

**Full Planning Application 05/02863/FUL
at
87 Ravelston Dykes Road
Edinburgh
EH4 3PA**

**Development Quality Sub-Committee
of the Planning Committee**

1 March 2006

1 Purpose of report

To consider application 05/02863/FUL, submitted by Eversley Homes Ltd..
The application is for: **Demolish existing dwelling house and erect a
development of eleven flats**

It is recommended that this application be **GRANTED** subject to the
conditions in Appendix B.

2 The Site and the Proposal

Site description

The property is a single storey stone bungalow set within extensive gardens.
The site area is 3655 square metres. The property is accessed via a private
road belonging to the adjacent school, which links to Ravelston Dykes Road
to the south, near to the junction with Murrayfield Avenue.

The neighbouring properties to the north south and west are residential.
Directly to the east there is the school (Mary Erskines) within its own
substantial grounds, on the opposite side of the private road.

The property is currently not located within a conservation area, however the
site is within an area proposed in the West Murrayfield Conservation Area
character appraisal for inclusion. Boundary changes would only be
implemented with the new City Local Plan.

There are a number of Listed Buildings within the vicinity, including the B Listed boundary wall within the grounds of the property, with two important features set within it (fireplace with dormerheads, and ice house entrance). There are listed buildings adjacent to the north of the site, which include 31 and 33 Ravelston Dykes Road (A listed), 95 Ravelston Dykes Road, the Mary Erskine School (formerly Ravelston House) (A listed), and 91 Ravelston Dykes Road, dovecot (B listed). The site is not in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes.

Site history

19.08.99 - Planning application for flatted development of fourteen flats and two mews dwellings withdrawn. (99/02555/FUL)

18.07.02 - Listed Building Consent for proposed flatted development of ten flats withdrawn. (02/02705/LBC)

03.10.2002 - Proposed flatted development of ten flats REFUSED. (02/02705/FUL) This application was for a six hundred and eighty-five square metre footprint traditionally detailed building of ten flats set further back into the site with surface parking for fourteen cars and a centrally positioned 5.5 metres wide access. Reasons for refusal were:

1. The proposal is contrary to Central Edinburgh Local Plan Policy CD11, in respect of New Development, as the proposal is considered unsuitable in both scale and height and not in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

2. The proposal is contrary to the Council's Non Statutory Guidance on Daylight, Sunlight and Privacy, in respect of Housing amenity, as the proposal will impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties.

21.12.05 Listed Building Consent granted to widen access and reinstate pillar. (05/02863/LBC)

Description of the Proposal

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing single storey villa, and the erection of a development of eleven flatted dwellings with twenty-four car parking spaces, fifteen of which are undercover, within the building.

The access to the site is widened, resulting in the removal of a small, 800mm, section of wall and relocation of a pillar. This has already been granted listed building consent.

This will be a three storey building, the upper storey being a set back penthouse level. Materials are brick and natural stone with the building

designed as a pavilion with wings extending from a central core. Units proposed are one two bed, nine three bed and one four bed ranging in size from one hundred and fifty-eighty to two hundred and thirteen square metres.

Bin storage is created at the entrance to the site, located behind the garden wall. The store includes provision for recycling bins. Full landscape details, including details of tree removal and proposed new planting, have been submitted.

3 Officer's Assessment and Recommendations

DETERMINING ISSUES

The determining issues are;

- Do the proposals preserve the listed building or its setting or any features of special or historic interest? there being a strong presumption against granting permission if they do not; For the purposes of this issue, 'preserve', in relation to a building, means preserve it either in its existing state or subject only to such alterations or extensions as can be carried out without serious detriment to its character.
- 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?

ASSESSMENT

To address the determining issues, the Committee needs to take account of the following specific considerations:

- a) Whether a flatted residential development is acceptable in principle in this location;
- b) The scale and quality of the design, and whether the proposals would have any adverse impact on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings;
- c) The quality of the proposed landscaping and whether the loss of trees is acceptable;
- d) Whether the proposals would have any adverse effect on the amenity of adjoining residents, and whether the prospective occupiers of the development would have adequate amenity; and
- e) Whether the parking and access arrangements are satisfactory.

a) The site is allocated for Housing and Compatible uses in the Central Edinburgh Local Plan. The present use is residential and surrounding uses are predominantly residential, with the exception of the school, which sits comfortably in proximity to residential uses. The local plan seeks to promote new housing where it will contribute to a more effective use of land and an improved environment and to promote diversity of provision to cater for the varied needs of the population. The Edinburgh and the Lothians Structure Plan 2015 encourages higher density redevelopment on windfall, brownfield sites in order to meet housing land requirements and to reflect changes in occupation structure due to falling household size and the reduction in the number of families with children (Policy HOU2).

