



 External email >

 First time sender >

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing in connection with the review of the refused planning application for the conversion of a garage to a domestic dwelling.

I have previously made comments on the application and these still stand. I note that the grounds of the refusal were wide ranging and fundamental.

The applicant has stated that their address is 1A Coltbridge Terrace but this is not factually correct as it is currently a garage, is not fit for human habitation or for use as a postal address. The information in the application is therefore misleading.

The applicant states that the grounds for a review are:

“We believe that the current housing crisis, and the environmental impact of new building, requires sympathetic conversions of current buildings. Our proposal to convert a garage, which has a negligible impact on the surrounding area, could be a model for future housing solutions. We have added further documentation in support of our appeal including photos of garage conversions in conservation areas in Edinburgh which stand out and change the landscape yet gained planning permission.”

As stated, the grounds for the review are purely subjective and ignore the clearly stated grounds on which it was previously refused. What are the characteristics of the “housing crisis” that this development will address? What is the definition of a housing crisis? How would this be “a model for future housing solutions”? None of these questions are addressed in the review documents.

The photographs of other developments in Edinburgh are, without exception, much more sizeable developments, on two floors and consistent with the planning guidelines on the overall footprint and amenity. It is relevant at this point to draw on the previous findings:

“The Edinburgh Design Guidance requires a minimum internal floor area of 52 square metres for a one-bedroom unit. The proposed dwelling has an approximate gross internal floor area of 39 square. Therefore, the proposal does not meet the minimum criterion and fails to provide adequate amenity for future occupiers. The Edinburgh Design Guidance recognises that people value the ability to look outside, whether to gardens, streets or more long-distance views. The proposed dwellinghouse offers only one patio window to the south (rear elevation) which will have an outlook of less than 3 metres in depth. Whilst not shown on the drawings, photographs submitted by the agent show a timber fence delineating this boundary. The proposal will therefore create a poor outlook for the future occupier.”

Without any changes to the original plan, these findings stand and undermine the case that the photographs attached to the review application actually support the case – indeed the detail of these other developments further reinforces that the grounds for refusal still stand.

It is also worth recalling the other grounds for refusal, none of which have been addressed in this application for a review:

“However, the building sits at the rear garden of a row of traditional terraced homes with large garden spaces to their rear. A dwellinghouse in this location would be uncharacteristic of the historic feu pattern of the site's immediate area. The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and is contrary to NPF 4 Policy 7”

“The principle of a house in this location is not acceptable in this instance. The proposal is contrary to LDP Policies Hou 1 and Hou 5 as it does not comply with other policies of the Development Plan, assessed in the relevant sections below.”

“The proposed dwellinghouse would occupy approximately 40% of the subdivided plot leaving just 60% to the original house. The proposal introduces a much denser development on the site and therefore represents overdevelopment of the site. The proposal does not draw on the positive characteristics of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore does not comply with LDP Policies Des 1 and Hou 4.”

“The proposed site plan shows a small strip of land at the rear of the proposed dwelling (to the south) which is approximately 3 metres in length. This does not provide adequate amenity space and is contrary to LDP Policy Hou 3. Justification has been submitted in support of the application which makes reference to the availability of public greenspace nearby. Whilst exceptional circumstances, where an infringement of this policy can sometimes be justified, this is usually applicable to high-density development and flats. In this instance, the established character is two storey properties with large front and rear gardens. Properties within the area typically retain large garden grounds and the proposal would be in stark contrast to this characteristic. Therefore the proposed level of garden ground is not acceptable and an infringement of the guidance is not justified.”

“The proposed site plan shows the patio door would be situated just three metres from the dividing boundary. If no fence or suitable boundary treatment is in place, the proposal would result in overlooking into the rear private garden ground of the existing property, which is unacceptable. Moreover, the existence of a fence in this location that is at a height capable of mitigating the overlooking to the neighbours garden, would have a detrimental impact upon the future occupier's outlook. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that it would not be to the detriment of neighbouring privacy, and is therefore contrary to LDP Policy Des 12.”

For all of the reasons above, we remain firmly opposed to this development and would contest any attempt to overrule the original findings and the comprehensive refusal.

