

Kenneth Reid Architects.
FAO: Kenneth Reid
39 Braid Farm Road
Edinburgh
EH10 6LE

Lochside Homes Ltd.
8 Corstorphine Road
Edinburgh
EH12 6HN

Decision date: 11 June 2020

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACTS
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2013

Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.
At 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Application No: 20/01041/FUL

DECISION NOTICE

With reference to your application for Planning Permission registered on 6 March 2020, this has been decided by **Local Delegated Decision**. The Council in exercise of its powers under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts and regulations, now determines the application as **Refused** in accordance with the particulars given in the application.

Any condition(s) attached to this consent, with reasons for imposing them, or reasons for refusal, are shown below;

Conditions:-

Reasons:-

1. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Env 3 in respect of Listed Buildings - Setting, as the use of a timber fence is not an appropriate boundary treatment against the setting of the listed buildings.
2. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Env 6 in respect of Conservation Areas - Development, as the use of a timber fence is not an appropriate material for the character of the conservation area.

3. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Des 5 in respect of Development Design - Amenity, as there is a need to ensure 1.8 high stone wall is erected to safeguard neighbouring amenity from overlooking.

Please see the guidance notes on our [decision page](#) for further information, including how to appeal or review your decision.

Drawings 01, represent the determined scheme. Full details of the application can be found on the [Planning and Building Standards Online Services](#)

The reason why the Council made this decision is as follows:

The proposal does not accord with the policies in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan. Failure to implement condition 2 of planning permission 19/05028/FUL and to retain the existing timber fence instead will result in adverse harm to the character setting of the listed buildings and will not enhance the character of the conservation area. There is no material consideration that outweigh this.

This determination does not carry with it any necessary consent or approval for the proposed development under other statutory enactments.

Should you have a specific enquiry regarding this decision please contact Laura Marshall directly at laura.marshall@edinburgh.gov.uk.

D R Leech

Chief Planning Officer
PLACE
The City of Edinburgh Council

NOTES

1. If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision to refuse permission for or approval required by a condition in respect of the proposed development, or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, the applicant may require the planning authority to review the case under section 43A of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 within three months beginning with the date of this notice. The Notice of Review can be made online at www.eplanning.scot or forms can be downloaded from that website. Paper forms should be addressed to the City of Edinburgh Planning Local Review Body, G.2, Waverley Court, 4 East Market Street, Edinburgh, EH8 8BG. For enquiries about the Local Review Body, please email localreviewbody@edinburgh.gov.uk.

2. If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, the owner of the land may serve on the planning authority a purchase notice requiring the purchase of the owner of the land's interest in the land accordance with Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

Report of Handling

**Application for Planning Permission 20/01041/FUL
At 4 Windsor Street Lane, Edinburgh, EH7 5JZ
Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished
in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the
boundary shall measure 1.8m.**

Item	Local Delegated Decision
Application number	20/01041/FUL
Wards	B12 - Leith Walk

Summary

The proposal does not accord with the policies in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan. Failure to implement condition 2 of planning permission 19/05028/FUL and to retain the existing timber fence instead will result in adverse harm to the character setting of the listed buildings and will not enhance the character of the conservation area. There is no material consideration that outweigh this.

Links

<u>Policies and guidance for this application</u>	LDPP, LDES05, LEN03, LEN06, NSG, NSGD02, NSLBCA,
---	--

Report of handling

Recommendations

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

Background

2.1 Site description

The site is enclosed by heras fencing and is presently under construction to erect housing on the site which is located within Windsor Street Lane. The site is accessed via a pend from Montgomery Street and the lane is a cul-de-sac, serving a number of residential mews and a commercial car repair shop.

The site lies within the setting of a category A listed properties (No. 5-29) on Windsor Street (date of listing: 16/12/1965, reference: LB29942).

This application site is located within the New Town Conservation Area.

2.2 Site History

29 August 1996 - Planning permission granted to demolish existing building and wall and erect 2 traditional mews buildings- one commercial, one residential (95/02289/FUL).

18 June 2008- Conservation Area Consent granted for the demolition of existing abandoned building (07/04609/CON).

19 June 2008- Planning permission granted to remove derelict two storey house and replace with two house units on site and adjoining gap site (application number 07/03820/FUL).

22 April 2009- Planning permission granted for two mews houses: amendments to previously approved scheme, with alterations to the rear boundaries, elevational treatment and internal layouts (application number 08/04109/FUL).