The proposal will be more effective in its use of land for housing, providing eleven units where there is presently only one, and will enhance the mix of house types by providing flats in an area where there are predominantly detached houses. The principle of a flatted residential development is therefore supported.

b) The spatial pattern of this area is varied. To the east of the access road into the site is the school, set in substantial grounds. To the north is a more "organic" layout of buildings. Along the west of the access road are the Morris and Steedman modern houses in a linear pattern. The existing house on this site follows this pattern in terms of its orientation and positioning on the site. The proposed flatted block pays reference to the spatial pattern set by the more modern housing with the built form with the north and south "wings" following the established building line of these houses. The block then forms a return element, thus "ending the row" with a parking court to the front (east). This pattern is seen on plan form, but, due to the walled nature of the site, will not be read as such on the ground. The previously refused proposals pushed the development further back into the site, without reference to the existing spatial pattern and, although it had a smaller footprint, appeared as a single mass of unvarying height.

The footprint of building is one thousand one hundred and twenty-one square metres compared to three hundred and thirty-eight square metres for the existing house and garage. Existing hard landscaping amounted to eight hundred and fifty-five square metres compared with two hundred and eighty-five square metres now proposed. This amounts to a total built area, including hard landscaping, of 37% of the site. This is concentrated at the front of the site with the majority of the remaining green space at the rear. Concern has been expressed at the loss of garden area, but these figures indicate that the level of development is appropriate for the site. This compares favourably with the previously refused application which was more dominated by parking.

The development is of a contemporary style, and with the use of natural stone and brick, the materials are of an appropriately high standard to respect the setting. Surrounding walls are also a mix of stone and brick. The three storey

building is larger than the existing dwelling, which was only single storey (although some elements were the equivalent to two storey height). The height of the roof is three metres greater than the height of the wall to the north boundary of the site. Sections through the site show how the new development sits in relation to its context. The building sits at a lower level than number 97 to the north, thus the three storeys proposed is accommodated without appearing as a significant mass in relation to surrounding properties. Photomontages show the outline of the proposed building set within its context, as a larger structure than is on site at present but of an appropriate scale with the treed backdrop remaining dominant.

The development is separated from listed buildings both by intervening buildings and due to the walled nature of the site. The setting of the listed buildings is not compromised by the proposals. Historic Scotland has no objections to the proposals neither on the effect on the listed wall and its follies that are around the boundary to the site, nor the setting of adjacent buildings.

The scale and design of the proposal are acceptable in this context and will have no adverse impact on the setting of adjacent listed buildings.

c) The development can be built with minimal loss of significant trees. The plans indicate three trees to be removed within the site; a Gean, a Silver Birch and a Japanese Cherry. The trees within the site are contemporary with the existing house. Significant trees are located along the access road and these will remain unaltered.

The development remains as a building set within a walled garden, as at present. The use of high quality paving materials and retention of much of the existing landscaping, supplemented with new planting, will ensure a high quality landscape scheme.

d) The proposed development is higher than the existing house. The site sits lower than the property to the north and is in a gable to gable situation with the property to the south. Further, the fact that the site is surrounded by high walls means no overshadowing occurs to neighbours from the development.

The proposed building comes to within 3.5 metres of the boundary to both north and south, twenty-five metres to the rear boundary and five metres to the front boundary, compared to respective measurements of ten metres, zero metres, thirty-nine metres and eighteen metres for the existing house and garage. Concern has been expressed about the presence of balconies around the development in close proximity to neighbouring properties. These are either nine metres or more from boundaries or screened such that neighbouring privacy is not compromised. Windows at ground floor level are screened by the existing garden wall. The penthouse level flat is set back from the boundaries to ensure no loss of privacy to neighbours.

The occupants of the development will enjoy high levels of amenity. All flats overlook garden areas and have access to private balconies.

There will be no detrimental impact on neighbouring residents and the level of amenity afforded to prospective residents is high.

e) The site is currently serviced by an un-adopted access road. This provides access for twenty-five houses and the school. The access is 4.25 metres wide with three passing places. The agents engaged traffic consultants to look at traffic movements on this road to ascertain the impact of the development on traffic movements overall.