Your faithfully

Giles Cooke

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>



 External email >

 First time sender >

Good day,

We are shocked to see this has come up again. Murrayfield is a conservation and listed buildings area. How can you possibly allow people to live in garages at the bottom of someone's garden. It's barbaric and out with the natural flow of the street.

This is shocking news that it's still being considered. People are set to destroy the beauty of Edinburgh.

Regards

Linda

External email >

First time sender >

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing in connection with the review of the refused planning application for the conversion of a garage to a domestic dwelling.

I have previously made comments on the application and these still stand. I note that the grounds of the refusal were wide ranging and fundamental.

The applicant states that the grounds for a review are:

“We believe that the current housing crisis, and the environmental impact of new building, requires sympathetic conversions of current buildings. Our proposal to convert a garage, which has a negligible impact on the surrounding area, could be a model for future housing solutions. We have added further documentation in support of our appeal including photos of garage conversions in conservation areas in Edinburgh which stand out and change the landscape yet gained planning permission.”

As stated, the grounds for the review are purely subjective and ignore the clearly stated grounds on which it was previously refused. What are the characteristics of the “housing crisis” that this development will address? What is the definition of a housing crisis? How would this be “a model for future housing solutions”? None of these questions are addressed in the review documents.

The photographs of other developments in Edinburgh are, without exception, much more sizeable developments, on two floors and consistent with the planning guidelines on the overall footprint and amenity. It is relevant at this point to draw on the previous findings:

“The Edinburgh Design Guidance requires a minimum internal floor area of 52 square metres for a one-bedroom unit. The proposed dwelling has an approximate gross internal floor area of 39 square. Therefore, the proposal does not meet the minimum criterion and fails to provide adequate amenity for future occupiers. The Edinburgh Design Guidance recognises that people value the ability to look outside, whether to gardens, streets or more long-distance views. The proposed dwellinghouse offers only one patio window to the south (rear elevation) which will have an outlook of less than 3 metres in depth. Whilst not shown on the drawings, photographs submitted by the agent show a timber fence delineating this boundary. The proposal will therefore create a poor outlook for the future occupier.”

Without any changes to the original plan, these findings stand and undermine the case that the photographs attached to the review application actually support the case – indeed the detail of these other developments further reinforces that the grounds for refusal still stand.

It is also worth recalling the other grounds for refusal, none of which have been addressed in this application for a review:

“However, the building sits at the rear garden of a row of traditional terraced homes with large garden spaces to their rear. A dwellinghouse in this location would be uncharacteristic of the historic feu pattern of the site's immediate area. The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and is contrary to NPF 4 Policy 7”

“The principle of a house in this location is not acceptable in this instance. The proposal is contrary to LDP Policies Hou 1 and Hou 5 as it does not comply with other policies of the Development Plan, assessed in the relevant sections below.”

“The proposed dwellinghouse would occupy approximately 40% of the subdivided plot leaving just 60% to the original house. The proposal introduces a much denser development on the site and therefore represents overdevelopment of the site. The proposal does not draw on the positive characteristics of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore does not comply with LDP Policies Des 1 and Hou 4.”

“The proposed site plan shows a small strip of land at the rear of the proposed dwelling (to the south) which is approximately 3 metres in length. This does not provide adequate amenity space and is contrary to LDP Policy Hou 3. Justification has been submitted in support of the application which makes reference to the availability of public greenspace nearby. Whilst exceptional circumstances, where an infringement of this policy can sometimes be justified, this is usually applicable to high-density development and flats. In this instance, the established character is two storey properties with large front and rear gardens. Properties within the area typically retain large garden grounds and the proposal would be in stark contrast to this characteristic. Therefore the proposed level of garden ground is not acceptable and an infringement of the guidance is not justified.”

“The proposed site plan shows the patio door would be situated just three metres from the dividing boundary. If no fence or suitable boundary treatment is in place, the proposal would result in overlooking into the rear private garden ground of the existing property, which is unacceptable. Moreover, the existence of a fence in this location that is at a height capable of mitigating the overlooking to the neighbours garden, would have a detrimental impact upon the future occupier's outlook. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that it would not be to the detriment of neighbouring privacy, and is therefore contrary to LDP Policy Des 12.”