23 July 2014 - Planning permission granted for to renew consent 08/04109/FUL to erect two mews houses: amendments to previously approved scheme, with alterations to the rear boundaries, elevation treatment and internal layouts (14/01360/FUL).

13 March 2017 - Conservation Area Consent granted for Complete Demolition in a Conservation Area (application number 17/01135/CON).

21 July 2017 - Planning permission granted to remove derelict 2 storey house and replace with 2no. mews house units on site and adjoining gap site (as amended) (application number 17/00890/FUL).

17 August 2018 - Planning permission granted to removal of condition 4 of planning permission 17/00890/FUL (application number 18/03308/FUL).

10 January 2020 - Planning permission granted to remove derelict 2 storey house and replace with 2no. mews house units on site and adjoining gap site. Per consented application ref: 17/00890/FUL with minor adjustments (application number 19/05028/FUL).

Main report

3.1 Description Of The Proposal

The proposal is a Section 42 application under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) where it seeks to delete the following condition (2) of planning permission 19/05028/FUL:

"The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m."

A supporting letter was submitted with this application.

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.

Section 59 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, a planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 states - special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

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, it needs to be considered whether:

- a) the principle of removing the condition is acceptable; and
- b) any public comments raised addressed.

a) Principle

The submitted supporting statement highlights the desire to leave the existing long-standing boundary divider design which is timber vertical "hit and miss" slats to 1.8 height that has established shrubbery around it and that it fits neatly into its local. It argues that the land has never had a boundary divider and that the existing timber fence is softer in appearance and would encourage biodiversity. It asserts that a 1.8metre high stone wall would be oppressive in this location, where it would be dull and hard, casting a heavy shadow. This supporting statement is largely contested.

The application site is located to the rear of a three-storey terraced unit, which is category A listed between 5-29 Windsor Street (listing reference: LB29942). The historic relationship between the listed building and the mews development within the rear lane is evident and the existing mews forms part of its setting.

The site has a long planning history to erect mews styles of housing.

The drawings under application 19/05028/FUL sought to retain an existing timber fence to the rear of one of the proposed units. The assessment concluded that this was not an appropriate boundary treatment to the setting of the A listed townhouses on Windsor Street and was not consistent with the character of the New Town Conservation Area.

The report of handling under application 19/05028/FUL highlights that prior to the demolition and clearance of the site, the gap site was used as informal parking space and the condition of the site was overgrown shrubs and trees. The existing timber fence had the appearance of being used to temporarily delineate boundary markings whilst the site lain as a vacant gap site for a considerable length of time. The existing fence did not have the weathered appearance of being in existence for more than 10 years. A representation received highlights that this fence was installed without planning permission between 2012 and 2015 by a nearby neighbour who sought to secure the rear gardens of 23 Windsor Street from the exposed gap site. At the time of the site visit for application 19/05028/FUL, the existing fence was not found to be in the location as shown on the drawings submitted. Instead, the positioning of the existing fence was found to be resting against the rear elevation of the adjacent unit at No 2. Windsor Street Lane and did not delineate the land earmarked for the proposed rear garden.

Traditionally, mews styles buildings did not include private rear gardens as they were often part of the rear curtilage of prominent buildings/townhouses that included long gardens, bounded by stone walls. The existing gap site alone is to infill the presence of an existing mews building and to include an area of private garden space to its rear. This intervention will alter the rear curtilage that originally formed part of the historic setting to the existing listed buildings on Windsor Street. Whilst the subdivision is not an issue, it is the suitability of the design and materials used to subdivide this section of garden ground to provide an appropriate boundary finish without resulting adverse harm to the historic environment of its surroundings.

To the rear of 27 Windsor Street, there is a recent example of a mews development where stone was used to subdivide the original settings of the listed buildings. This demonstrates the success of integrating new developments with quality materials that are appropriate to enrich its historic surroundings. For these reasons, reference to the

visual softness of the timber fence and the biodiversity benefits do not carry significant weight in the assessment of the proposals against the setting of the listed building and the character of the conservation area. The site has been cleared as part of the demolition works where there is no established shrubbery.

The agent refers to an example of a timber fence used on Cumberland Street (no exact address provided). Reference to this fence is not applicable to the individual circumstances of the current application site or the merits of the proposal.

The removal of condition 2 of planning permission 19/05028/FUL does not comply with the policy objectives of Env 3 Listed Buildings- Setting and Env 6 Conservation Areas- Development. The redevelopment of the site by retaining the existing temporary fence fails to take cognisance of its historic environment where stone is the predominate and most appropriate material.

