets principles to assess the sustainability of major planning applications in Edinburgh

Relevant policies of the Local Development Plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LDP Policy Des 7 (Layout design) sets criteria for assessing layout design.

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

LDP Policy Des 10 (Waterside Development) sets criteria for assessing development on sites on the coastal edge or adjoining a watercourse, including the Union Canal.

LDP Policy Env 8 (Protection of Important Remains) establishes a presumption against development that would adversely affect the site or setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument or archaeological remains of national importance.

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 13 (Sites of International Importance) identifies the circumstances in which development likely to affect Sites of International Importance will be permitted.

LDP Policy Env 14 (Sites of National Importance) identifies the circumstances in which development likely to affect Sites of National Importance will be permitted.

LDP Policy Env 15 (Sites of Local Importance) identifies the circumstances in which development likely to affect Sites of Local Importance will be permitted.

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

LDP Policy Env 20 (Open Space in New Development) sets out requirements for the provision of open space in 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 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 Emp 10 (Hotel Development) sets criteria for assessing sites for hotel development.

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

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

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

Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines

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

Appendix 1

Application for Approval of Matters Specified in Conditions 17/05306/AMC

**At Granton Harbour, West Harbour Road, Edinburgh
Granton Harbour plots 29 and 35: Housing, hotel and serviced flats development. Application for approval of matters conditioned regarding the erection of buildings containing residential flats, hotel and serviced apartments; formation of road access, parking, and open space (AS AMENDED)**

Consultations

Scottish Water

Scottish Water has no objection to this planning application; however, the applicant should be aware that this does not confirm that the proposed development can currently be serviced and would advise the following:

Water

- There is currently sufficient capacity in the Marchbank Water Treatment Works. However, please note that further investigations may be required to be carried out once a formal application has been submitted to us.

Foul

- There is currently sufficient capacity in the Edinburgh Waste Water Treatment Works. However, please note that further investigations may be required to be carried out once a formal application has been submitted to us.

The applicant should be aware that we are unable to reserve capacity at our water and/or waste water treatment works for their proposed development. Once a formal connection application is submitted to Scottish Water after full planning permission has been granted, we will review the availability of capacity at that time and advise the applicant accordingly.

Surface Water

For reasons of sustainability and to protect our customers from potential future sewer flooding, Scottish Water will not normally accept any surface water connections into our combined sewer system.

There may be limited exceptional circumstances where we would allow such a connection for brownfield sites only, however this will require significant justification from the customer taking account of various factors including legal, physical, and technical challenges.

In order to avoid costs and delays where a surface water discharge to our combined sewer system is anticipated, the developer should contact Scottish Water at the earliest opportunity with strong evidence to support the intended drainage plan prior to making a connection request. We will assess this evidence in a robust manner and provide a decision that reflects the best option from environmental and customer perspectives.

General notes:

- Scottish Water's current minimum level of service for water pressure is 1.0 bar or 10m head at the customer's boundary internal outlet. Any property which cannot be adequately serviced from the available pressure may require private pumping arrangements to be installed, subject to compliance with Water Byelaws. If the developer wishes to enquire about Scottish Water's procedure for checking the water pressure in the area then they should write to the Customer Connections department at the above address.

- If the connection to the public sewer and/or water main requires to be laid through land out-with public ownership, the developer must provide evidence of formal approval from the affected landowner(s) by way of a deed of servitude.

- Scottish Water may only vest new water or waste water infrastructure which is to be laid through land out with public ownership where a Deed of Servitude has been obtained in our favour by the developer.

- The developer should also be aware that Scottish Water requires land title to the area of land where a pumping station and/or SUDS proposed to vest in Scottish Water is constructed.

Next Steps:

- Single Property/Less than 10 dwellings

For developments of less than 10 domestic dwellings (or non-domestic equivalent) we will require a formal technical application to be submitted directly to Scottish Water or via the chosen Licensed Provider if non domestic, once full planning permission has been granted. Please note in some instances we will require a Pre-Development Enquiry Form to be submitted (for example rural location which are deemed to have a significant impact on our infrastructure) however we will make you aware of this if required.

- 10 or more domestic dwellings:

For developments of 10 or more domestic dwellings (or non-domestic equivalent) we require a Pre-Development Enquiry (PDE) Form to be submitted directly to Scottish Water prior to any formal Technical Application being submitted. This will allow us to fully appraise the proposals.

Where it is confirmed through the PDE process that mitigation works are necessary to support a development, the cost of these works is to be met by the developer, which Scottish Water can contribute towards through Reasonable Cost Contribution regulations.