For all of the reasons above, we remain firmly opposed to this development and would contest any attempt to overrule the original findings and the comprehensive refusal.

Yours faithfully

Philippa Cunniff

Multi award-winning full service law firm, for more information [click here](#)
To find out more about the services we offer [click here](#)

PRIVACY POLICY: This email has come from part of the Gilson Gray group. This includes Gilson Gray LLP (a Scottish registered law firm), Gilson Gray (England) Limited (an English registered law firm approved by the SRA) Gilson Gray Property Services LLP (an estate agent and lettings agency) and Gilson Gray Financial Limited, which trades as Gilson Gray Financial Management (a financial advisory business). Your details and personal data will, therefore be held in accordance with the Gilson Gray privacy policy which can be accessed here: [click here](#). If you are not happy for us to share information with our wider group then let us know by email, but it may mean we are unable to provide our range of services to you. We will not send direct marketing e-mail to you without your consent.

This footer applies to any encrypted message or document attached to this message.

CYBER SECURITY: Guard against online fraud. Please note that our bank account details will not change during the course of a transaction and we never change our bank details via email. Please be careful to check account details with us in person if in any doubt. For payments to you, we will not accept any change to your bank details without additional documentation and confirmation being provided.

"Phishing" is the most common type of cyber-attacks. Phishing attacks can take many forms, but they all share a common goal – getting you to share sensitive information such as login credentials, credit card information, or bank account details. If something seems off or you are unsure of the authenticity of this email or any email claiming to be from us please get in touch with us on our mainline number to verify the identity and origin of this email.

Gilson Gray LLP, Gilson Gray Property Services LLP and Gilson Gray Financial Limited are registered in Scotland as limited liability partnerships with the registered numbers SO304731, SO304732 and SC717112 respectively. Registered office: 29 Rutland Square, Edinburgh EH1 2BW. A list of all relevant members is open to inspection at the registered office. Gilson Gray LLP is regulated by the Law Society of Scotland. This message is confidential and/or may be privileged or protected by other legal rules and is intended for a particular recipient only. If you have received this message by mistake please notify us by return email. Do not copy this email message or disclose its contents to anyone else. Please then delete it from your system. This message has not been encrypted. It may therefore be liable to compromise. It is your responsibility to scan this message for viruses. Viruses and compromises of security are inherent risks in relation to email. To the extent permitted by law we do not accept any liability for any virus infection and/or external compromise of security in relation to transmissions by email. Any personal views expressed in this message are not necessarily the views of Gilson Gray LLP, Gilson Gray Property Services LLP and Gilson Gray Financial Limited, its members or employees. Please note that contracts may NOT be concluded on behalf of Gilson Gray LLP, Gilson Gray Property Services LLP and Gilson Gray Financial Limited by email.

*Gilson Gray conduct financial services business through the vehicle Gilson Gray Financial Limited, trading as Gilson Gray Financial Management, a partner practice of St James's Place Wealth Management plc, which is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority.

External email >

First time sender >

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to reinforce my strong objection to the planning application submitted by Ms Karen Finlayson, currently a non-resident of the street, for the conversion of a garage to residential premises. This application, which was previously refused by the City of Edinburgh council, continues to raise significant concerns among myself and fellow residents of the area, particularly those residing in Coltbridge Terrace within the Coltbridge and Wester Coates Conservation area.

The City of Edinburgh is admired for its commitment to preserving the its architectural style and heritage, and it is notoriously strict in its approval of projects. The proposed development, must be considered with utmost care and diligence to ensure the continued preservation of the city's unique character.

Despite being at the rear of the garden ground at 3 Murrayfield Avenue, the proposed conversion of the garage to a residential unit directly impacts the architectural integrity and residents of Coltbridge Terrace, a street lined with listed houses and villas designed in Early Baronial and 'Arts and Crafts' styles. The adjacent terrace of villas at 1-7 Coltbridge Terrace, designed by Frederick Pilkington, holds particular significance and must be safeguarded against developments that could compromise its historical value (<https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/23356/coltbridge-and-west-coates-conservation-area-character-appraisal>). It is essential to note that, contrary to the response given by the applicant, the garage is not set back from Coltbridge Terrace's listed buildings' principal elevations. This oversight could detract significantly from the setting and potentially result in damage to the boundary walls, which are also listed.