The requirement for the stone wall to be 1.8 metre in height is to mitigate potential overlooking into neighbouring gardens as a result of the new glazing on the rear elevation of the new build element. This is to satisfy the objectives of policy Des (Development Design - Amenity) in the LDP.

b) Public Comments

Material - Objection

- Impact on the setting of the listed building - Addressed in Section 3.3 (a).
- Impact on the character of the conservation - Addressed in Section 3.3 (a).
- Existing timber fence is cheap and temporary in appearance - Addressed in Section 3.3 (a).
- Existing timber fence not aesthetically appropriate for the quality of its surroundings- Addressed in Section 3.3 (a).
- Will impact on neighbouring privacy as the existing fence is not 1.8metres as suggested- Addressed in Section 3.3 (a).
- The established shrubbery is weeds and the remains of trees recently removed - Addressed in Section 3.3 (a).
- The fence was constructed between 2012- 2015 - Addressed in Section 3.3 (a).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposal does not accord with the policies in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan. Failure to implement condition 2 of planning permission 19/05028/FUL and to retain the existing timber fence instead will result in adverse harm to the character setting of the listed buildings and will not enhance the character of the conservation area. There is no material consideration that outweigh this. It is recommended that the application be refused.

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 Policy Env 3 in respect of Listed Buildings - Setting, as the use of a timber fence is not an appropriate boundary treatment against the setting of the listed buildings.
2. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Env 6 in respect of Conservation Areas - Development, as the use of a timber fence is not an appropriate material for the character of the conservation area.
3. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Des 5 in respect of Development Design - Amenity, as there is a need to ensure 1.8 high stone wall is erected to safeguard neighbouring amenity from overlooking.

Risk, Policy, compliance and governance impact

4.1 Provided planning applications are determined in accordance with statutory legislation, the level of risk is low.

Equalities impact

5.1 The equalities impact has been assessed as follows:

The application has been assessed and has no impact in terms of equalities or human rights.

Consultation and engagement

6.1 Pre-Application Process

There is no pre-application process history.

6.2 Publicity summary of representations and Community Council comments

The application was advertised on 20 March 2020 and the proposal attracted 6 letters of objections.

Background reading / external references

- [To view details of the application go to](#)
- [Planning and Building Standards online services](#)

Statutory Development

Plan Provision

The site is an urban area as designated in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan and the New Town Conservation Area.

Date registered

6 March 2020

Drawing numbers/Scheme

01,

Scheme 1

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

Contact: Laura Marshall, Planning Officer
E-mail:laura.marshall@edinburgh.gov.uk

Links - Policies

Relevant Policies:

Relevant policies of the Local Development Plan.

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

LDP Policy Env 3 (Listed Buildings - Setting) identifies the circumstances in which development within the curtilage or affecting the setting of a listed building will be permitted.

LDP Policy Env 6 (Conservation Areas - Development) sets out criteria for assessing development in a conservation area.

Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines

Non-Statutory guidelines Edinburgh Design Guidance supports development of the highest design quality and that integrates well with the existing city. It sets out the

Council's expectations for the design of new development, including buildings, parking, streets and landscape, in Edinburgh.

Non-statutory guidelines 'LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS' provides guidance on repairing, altering or extending listed buildings and unlisted buildings in conservation areas.

Appendix 1

Consultations

No consultations undertaken.