The majority of journeys along the access road to the site relate to dropping off and picking up from the school. This results in peak movements in the morning and afternoon. The access road is not owned by the applicants, the school or the other residents who gain access off it; it was retained in the ownership of the last owners of Ravelston House. It would not be possible for the applicants to carry out works to improve it. In addition, the access road is an attractive avenue with mature trees along it; the loss of these trees would be to the detriment of the character of the area and the setting of the listed Ravelston House.

The access road is not capable of being brought up to adoptable standards. However, the traffic consultants have indicated that certain improvements for the schools benefit can be made. There are separate pedestrian paths for those walking to school to use and the road itself allows vehicles at limited speeds to pass. Notwithstanding the recommendation from Transport, it is not considered that the additional eleven units would, in themselves, merit refusal based on a substandard access and the need to retain the tree lined avenue outweighs any benefits to be gained in upgrading the access road.

In conclusion, the proposals represent an appropriate use, designed to respect the constraints of the site and adjacent listed buildings, without detriment to residential amenity or highway safety.

It is recommended that the Committee approves this application, subject to conditions relating to materials, landscape and waste management implementation and archaeology, and to a legal agreement to ensure implementation of improvements to the access road in relation to school traffic.

ADDENDUM

This application was continued at the Development Quality Sub Committee on 1 March 2006 to visit the site, require further visual material and information on height massing and materials and clarify road issues.

A visit took place on 2 March 2006. Visual material was submitted which shows the relationship of the proposals to the previously refused application and photomontage images as well as massing diagrams. The ridge height of the previously refused proposal was at 74.4 metres above ordnance datum. The current proposal is at 72.2 metres AOD. Materials are a mix of brick and

stone, to match the context of the walled garden, which is also brick and stone.

Transport has confirmed that the access road could be brought up to adoptable standards without necessarily carrying out widening. However, works would require drainage to be brought up to adoptable standards and this would involve engineering works which would jeopardise tree roots. It would not be possible to carry out any engineering works within the vicinity of the trees along the access avenue without endangering the trees viability. Thus any works to improve the road to adoptable standards cannot be implemented.

It is recommended that the Committee approves this application, subject to the conditions previously stated.

Alan Henderson

Alan Henderson
Head of Planning and Strategy

Contact/tel	Barbara Cummins on 0131 529 3442
Ward affected	15 - Murrayfield
Local Plan	Central Edinburgh
Statutory Development Plan Provision	Housing and Compatible Uses
Date registered	30 August 2005
Drawing numbers/ Scheme	01, 02A, 03A,04 05A-15A, 16 Scheme 2

Advice to Committee Members and Ward Councillors

The full details of the application are available for viewing on the Planning and Building Control Portal : www.edinburgh.gov.uk/planning.

If you require further information about this application you should contact the following Principal Planner, Ian Dryden on 0131 529 3996. Email: ian.dryden@edinburgh.gov.uk.

If this application is not identified on the agenda for presentation, and you wish to request a presentation of this application at the Committee meeting, you must contact Committee Services by 9.00a.m. on the Tuesday preceding the meeting on extension 4229/4239. Alternatively, you may e-mail gavin.king@edinburgh.gov.uk or sarah.bogunovic@edinburgh.gov.uk

Application Type Full Planning Application
Application Address: 87 Ravelston Dykes Road
Edinburgh
EH4 3PA
Proposal: Demolish existing dwelling house and erect a development of eleven flats
Reference No: 05/02863/FUL

Consultations, Representations and Planning Policy

Consultations

Education

School Capacities

The site is located within the catchment areas of Blackhall Primary School, Fox Covert RC Primary School, The Royal High School and St Augustine's RC High School.

The development is unlikely to generate additional children for Blackhall Primary School, Fox Covert RC Primary School, The Royal High School and St Augustine's RC High School.

The forecasts are based on 2004 Start of Session School Rolls and housing completions identified in the Housing Land Audit 2004. Revised child to house ratios have been applied.

Summary

It is unlikely that this development would generate additional children for the catchment schools. Accordingly, I have no objection to this development.