- Non Domestic/Commercial Property:

Since the introduction of the Water Services (Scotland) Act 2005 in April 2008 the water industry in Scotland has opened up to market competition for non-domestic customers. All Non-domestic Household customers now require a Licensed Provider to act on their behalf for new water and waste water connections. Further details can be obtained at www.scotlandontap.gov.uk

- Trade Effluent Discharge from Non Dom Property:

Certain discharges from non-domestic premises may constitute a trade effluent in terms of the Sewerage (Scotland) Act 1968. Trade effluent arises from activities including; manufacturing, production and engineering; vehicle, plant and equipment washing, waste and leachate management. It covers both large and small premises, including activities such as car washing and launderettes. Activities not covered include hotels, caravan sites or restaurants.

The Waste (Scotland) Regulations which require all non-rural food businesses, producing more than 50kg of food waste per week, to segregate that waste for separate collection. The regulations also ban the use of food waste disposal units that dispose of food waste to the public sewer. Further information can be found at www.resourceefficientscotland.com.

Economic Development

The following are comments from the City of Edinburgh Council's Economic Development service relating to planning application 17/05306/AMC for a mixed-use development at Granton Harbour, Edinburgh.

Commentary on existing use

The application relates to a 1.8-hectare brownfield gap site at Granton Harbour. The site was reclaimed from the Forth via infilling relatively recently and has never been developed; it therefore does not support any economic activity.

Commentary on proposed uses

The application proposes a development of two blocks: a hotel/serviced apartment block and a block of flats.

- Class 7 - Hotels and Hostels

The development as proposed would deliver a 186-bedroom full service hotel along with 112 serviced apartments. The operator of the proposed hotel has been named as Moxy Hotels, a "boutique budget" brand.

Based on an average employment density of one employee per two bedrooms for upscale hotels and one employee per five bedrooms for limited service hotels, the hotel and serviced apartments could be expected to directly support approximately 115 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs $((186 \div 2) + (112 \div 5))$.

Based on the average GVA per worker for employees in the accommodation sector in Edinburgh of £27,033 per annum, this could be expected to directly add approximately £3.11 million of GVA (2015 prices) to the economy of Edinburgh per annum (115 x £27,033).

These figures do not include the impact of expenditure by visitors to Edinburgh staying in the hotel on items other than accommodation (for example, transport, recreation, and shopping) due to a lack of the raw data required to model this impact robustly.

- Sui generis - Flats

The development as proposed would deliver 108 residential units. These would not be expected to directly support any economic activity beyond potentially a small number of jobs in factoring and personal services such as housekeeping. However, the units could be expected to support economic activity via the expenditure of their residents. Based on average levels of household expenditure in Scotland, the residents of the 108 units could be expected to collectively spend approximately £2.71 million per annum (2015 prices). Of this £2.71 million, it is estimated that approximately £1.43 million could reasonably be expected to primarily be made within Edinburgh. This £1.43 million could be expected to directly support approximately 15 jobs and £0.50 million of GVA per annum (2015 prices) in Edinburgh, primarily in the retail, transport and hospitality sectors.

SUMMARY RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

The development as proposed is projected to directly support 115 full-time equivalent jobs and £3.11 million of GVA per annum (2015 prices), with a further 15 jobs and £0.50 million of GVA (2015 prices) supported throughout Edinburgh by residents' expenditure.

Scottish Natural Heritage

Thanks for the opportunity to look at the three AMC applications at Granton Harbour. I have reviewed the list of conditions found in the three supporting Design and Access Statements.

As you have stated below, we have provided advice to the Council at the Masterplan stages of this development, as well as throughout the CEC LDP process. As such I am content that we do not need to provide any additional comments on these AMC proposals.

SEPA

Thank you for your consultation which SEPA received on 18 January 2018.

Advice for the planning authority

We have no objection to this planning application, but please note the advice provided below, especially in section 1.

1. Drainage

Foul Drainage.

1.1 There appears to be confirmation from Scottish Water that there is capacity at Edinburgh Waste Water Treatment Works for sewage from this site and, therefore, we have no objection to this application. We strongly advise you to have this confirmed before this planning application is determined.

1.2 SEPA would not support or approve a CAR licence for any private sewage plant, until the connection to the public sewer has been investigated.

Surface Water Drainage

1.3 The proposals for surface water drainage are acceptable to SEPA.

2. Flood Risk

2.1 We have no objection to the proposed development on flood risk grounds. Notwithstanding this we expect Edinburgh Council to undertake its responsibilities as the Flood Prevention Authority.