END

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Mrs olivia doherty

Address: 23 Windsor Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The existing wooden fence compromises the original back garden plans. This is a temporary appearing structure which will have a short life span compared to a new wall that fits in perfectly with the surrounding area. All walls are in stone and this fence is an anomaly and should reasonably be replaced with an appropriate stone wall. There is a precedent for this at the rear of number 27 Windsor street when a new house was built and a new stone wall had to be built to match the surroundings and is in an appropriate stone finish. I cannot see why a wooden fence is acceptable in the area as this is most definitely not in keeping with the surrounding area. Mr Meikle is the only person from planning who has seen this fence as it is impossible to see this fence apart from in the houses on Windsor Street. I very strongly object to the removal of this condition as it appears to be for financial reasons rather than a regard for the surroundings and retaining the integrity and character of the area. At the moment the house ground level is significantly higher than the approved plans and as it progresses it is apparent that we will be able to see clearly into the back of the house as the fence is not high enough (it is significantly lower than all the surrounding stone walls) and the house is very close. This means when people are in the (much higher than approved) garden at the rear they will be able to see over the surrounding walls, this is a significant loss of privacy (a basic human right) for all the residents on this side of Windsor street. The developers have tried from the beginning to get exactly what they want even appropriating our neighbours garden into their plans. I strongly object to proposing to retain the wooden fence as it does not fit in with original William Playfair plans for these Grade 1 listed buildings and is an inappropriate height, material and does not match the surrounding original aesthetic and severely compromises the right to privacy in your own home and garden.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The existing wooden fence compromises the original back garden plans. This is a temporary appearing structure which will have a short life span compared to a new wall that fits in perfectly with the surrounding area. All walls are in stone and this fence is an anomaly and should reasonably be replaced with an appropriate stone wall. There is a precedent for this at the rear of number 27 Windsor street when a new house was built and a new stone wall had to be built to match the surroundings and is in an appropriate stone finish. I cannot see why a wooden fence is acceptable in the area as this is most definitely not in keeping with the surrounding area. Mr Meikle is the only person from planning who has seen this fence as it is impossible to see this fence apart from in the houses on Windsor Street. I very strongly object to the removal of this condition as it appears to be for financial reasons rather than a regard for the surroundings and retaining the integrity and character of the area. At the moment the house ground level is significantly higher than the approved plans and as it progresses it is apparent that we will be able to see clearly into the back of the house as the fence is not high enough (it is significantly lower than all the surrounding stone walls) and the house is very close. This means when people are in the (much higher than approved) garden at the rear they will be able to see over the surrounding walls, this is a significant loss of privacy (a basic human right) for all the residents on this side of Windsor street. The developers have tried from the beginning to get exactly what they want even appropriating our neighbours garden into their plans. I strongly object to proposing to retain the wooden fence as it does not fit in with original William Playfair plans for these Grade 1 listed buildings and is an inappropriate height, material and does not match the surrounding original aesthetic and severely compromises the right to privacy in your own home and garden.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Mr Mark Doherty

Address: 23 WINDSOR STREET Windsor Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Councillor's Reference

Comment: I wish to object to the proposed retaining of the wooden fence at the rear of 23 Windsor Street

The little wooden fence is approximately 1.3 meters in height NOT 1.8 as suggested.

The established shrubbery is weeds and the remains of recently removed trees that grew on the site over the years the site remained derelict.

Our neighbour recalls this fence being built around 8 years ago

There is NO paint treatment, nor should there be. This is a pressure treated timber fence with no coating other than green mould.

There is absolutely no way the little wooden fence is 38 years old!!! Utterly ridiculous!

The wall will replace the little wooden fence that currently runs from west to east and therefore has NO shadow cast by the sun as it passes overhead.

The walls running perpendicular to the little wooden fence do however cast shadow as they run north to south.

The building at the end of 27 has a retaining wall of similar stone to the north to south walls, built to a height of 1.8 meters.

This would always have been the case and in the instance of the rear of 23, the garden originally ran to the wall of the removed building. This is obvious and the same at the rear of 25. The rear of 21's wall has temporarily been removed and was originally the rear wall of the removed derelict building. This will be returned to its original state as building is completed..

The original William Playfair plans for these listed buildings have no wooden boundary walls. The gates however would have been of timber construction. As there was no gate there is no precedent for the use of timber. It does not match the surrounding original aesthetic and having a 'little wooden fence' standing at 1.3 metres, our privacy in your own home and garden severely compromised.

The full height wall would also do the intended job of blocking the light omitted from the new property into the garden of 23. The hit and miss fence would obviously allow masses of light into the private garden it abutts.

To say the fence compromises the original garden plans is astonishing as the fence is not original, being built since 2000.

I will stop short of commenting on the softness of the wooden fences surface...

Not only is there lessened security but also reduce the aesthetic beauty, further degrading the status of the area. It could open the gates to copycat planning requests.

I strongly object to this proposal of retaining the wooden fence at the rear of 23 Windsor Street.

Yours Sincerely

Mark Doherty

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Councillor's Reference

Comment: I wish to object to the proposed retaining of the wooden fence at the rear of 23 Windsor Street

The little wooden fence is approximately 1.3 meters in height NOT 1.8 as suggested.

The established shrubbery is weeds and the remains of recently removed trees that grew on the site over the years the site remained derelict.

Our neighbour recalls this fence being build around 8 years ago

There is NO paint treatment, nor should there be. this is a pressure treated timber fence with no coating other than green mould.