Archaeology Service

Ravelston has been occupied since at least AD1363 (Harris, S. Place Names of Edinburgh), forming the centre of a medieval estate. The present Ravelston House built by George Foulis in 1790 is at least the last in a line of major buildings to have been at Ravelston, replacing an earlier 1624 mansion which in turn had replaced a medieval tower-house. Little is known of these earlier structures but it is almost certain that the two preserved 17th century, listed, openings attached to the walled garden originated in this earlier mansion house.

The site is therefore regarded as occurring within an area of archaeological potential and should be considered under National Planning Policy Guidance 5: Planning and Archaeology (NPPG 5) and the accompanying Planning Advice Note 42 (PAN42), both issued by the Secretary of state for Scotland in 1994. The aim should be to preserve archaeological deposits in situ as a first option, but alternatively where this is not possible, archaeological excavation or an appropriate level of recording may be an acceptable alternative.

As assessment of the location and scale of the proposed new development upon the walled garden and listed structures has led to the conclusion that the impact of this proposal would not be sufficient to justify refusal of consent on archaeological grounds. However, it is essential that both of the listed 17th century openings/structures are not only preserved in situ but that are protected during the development itself. Accordingly the developer must submit for approval prior to development a mitigation strategy which will meet this aim.

Furthermore, the close proximity any archaeological remains that may survive in situ could provide important information regarding the medieval origins and development of Ravelston. In relation to the possible scale of any such impact, it is in my opinion however that it again would not be significant enough to justify refusal of consent on archaeological grounds. Nevertheless, it is essential that a suitable programme of archaeological works (watching brief) is undertaken at the site by a professional archaeologists, in order to record any remains uncovered during ground breaking operations.

It is recommended therefore that this programme of works secured using a condition based upon the model condition stated in PAN 42 Planning and Archaeology (para 34), as follows;

'No development shall take place on the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work 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, working either 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 excavations and for the archiving and appropriate level of publication of the results lies with the applicant.

Historic Scotland

The application is for the proposed demolition of 87 Ravelston Dykes Road, an unlisted building outwith a conservation area. The proposal would see the demolition of the house, the site boundaries of which are an 18th century wall incorporating a composite garden folly and ice house entrance which are category B listed. This was once part of the Ravelston Tower policies, and as such is part of a much wider category A group, which should be considered in relation to this proposal.

The proposed flattened development would be sited approximately on the footprint of the current building, and does not appear to interfere with the historic built fabric of the listed walls enclosing the site.

We note that the entrance for the development is to be through the existing vehicular access, sited within the east wall. Although not fully elaborated on the submitted plans, we would ask that further details be submitted to us if it is the intention to widen this access in anyway. It is also noted on the plans that two feature entrance gateways are being proposed, both appearing to correlate with existing architectural features, such as the stone folly to the west of the site abutting the wall and the in-filled entrance to the east wall. The folly should remain in situ in an unaltered state and further details of the potential unblocking of the entrance arch should be passed to us for comment.

The Garden History Society

The society's concerns with this application are two-fold

- The reduction of garden ground at 87 Ravelston Dykes Road and the implications for the listed structures contained within the walled garden*
- The implications of the development on the wider setting of the remains of the former Ravelston House, and associated listed features*

We appreciate that neither the designed landscape of Ravelston House, now Mary Erskine School, nor the surviving fragments of the designed landscape of Old Ravelston House are included in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland. As a result of fragmentation and subsequent development they are unlikely to ever be considered for inclusion. Nevertheless, the remnants of the landscape which remain can still be considered of some Regional and local significance for their historical and architectural value, and scenic contribution to the landscape of West Edinburgh.

33 Ravelston Dykes Road and the A-listed tower in the garden of 97 are the remnants of the north wing of Old Ravelston House, constructed around 1620 by George Foulis of Colinton. The house was destroyed by fire in the 1830's and the current A-listed Ravelston House, now Mary Erskine School, constructed around 1837. 91 Ravelston Dykes Road, a B-listed doocot is also associated with the old house. Other surviving structure from the old house include the sire place, dated 1624, now built into the garden walls of number 87, the former ice house entrance in the same walls, all A-listed as one composite structure, and an A-listed fire place incorporated into the walls of number 37. The house was acquired by the Keith family in the early 18th century, to whom Sir Walter Scott was related, and the garden of Old Ravelston House is said to be the inspiration for the gardens of Tullyveolan in his novel, Waverley.