2.2 We have provided advice on a number of planning applications in the Granton Harbour area, including the overall masterplan, reference 01/00802/OUT. We did not object to the overall masterplan. We have, however, made recommendations on finished floor levels and any development below ground.

2.3 An updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), has been completed by Fairhurst (August 2017). This updated FRA includes additional analysis to quantify wave action and overtopping rates at the site. It is for the City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) to satisfy itself that the assessment of wave action and joint probability correspond with its analysis of these factors.

2.4 We previously recommended that finished floor levels (FFLs) should be set above 5.07mAOD. The FRA recommends FFLs of 5.44mAOD and review of site elevations FFLs of the ground floor are set at a minimum of 6.0m. We support the elevation of FFLs and the overland flow pathways shown within the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP). Where ground levels are landscaped they should direct surface water away from developments and not increase flood risk to nearby properties.

2.5 We note that an underground car park is proposed underneath the proposed developments. No further information has been provided on mitigation measures against groundwater ingress, however within the FRA it is stated that the access points or openings to the basement levels should be set to a minimum of 5.44mAOD, which we support. Given the proximity of the sites to the coast and the fact that the parking spaces will be set below the 1 in 200 year extreme still water level for the area we strongly recommend that the car park is tanked and all entrances and exits are elevated relative to the surrounding area so they will not be inundated with surface water in the event of heavy rainfall. We also strongly recommend that in addition to tanking, pumps are installed within to ensure that should water ingress occur, there is a way to remove the standing water.

Caveats and Additional Information for Applicant

2.6 The SEPA Flood Maps have been produced following a consistent, nationally-applied methodology for catchment areas equal to or greater than 3km² 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/>

2.7 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.

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 the City of Edinburgh Council as Planning Authority in terms of the said Section 72 (1). Our briefing note "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/>

Regulatory advice for the applicant

3. Regulatory requirements

3.1 Details of regulatory requirements and good practice advice for the applicant can be found on the Regulations section of our website. If you are unable to find the advice you need for a specific regulatory matter, please contact a member of the regulatory team in the local SEPA office at: Silvan House, SEPA 3rd Floor, 231 Corstorphine Road, Edinburgh EH12 7AT. Tel: 0131 449 7296.

Flood Prevention - updated 19/04/2018

The certificates provided are sufficient to address the last of the Flood Prevention comments. We are happy for the application to proceed with no further comment.

Flood Prevention

Thank you for the consultation. There are two items of information that we require. These are the Certificate A1 for the self-certification of the Flood Risk assessment and the Certificate B1 covering the independent check of the Flood Risk Assessment. The Certificates provided only cover the surface water management plan.

Other than that, the information submitted appears to be in line with CEC guidelines.

Environmental Protection Response 15/2/19

Environmental Protection understands that plot-specific issues will be addressed through detailed development processes (assuming the Masterplan delivers no major shift in the content or context of the outline approval, including development phasing). This proposal follows what has been agreed in the masterplan however the density of this proposal has increased. The indicative capacity approved in the most recent Masterplan (Y-2f) of plot 29 is 79 flats and plot 35 is 128 hotel rooms and 92 hotel-apartments with 1488m2 of commercial/ business. The present proposal for plot 29 is 108 units and for plot 35 is 186 hotel rooms and 112 apartments. This is higher than the masterplan with 431 car parking spaces.

The site is in to the north of the Granton Harbour development and is located to the north east of the main thoroughfare Hesperus Broadway. The plots are bordered by Stopford Parade, North Breakwater road, Merlin Road and Stopford Way. There is also a proposed community boatyard at 'Plots 8A & 8B', and the Forth Corinthian Yacht Club located at Middle Pier in close proximity to the propose development site.

The 'public' areas in the hotel occupy the ground and first floors. The accommodation extends to an extensive spa and wellness centre, the hotel reception and lounge, a number of dining spaces, retail spaces and two bars. These spaces encircle the south-west facing landscaped courtyard, at both levels. This arrangement provides a high level of visual and physical interaction between the internal spaces of the hotel and the courtyard.

The applicant has advised that the hotel will incorporate low-carbon energy technology in the form of solar PV arrays on the roof and Combine Heat and Power.

Noise

The 'Plot 35' comprises of apartment hotel and leisure. The hotels service yard is contained within the building, most deliveries and unloading activities will likely occur within this proposed enclosed yard. The proposed hotel building has further ancillary accommodation extending to a function suit, restaurant, bistro, bar and a spa suite. The proposed hotel also has terraces for the bar/restaurant and function spaces in an elevated position with views of the Marina and the Firth of Forth to the north and east.