Furthermore, the addition of the proposed flat on a bend in the street exacerbates existing traffic and parking issues. Coltbridge Terrace already struggles with one-way traffic during school hours and limited parking areas. Granting permission for such a project would only worsen these problems and disrupt the tranquility of our neighbourhood.

It is also evident that the applicant does not intend to reside in the premises, as the proposed flat lacks windows to a proper external area. Instead, it is apparent that the primary intention is for short-term rentals, catering to visitors attending events at nearby West End area and Murrayfield Stadium. This raises concerns about the impact on the residential character of our community and the potential for increased transient populations, which is already problematic during matches and concerts.

Moreover, allowing this conversion sets a dangerous precedent for future developments. Granting permission to convert a garage into residential premises opens the door to further requests for extensions or similar conversions, detracting from the historical and architectural integrity of Coltbridge Terrace.

In addition to my objections, I must highlight that other residents of Coltbridge Terrace, including those from house numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 14 and 24 have also expressed strong opposition to this project. Their concerns align with mine regarding the impact on the neighbourhood's character, traffic congestion, and the precedent it sets for future developments.

In light of these concerns, I urge the Local Council to uphold the decision to refuse the planning application submitted by Ms Finlayson. Preserving the architectural heritage of Coltbridge Terrace and protecting the residential character of our neighbourhood should be paramount in any decision-making process.

Thank you for considering my objections to this proposal. I trust that the Local Council will prioritise the interests and well-being of the community in reaching its decision.

Sincerely,

Paula and Leo Kelion
10 Coltbridge Terrace



External email >

First time sender >

Planning Application - Local Review No 23/04442/FUL

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing in connection with the review of the refused planning application for the conversion of a garage to a domestic dwelling.

This development would not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. It would adversely impact on its special architectural and historic interest and harm the character of the surrounding listed buildings.

Of special note is the short terrace of villas 1-7 Coltbridge Terrace by Frederick Pilkington, neighbouring the garage proposed for conversion. Their exuberant architectural quality make a major contribution to the wealth and enjoyment of the physical character of the conservation area. The most exuberant detailing in terms of material, colours, textures and sensory qualities is found in the Pilkington villas. These are category B listed buildings, therefore the façade cannot be altered. The rooflights proposed to be installed in the garage conversion plans would be visible from the front facade of these properties.

In terms of building alterations, in particular it is important that window and door alterations match the original proportions, design or opening methods. Inappropriate alterations such as use of uPVC and brick have a cumulative effect on the appearance of the area. The proposed new skylights will be visible from the Pilkington villas and the door alteration to make the garage a residential entrance will disregard all three of the original proportions, design or opening methods.

A dwelling house at the bottom of the row of listed Pilkington houses would be uncharacteristic of the historic pattern of the sites immediate area. In terms of building compositions, the building lines are hard against the pavement in the surrounding tenements and at greater distances in the villas set by the depths of

front gardens. This garage conversion would be stand out different to the historic spatial pattern.

On the change of use point, additional parking and traffic demands will be two-fold with the loss of a garage in an area already affected by significant on-street parking, detracting from the attractive streetscape. This does not enhance the area as it removes a viable off-road garage for parking vehicles and detracts from the area as vehicles of potential occupiers will subsequently be parked on the street resulting in an unreasonable loss of neighbouring amenity. In addition, it is not possible to park directly outside the garage due to Coltbridge Terrace being a narrow road, with the garages situated on the bend. Therefore, double yellow lines are in place to allow emergency vehicles to pass through.

Converting a garage to a residential property with zero green space in a built up residential area does not solve the housing crisis but adds to population density in an already crowded area.

I would also complain that this original planning application was not advertised for public comment. The entrance and exit to the property are on Coltbridge Terrace but the majority of houses situated on the terrace were not advised of the initial planning application. Subsequently, having missed the deadline for comment these property owners are now being advised their views cannot be expressed or taken into account on the decision on the application for review.

For all of the reasons stated above, in addition to the reasons on the original objection, we remain firmly opposed to this change of use and development.

Your faithfully

Laura Docherty