Number 87 Ravelston Dykes Road is located in the former walled garden of Ravelston House. Although clearly visible on the first Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1855, the walled garden is not shown on General Roy's Military Survey of 1750,

although there is some evidence of enclosure in this area, and was probably constructed during the late 18th century walls, provide an attractive and well maintained setting for the two listed features; in terms of garden design, a fairly successful blend of old and new.

The Garden History Society is always opposed to the irreversible loss of garden ground where this can be avoided. To date, the original area of the walled garden as designed in the 18th century has already been reduced by the construction of one dwelling house, but the balance retained as a successful setting a single house and the surviving architectural features contained in the walls. The proposed development of eleven flats would significantly increase the footprint of the built structure further increasing the loss of garden ground and reducing the area of setting for the architectural features, particularly the former entrance to the ice house. In addition, we would question whether the balance of ground retained as garden, 63% of the total garden area, would be sufficient garden ground for the setting of a development of eleven flats and consider this would lead to an over intensive development of the site.

With regards to the setting of the remnants of Old Ravelston House and associated listed features, the former walled garden can be considered to be an integral part. Although already compromised by surrounding developments, the namely the 1960's villa number 97, the Morris and Steadman development of low-rise houses to the south, and to a certain extent the existing house at number 87, sufficient fragments of the designed remain to provide a surprisingly effective setting for these 17th century features, largely provided by the walled garden structure and mature planting of various dates. Whilst the Society accepts that efforts have been made by the architects to restrict the height of the block of flats we are concerned that a more intensive development at this location will be intrusive and further degrade the remains of the fragile setting. We do however accept that the proposed development is likely to have minimal or no impact on the setting of the existing Ravelston House (Mary Erskine School).

We understand that consideration is being given by City of Edinburgh Council to extending the existing West Murrayfield Conservation Area to include this area west of the access road to Ravelston House, and this is likely to be adopted under the next review of the Central Edinburgh Local Plan. Although the area is currently allocated as residential, the Local Plan seeks to safeguard its existing residential character and amenities. To the east, west and north of the site areas designated as Open Spaces of Outstanding Landscape Quality, and Green Belt add to the rural, non intensive feel of the area.

To summarise therefore, the Society wishes to record its objection to this proposal and considers:

- It to be over intensive use of, and leading to further irreversible loss of garden ground within the walled garden*
- It will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the listed structures within the walled garden*

- It will have a detrimental effect on the setting of the surviving elements of the 17th century Old Ravelston House and its designed landscape which is of significant historical and literary value

- It is contrary to the protection offered by the proposed extension of the West Murrayfiled Conservation Area designation in safeguarding the sense of rural seclusion and privacy of this residential area.

Transport

This application be refused.

Reason: The road leading off Ravelston Dykes Road to the site is a substandard private road. This road needs to be brought up to an adoptable standard of 5.5m wide with a two metre footway, street lighting and drainage, before additional housing be considered.

Representations

The application was advertised on 6 September 2005.

Twenty-eight letters of representation have been received, from The Cockburn Association, the Garden History Society, the Feu Superiors for the site, the adjacent school and twenty-four local residents.

The issues raised are;

- Overdevelopment
- Scale
- Reduction in garden ground
- Setting of listed buildings
- Too high
- Visual intrusion
- Loss of amenity
- Loss of privacy
- Increase in traffic congestion
- Impact on wildlife
- Out of character
- Detrimental to soon to be designated conservation area

- Not in keeping with designation of Landscape Value
- Loss of trees
- Drainage issues

Full copies of the representations made in respect of this application are available in Group Rooms or can be requested for viewing at the Main Reception, City Chambers, High Street.

Planning Policy

The site is identified by the **Central Edinburgh Local Plan** as being within an area allocated for housing and compatible uses.

Relevant Policies:

Policy HOU2 supports the development of suitable urban brownfield sites for housing through re-use, redevelopment or conversion.

Policy CD2 (LISTED BUILDINGS) sets out criteria for assessing proposals affecting listed buildings and seeks to safeguard their character and setting.

Policy CD10 (NEW DEVELOPMENT - OBJECTIVE) encourages new development of the highest possible architectural and urban quality.

Policy CD8 (ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION) sets out procedural requirements for applications for development or redevelopment of sites of known or suspected archaeological significance.

Policy CD11 (NEW DEVELOPMENT - GENERAL) sets out general design requirements for new development, and requires particular attention to be paid to main approach roads to the city centre.

Policy CD15 (INFILL DEVELOPMENT) sets out design requirements for new infill development.