The applicant has submitted supporting noise impact assessments it has addressed the noise from the proposed delivery and service yard of the proposed hotel. Another noise impact assessment has been submitted to assess the other operational noise concerns raised by Environmental Protection. To assume a worst-case scenario some external delivery activity during the day and night-time period has been considered in the noise assessment. Another noise impact assessment has addressed the other proposed uses such as the function suit, restaurant, bistro, bar and spa suite. The noise impact assessment has assessed the potential impacts these uses may have on the proposed/consented residential properties. It has been highlighted in the noise impact assessment that noise mitigation measures will be required to ensure residential amenity will be protected. Environmental Protection shall recommend a condition is attached to ensure the noise mitigation measures are implemented.

Land contamination

Environmental Protection has received information regarding the outline consent for Granton Harbour (01/00802/OUT). The applicant has submitted an updated Ground Investigation Report which is currently being assessed by Environmental Protection. Until this has been completed Environmental Protection recommends that a condition is attached to ensure that contaminated land is fully addressed.

Odours

The applicant has provided details of where the commercial kitchen extracts will be located. This information is required to ensure cooking odours from the hotel, restaurant or public house uses do not discharge into residential or other sensitive uses. Environmental Protection shall recommend a condition is attached to ensure the appropriate extraction system is installed as per drawing A-P-RF-G2-014 rev D dated 26/07/2018.

Air Quality

As detailed above the quantum of development has increased, Environmental Protection is concerned with the proposed number of car parking spaces.

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

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

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

Developers should now consider the potential for EV charging as they develop their proposals. Based on currently available technology Environmental Protection recommends that a 7Kw charger is installed for each parking space provided in the parking area. The location of each charger should be included in a referenced drawing.

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.

With regards to air quality Environmental Protection raises concerns due to the increased density of development with no local air quality mitigation measures. We would normally encourage the developer to work with this department to produce a 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 electric vehicle charging facilities.*
4. *Public transport incentives for residents.*
5. *Improved cycle/pedestrian facilities and links.*

Environmental Protection would also advise the applicant that all energy systems must comply with the Clean Air Act 1993 and that Environmental Protection will not support the use of biomass.

Environmental Protection now offers no objection subject to the conditions and legal agreement recommendations from 01/00802/FUL planning application being carried forward. Specifically, regarding this plot, the following conditions must be attached to any consent;

Conditions

Noise

1. *The following noise protection measures to the proposed hotel, as defined in the 'Enviro Centre Mechanical Services Plant & Noise Breakout Assessment' report (Ref 8302 - 771381-MI1-RGM), dated August 2018:*

- *An acoustic lobby is required to serve the function room door at east corner of ground floor as shown in drawings A-P-00-G2-005 rev B & A-P00-G2-004 rev E both dated 26/07/2018.*

shall be carried out in full and completed prior to the development being occupied.

Odours

2. *Prior to the use being taken up, the extract flue and ventilation system, capable of 30 air changes per hour, as show on drawing no. A-P-RF-G2-014 rev D dated 26/07/2018 shall be implemented.*

Contaminated Land

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

(a) *A site survey (including initial desk study as a minimum) must be carried out to establish to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning, 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 remedial and/or protective measures, including their programming, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning.*

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 to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning.

Local Air Quality

4. *Prior to the use being taken up, 7Kw electric vehicle charging point, shall be installed serving each space in the car park for all residential properties.*

Informative

1. *Electric vehicle charging points should be installed in accordance with Transport Scotland's Switched On Scotland: A Roadmap to Widespread Adoption of Plug-in Vehicles (2013).*

2. *When available the applicant shall provide details of all the boilers to Environmental Assessment to ensure compliance with the Clean Air Act 1993.*

3. *It should be noted that when designing the exhaust ducting, heating, ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) good duct practice should be implemented to ensure that secondary noise is not generated by turbulence in the duct system. It is recommended that the HVAC Engineer employed to undertake the work, undertakes the installation with due cognisance of the Chartered Institute of Building Services Engineers (CIBSE) and American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Guidance.*

Contaminated Land

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

(a) *A site survey (including initial desk study as a minimum) must be carried out to establish to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning, 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 remedial and/or protective measures, including their programming, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning*

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 to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning

Local Air Quality

1. *Prior to the use being taken up, 7Kw electric vehicle charging point, shall be installed serving each space in the car park for all residential properties.*

Informative

2. *Electric vehicle charging points should be installed in accordance with Transport Scotland's Switched On Scotland: A Roadmap to Widespread Adoption of Plug-in Vehicles (2013).*

3. When available the applicant shall provide details of all the boilers to Environmental Assessment to ensure compliance with the Clean Air Act 1993.