Policy CD17 (MATERIALS) sets out requirements for materials in new developments and seeks a greater use of stone, roofing slate and other traditional materials in appropriate cases.

Policy CD18 (SAFETY, SUSTAINABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY) requires the design and layout of development proposals to meet safety, sustainability and accessibility objectives.

Policy GE11 (Tree Protection) sets out tree protection requirements for new development.

Policy GE12 (LANDSCAPING) requires development proposals to include provision for landscaping of high quality and new open spaces where appropriate.

Policy GE13 (OPEN SPACE IN NEW HOUSING) sets out requirements for open space provision for major housing developments.

Policy T8 (CYCLE PARKING) requires new development to provide cycle parking facilities in accordance with agreed standards and on suitable sites to contribute to the network of safe routes.

Policy T15 (PRIVATE CAR PARKING) requires all new development to comply with car parking standards set out in the Development Control Handbook, including provision for people with disabilities, and requires car parking to be designed to minimise visual intrusion.

Non-statutory guidelines 'DAYLIGHTING, PRIVACY AND SUNLIGHT' set criteria for assessing proposals in relation to these issues.

Non-statutory guidelines on 'OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS IN NEW DEVELOPMENT' set the required standards for open space provision.

Non-statutory guidelines 'ALTERATIONS TO LISTED BUILDINGS' provide general guidance for assessing proposals for both internal and external alterations.

Non-statutory guidelines on the 'SETTING OF LISTED BUILDINGS' supplement local plan conservation and design policies, providing guidance for the protection and enhancement of the setting of listed buildings.

Non-statutory guidelines on Developer contributions in schools gives guidance on the situations where developers will be asked to make financial or other contributions towards the cost of providing new facilities for schools.

Non-statutory guidelines on 'HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN GARDEN GROUNDS' supplement local plan housing, conservation and design policies, and provide additional guidance on this subject.

Non-statutory guidelines on 'TREE PROTECTION' supplement local plan green environment policies, and support the retention of healthy trees of landscape or amenity significance, encourage new tree planting wherever appropriate within new development and promote a substantial renewal of the city's woodland resource.

Application Type Full Planning Application
Application Address: 87 Ravelston Dykes Road
Edinburgh
EH4 3PA
Proposal: Demolish existing dwelling house and erect a development of eleven flats
Reference No: 05/02863/FUL

Conditions/Reasons associated with the Recommendation

Recommendation

It is recommended that this application be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions below.

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than five years from the date of this consent.
2. A detailed specification, including trade names where appropriate, of all the proposed external materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning & Strategy before work is commenced on site; Note: samples of the materials may be required.
3. The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented within six months of the completion of the development, and thereafter shall be maintained by the applicants and/or their successors to the entire satisfaction of the planning authority; maintenance shall include the replacement of plant stock which fails to survive, for whatever reason, as often as is required to ensure the establishment of the approved landscaping scheme.
4. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning & Strategy, having first been agreed by the City Archaeologist.
5. The waste management facilities, as shown on the approved plans, shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning and Strategy.
6. Prior to the commencement of works on site detailed plans showing the widening of the access road to 5 metres between the school car park entrance and the end of the application site verge, as per the recommendations in the traffic study

produced by Dougall Baillie Associates, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning and Strategy.

7. Only the tree/s shown for removal on the approved drawing/s shall be removed, and no work shall be carried out on the remaining trees at any time without the prior written consent of the Head of Planning & Strategy.

8. The trees on the site shall be protected during the construction period by the erection of fencing, in accordance with clause 2 of BS5837: 2005 " Trees in relation to construction", or similar as approved in writing by the Head of Planning & Strategy, at the limit of the canopy spread of the trees; no materials, equipment or buildings shall be stored or located within the protected area, nor shall there be any access through it. The fencing shall be maintained in a secure and upright condition to the satisfaction of the Head of Planning & Strategy.

Reasons

1. In order to accord with the statutory requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts.

2. In order to enable the Head of Planning & Strategy to consider this/these matter/s in detail.

3. In order to ensure that the approved landscaping works are properly established on site.

4. In order to safeguard the interests of archaeological heritage.

5. To ensure the timeous provision of waste management facilities.

6. In order to enable the Head of Planning & Strategy to consider this/these matter/s in detail.

7. In order to safeguard protected trees.

8. In order to safeguard protected trees.

End