Further Environmental Protection response

As the current application is an AMC application relating to the outline planning permission, there is already consent for an acceptable quantum of development on the site. This application is for two new buildings 'Plot 29' a block of flats with a total of 108 residential units comprising a mix of 1,2 and 3 bedroom flats and 'Plot 35' a 186-bedroom hotel with a further 112 serviced apartments. The hotel building has further ancillary accommodation extending to a function suit, restaurant, bistro, bar, a spa suite, and on-site 431 parking spaces.

Environmental Protection understands that plot-specific issues will be addressed through detailed development processes (assuming the Masterplan delivers no major shift in the content or context of the outline approval, including development phasing). This proposal follows what has been agreed in the masterplan however the density of this proposal has increased. The indicative capacity approved in the most recent Masterplan (Y-2f) of plot 29 is 79 flats and plot 35 is 128 hotel rooms and 92 hotel-apartments with 1488m² of commercial/ business. The present proposal for plot 29 is 108 units and for plot 35 is 186 hotel rooms and 112 apartments. This is higher than the masterplan with 431 car parking spaces.

The site is in to the north of the Granton Harbour development and is located to the north east of the main thoroughfare Hesperus Broadway. The plots are bordered by Stopford Parade, North Breakwater road, Merlin Road and Stopford Way. There is also a proposed community boatyard at 'Plots 8A & 8B', and the Forth Corinthian Yacht Club located at Middle Pier in close proximity to the propose development site.

The 'public' areas in the hotel occupy the ground and first floors. The accommodation extends to an extensive spa and wellness centre, the hotel reception and lounge, a number of dining spaces, retail spaces and two bars. These spaces encircle the south-west facing landscaped courtyard, at both levels. This arrangement provides a high level of visual and physical interaction between the internal spaces of the hotel and the courtyard.

The applicant has advised that the hotel will incorporate low-carbon energy technology in the form of solar PV arrays on the roof and Combine Heat and Power.

Noise

The 'Plot 35' comprises of apartment hotel and leisure. The hotels service yard is contained within the building, most deliveries and unloading activities will likely occur within this proposed enclosed yard. The proposed hotel building has further ancillary accommodation extending to a function suit, restaurant, bistro, bar and a spa suite. The proposed hotel also has terraces for the bar/restaurant and function spaces in an elevated position with views of the Marina and the Firth of Forth to the north and east.

The applicant has submitted a supporting noise impact assessment it has addressed the noise from the proposed delivery and service yard of the proposed hotel. To assume a worst-case scenario some external delivery activity during the day and night-time period has been considered in the noise assessment. However, the noise impact assessment has not addressed any of the other proposed uses such as the function suit, restaurant, bistro, bar and spa suite. The noise impact assessment should have assessed the potential impacts these uses may have on the proposed/consented residential properties. It is therefore concluded that the noise impact assessment is not demonstrating a worst-case scenario. Based on the submitted noise impact assessment Environmental Protection recommend the application is refused.

Land contamination

Environmental Protection has received information regarding the outline consent for Granton Harbour (01/00802/OUT). The applicant has submitted an updated Ground Investigation Report which is currently being assessed by Environmental Protection. Until this has been completed Environmental Protection recommends that a condition is attached to ensure that contaminated land is fully addressed.

Odours

The applicant has not provided any details on where the commercial kitchen extracts will be located. This information is required to ensure cooking odours from the hotel, restaurant or public house uses do not discharge into residential or other sensitive uses.

Air Quality

As detailed above the quantum of development has increased, Environmental protection is concerned with the proposed number of car parking spaces.

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

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

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

Developers should now consider the potential for EV charging as they develop their proposals. Based on currently available technology Environmental Protection recommends that a 7Kw charger is installed for each parking space provided in the parking area. The location of each charger should be included in a referenced drawing.

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.

With regards to air quality Environmental Protection do raise concerns due to the increased density of development with no local air quality mitigation measures. We would normally encourage the developer to work with this department to produce a 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 electric vehicle charging facilities.*
- 4. Public transport incentives for residents.*
- 5. Improved cycle/pedestrian facilities and links.*

Environmental Protection would also advise the applicant that all energy systems must comply with the Clean Air Act 1993 and that Environmental Protection will not support the use of biomass.

On balance, Environmental Protection recommends the application is refused due to the potential noise/odour impacts the hotel and other associated uses may have on the proposed residential properties. However, if consented it must be subject to the conditions and legal agreement recommendations from 01/00802/FUL planning application being carried forward. Specifically, regarding this plot, the following conditions must be attached to any consent. As the current application is an AMC application relating to the outline planning permission, there is already consent for an acceptable quantum of development on the site. This application is for two new buildings 'Plot 29' a block of flats with a total of 108 residential units comprising a mix of 1,2 and 3 bedroom flats and 'Plot 35' a 186-bedroom hotel with a further 112 serviced apartments. The hotel building has further ancillary accommodation extending to a function suit, restaurant, bistro, bar, a spa suite, and on-site 431 parking spaces.

Archaeology

Further to your consultation request I would like to make the following comments and recommendations in respect to this application for approval of matters conditioned regarding the erection of buildings containing residential flats, hotel and serviced apartments; formation of road access, parking, and open space (AS AMENDED).

I refer you to my earlier comments in response to 01/00802/OUT and subsequent AMC applications (06/03636/REM, 13/01013/AMC, 13/04320/AMC, 14/05305/AMC, 17/05120/AMC etc.) which outlined the archaeological significance of the Granton Harbour redevelopment site. In this site has been identified as being of archaeological importance overly both the western arm of the harbours Victorian breakwater completed in 1851. Therefore, this application must be considered under the terms Scottish Government's Our Place in Time (OPIT) and Scottish Planning Policy (SPP), Historic Environment Scotland's Policy Statement (HESPS) 2016 and Archaeology Strategy and also CEC's Edinburgh Local Development Plan (2016) Policy ENV9.

The amended proposals show that although the main building block will be constructed back from the main wall, the inner foundations for the Victorian breakwater will be impacted upon by the insertion of foundations piles. Accordingly, the construction of plot 35 is considered to have a low-moderate archaeological impact. Therefore, it is recommended that a programme of works is undertaken during works adjacent to and affecting this historic breakwater. This will complement the finding of CFA's earlier 2008 report (CFA report 1581, OASIS Ref cfaarcha1-52857) undertaken during test trenching along the line of the breakwater and recording of its upper superstructure.

It is therefore recommended that the following condition is attached to this application to ensure the completion of this archaeological programme of works;

'No development shall take place on the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work (excavation, analysis & reporting) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority.'

The work must be carried out by a professional archaeological organisation, either working to a brief prepared by CECAS or through a written scheme of investigation submitted to and agreed by CECAS for the site. Responsibility for the execution and resourcing of the programme of archaeological works and for the archiving and appropriate level of publication of the results lies with the applicant.

Waste Protection Service

The Council's Waste Protection Service has advised that it has no objections to the proposals for waste storage and collection.

Transport Planning

Further to the memorandum sent on the 15th of November 2018 and the subsequent amendments made this application should be refused.

Reasons:

- 1. The proposals within this application are not considered to comply with section 2.4 of the Edinburgh Design Guidance 2017 - Design, Integration and Quantity of Parking for the following reasons:*
 - a. Proposals exceed maximum standard for car parking (see not I for further information);*
 - b. No reasoned justification for the level of proposed car parking provision has been included within this application;*

Therefore the proposed level of car parking is considered contrary to the following policies of the Edinburgh LDP and Edinburgh's Local Transport Strategy (LTS):

- c. Tra 2 - Private Car Parking (LDP);
- d. Thrive 1 (LTS)
- e. Cars 1 (LTS)
- f. Park 4 (LTS)
- g. Park 24 (LTS)
- h. Park 26 (LTS)

2. The application is not considered to meet the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, as people with impaired mobility will have significant issues with a number of areas within the proposed development due to limited accessibility. This also raises issues for cycle, pram and pushchair access to certain areas within the development.

Notes:

I. The application has been assessed under the 2017 parking standards. These permit the following:

a. A maximum of 257 car parking spaces (one space per housing unit and one space per 2 rooms for the hotel) for a development of this size and nature. 313 car parking spaces are proposed;

b. A minimum of 245 cycle parking spaces. 432 cycle parking spaces are proposed;

c. A minimum of 20 Motorcycle parking spaces, 19 motorcycle parking spaces are proposed;

a. A minimum of 8% of the car parking provision should be designated as accessible parking. This should result in 25 accessible spaces, 31 accessible spaces are proposed;

b. A minimum of 1 in 6 spaces should be equipped for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging. Resulting in 52 EV spaces, 53 EV spaces are proposed;

The serviced apartments proposed within this application have been assessed as hotel in relation to the parking standards.

The hotel includes a number of facilities that will be open to the public as well as customers. Parking associated with these facilities is taken into account within the parking standard for hotel use, which incorporates an assumption of dual-use of the hotel and its facilities.

It is considered that the application does not provide adequate information and detail indicating how the development will contribute to a number of the aims and outcomes of Edinburgh's Local Transport Strategy that relate to reducing private car dependency and promoting modal shift to sustainable transport modes

II. No further detail was provided relating to the proposed 30 cycle parking spaces at ground level, as specified in the previous consultation response.

Transport Planning response - 15 November 2019

The application should be refused.

Reasons:

1. *The proposals within this application are not considered to comply with section 2.4 Design, Integration and Quantity of Parking of the Edinburgh Design Guidance 2017 as no reasoned justification for the level of proposed car parking provision has been included within this application. It is considered that the application does not provide adequate information and detail indicating how the development will contribute to a number of the aims and outcomes of Edinburgh's Local Transport Strategy that relate to reducing private car dependency and promoting modal shift to sustainable transport modes. Therefore the proposed level of car parking is considered contrary to the following policies of the Edinburgh LDP and Edinburgh's Local Transport Strategy (LTS):*
 - a. *Tra 2 - Private Car Parking (LDP);*
 - b. *Thrive 1 (LTS)*
 - c. *Cars 1 (LTS)*
 - d. *Park 4 (LTS)*
 - e. *Park 24 (LTS)*
 - f. *Park 26 (LTS)*
2. *Further detail is required relating to the proposed 30 cycle parking spaces at ground level;*
3. *There are concerns relating to cyclists access to the underground car park. Provision should be made for either a separate cycle access or a segregated area on the proposed access ramps should be made available for cyclists.*
4. *The application is considered to not meet the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, as people with impaired mobility would have significant issues accessing the proposed raised amenity area from Stopford Street due to only a stepped access being proposed. This stepped access also raises issues for cyclist access to this area.*

Notes:

1. *The application has been assessed under the 2017 parking standards. These permit the following:*
 - a. *A maximum of 313 car parking spaces, 313 car parking spaces are proposed;*
 - b. *A minimum of 424 cycle parking spaces, 432 cycle parking spaces are proposed;*
 - c. *A minimum of 8% of the car parking provision should be designated as accessible parking. This should result in 25 accessible spaces, 31 accessible spaces are proposed;*
 - d. *A minimum of 1 in 6 spaces should be equipped for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging. Resulting in 52 EV spaces, 53 EV spaces are proposed;*
2. *The hotel includes a number of facilities that will be open to the public as well as customers. Parking associated with these facilities is taken into account within the parking standard for hotel use, which incorporates an assumption of dual-use of the hotel and its facilities.*
3. *The serviced apartments proposed within this development have been assessed as residential in relation to the parking standards. If assessed as hotel the following is applicable for this development under the 2017 parking standards:*
 - a. *A maximum of 257 car parking spaces (one space per housing unit and one space per 2 rooms for the hotel) for a development of this size and nature.*
 - b. *A minimum of 245 cycle parking spaces.*
 - c. *A minimum of 20 Motorcycle parking spaces.*

- d. A minimum of 8% of the car parking provision should be designated as accessible parking.
- e. A minimum of 1 in 6 car parking spaces should be equipped for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging.

Transport response 14 March 2019

Further to the memorandum sent on the 15th of November 2018 and the subsequent amendments made, this application should be refused.

Reasons:

1. *The proposals within this application are not considered to comply with section 2.4 of the Edinburgh Design Guidance 2017 - Design, Integration and Quantity of Parking for the following reasons:*

a. *Proposals exceed maximum standard for car parking (see not 1 for further information);*

b. *No reasoned justification for the level of proposed car parking provision has been included within this application;*

Therefore the proposed level of car parking is considered contrary to the following policies of the Edinburgh LDP and Edinburgh's Local Transport Strategy (LTS):

c. *Tra 2 - Private Car Parking (LDP);*

d. *Thrive 1 (LTS)*

e. *Cars 1 (LTS)*

f. *Park 4 (LTS)*

g. *Park 24 (LTS)*

h. *Park 26 (LTS)*

2. *The proposals within this application are considered contrary to LDP policy Tra 9 - Cycle and Footpath Network for the following reasons:*

a. *The proposals do not include an extension of the cycle route on Hesperus Broadway, as per the masterplan approved February 2017 (16/05618/AMC). The proposed extension of the cycle route would also form part of the proposed Edinburgh Waterfront Promenade;*

b. *A number of the footways within the development boundary are narrowed to an unacceptable standard, this will have an impact on pedestrians and will cause significant issues for people with mobility issues and visual impairments;*

3. *The application is not considered to meet the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, as people with impaired mobility will have significant issues with a number of areas within the proposed development due to limited accessibility. This also raises issues for cycle, pram and pushchair access to certain areas within the development.*

Notes:

1. *The application has been assessed under the 2017 parking standards. These permit the following:*

a. *A maximum of 257 car parking spaces (one space per housing unit and one space per 2 rooms for the hotel) for a development of this size and nature. 313 car parking spaces are proposed;*

b. *A minimum of 245 cycle parking spaces. 432 cycle parking spaces are proposed;*

c. *A minimum of 20 Motorcycle parking spaces, 19 motorcycle parking spaces are proposed;*

a. *A minimum of 8% of the car parking provision should be designated as accessible parking. This should result in 25 accessible spaces, 31 accessible spaces are proposed;*

b. A minimum of 1 in 6 spaces should be equipped for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging. Resulting in 52 EV spaces, 53 EV spaces are proposed; The serviced apartments proposed within this application have been assessed as hotel in relation to the parking standards.

The hotel includes a number of facilities that will be open to the public as well as customers. Parking associated with these facilities is taken into account within the parking standard for hotel use, which incorporates an assumption of dual-use of the hotel and its facilities.

It is considered that the application does not provide adequate information and detail indicating how the development will contribute to a number of the aims and outcomes of Edinburgh's Local Transport Strategy that relate to reducing private car dependency and promoting modal shift to sustainable transport modes

II. No further detail was provided relating to the proposed 30 cycle parking spaces at ground level, as specified in the previous consultation response;

III. In relation to the cycle parking there are concerns that the proposed layout within the underground car park is not particularly secure, particularly for residents. Consideration needs to be given to the security needs of the different uses. The Draft Street Design Guidance Fact Sheet C7 - Cycle Parking details the requirements for cycle parking for different uses

Children and Families response - 31 January 2019

The Council has assessed the impact of the growth set out in the LDP through an Education Appraisal (August 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 2019).

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'.

Assessment and Contribution Requirements

Assessment based on:

89 Flats (19 one bedroom flats excluded)

This site falls within Sub-Area CB-1 of the 'Craigroyston Broughton Education Contribution Zone'.

The Council has assessed the impact of the proposed development on the identified education infrastructure actions and current delivery programme.

The education infrastructure actions that are identified are appropriate to mitigate the cumulative impact of development that would be anticipated if this proposal progressed.

The proposed development is therefore required to make a contribution towards the delivery of these actions based on the established 'per house' and 'per flat' rates for the appropriate part of the Zone.

If the appropriate infrastructure and land contribution is provided by the developer, as set out below, Communities and Families does not object to the application.

*Total infrastructure contribution required:
£314,704*

Note - all infrastructure contributions shall be index linked based on the increase in the BCIS Forecast All-in Tender Price Index from Q4 2017 to the date of payment.

*Total land contribution required:
£1,691*

Note - no indexation to be applied to land contribution.

Although the above assessment is based on the current approach to determining developer contributions, there is a legal agreement attached to the original outline consent for the Granton Harbour development (01/00802/OUT). The Planning service has advised that the terms of this agreement are applicable to this application. This requires payment of £1,366 (to be indexed from 2002) per residential unit towards education infrastructure.

If 108 units are delivered at Granton Harbour under the terms of the original agreement, the value of the financial contributions that the Council would receive is estimated to be £233,782 (as at Q4 2017).

It is therefore likely that there will be a significant funding gap with regard to the delivery of the infrastructure that is now required to serve the new housing development expected in the Contribution Zone.

The potential for such gaps to arise has previously been identified and reported through LDP Action Programme governance arrangements, including a report to the Council's Finance and Resource Committee (24 January 2018). There is as yet no confirmed source of alternative funding to address the cumulative gap in capital funding arising. There will also be significant additional revenue costs arising from the new education infrastructure for which no revenue budget currently exists within either Communities and Families, or Corporate Property (with whom responsibility for all property related budgets now lies).

Any future capital and revenue budget pressures arising from the infrastructure requirements in this area, and the Local Development Plan as a whole, will need to be considered as part of the on-going budget consultation process. If the funding gap towards the education infrastructure actions identified in the 'Craigroyston Broughton Education Contribution Zone' and the additional revenue costs are not addressed through Council budget processes, there is a significant risk that the Council will not be able to provide local school places for pupils arising from new development in this area.

Location Plan



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