There is absolutely no way the little wooden fence is 38 years old!!! Utterly ridiculous!

The wall will replace the little wooden fence that currently runs from west to east and therefore has NO shadow cast by the sun as it passes over head.

The walls running perpendicular to the little wooden fence do however cast shadow as they run north to south.

The building at the end of 27 has a retaining wall of similar stone to the north to south walls, built to a height of 1.8 meters.

This would always have been the case and in the instance of the rear of 23, the garden originally ran to the wall of the removed building. This is obvious and the same at the rear of 25. The rear of 21's wall has temporarily been removed and was originally the rear wall of the removed derelict building. This will be returned to its original state as building is completed..

The original William Playfair plans for these listed buildings have no wooden boundary walls. The gates however would have been of timber construction. As there was no gate there is no precedent for the use of timber. It does not match the surrounding original aesthetic and having a 'little wooden fence' standing at 1.3 metres, our privacy in your own home and garden severely compromised.

The full height wall would also do the intended job of blocking the light omitted from the new property into the garden of 23. The hit and miss fence would obviously allow masses of light into the private garden it abutts.

To say the fence compromises the original garden plans is astonishing as the fence is not original, being built since 2000.

I will stop short of commenting on the softness of the wooden fences surface...

Not only is there lessened security but also reduce the aesthetic beauty, further degrading the status of the area. It could open the gates to copycat planning requests.

I strongly object to this proposal of retaining the wooden fence at the rear of 23 Windsor Street.

Yours Sincerely

Mark Doherty

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Mr James Fergusson

Address: 25 Windsor St Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: 4 Windsor St Lane EH7 5JZ

Reference 20/01041/FUL

Dear Ms Marshall,

I am writing to object to the above application from Kenneth Reid Architects, who wish to roll back on their obligation to finish the boundary wall in stone to match the adjoining walls, to a height of 1.8m. I am the owner of No 25 Windsor St; the wall in question is at the end of the garden at No 23, and so forms an important part of my back view.

My reasons for objecting are as follows:

Appearance of Area, Impact on a Conservation Area, Setting of a Listed Building

In his letter to you of 2 March 2020 (reference 1292/2.01/KCR), Mr Reid argues for the retention of the existing 'hit and miss' slat fence, which he says 'neatly fits into its locale very well.' I strongly contest this. The back boundary of every other garden on Windsor St is of dressed stone! The present one is completely out of character with the old and elegant boundaries of all the street's gardens.

Mr Reid appears to argue that the present boundary fence should be left in place because it is old. ('The existing divider has been in the same place, in the same style since 1982 when the previous owner had it erected'). This is misleading at best. The present fence was put up by neighbour, Gordon Menzies at No 23, in about 2015. I remember it going up very well. There was no fence to

speak of before that - just a thick stand of self-planted ash trees and a steep bank of brambles, much inhabited by foxes. There may once have been a fence there in the 1980s, but it was certainly long gone by the time my family moved into No 25 in 2008.

Mr Menzies, who runs an accountancy from the basement of No 23, put the fence up because he was worried about the security of his office. By his own admission, he erected the fence as quickly and cheaply as possible, I think using a local joiner who owed him a favour. It was in no way intended to become permanent. Planning permission was certainly not sought. How does that square with Mr Reid's notion that it 'screens in a soft manner that does not fight against the natural "grain" of the original walls'?

Mr Reid thinks the present slat fence 'pleasant to look at.' To those of us who actually have to look at it, however, it is an eyesore: a very obvious blot on the garden landscape of a Grade A Playfair Terrace. Mr Reid claims it 'provides a soft and a tactile surface on which touch'. The fence is actually made of cheap, rough-hewn tanalised timber; my children, who sometimes climb over that way to retrieve a football, have received splinters from it.

His argument that the fence 'encourages biodiversity and also has wildlife value' also seems dubious. There is very little 'shrubbery' growing now growing on either side of it. How and why is it better for wildlife than a stone wall would be? (It is also a bit much to argue for biodiversity when the preparations for the site included the felling of two of the few remaining mature trees in the gardens. The plot in its derelict state was like a mini-nature reserve!)

I might add that when the mews house at the end of No 27 Windsor St was developed (No 2 Windsor St Lane?), I think in the early 2000s, the developers were obliged to erect a new dividing wall built of stone in keeping with its surrounds. It looks good, and continues to weather gently into this 200-year-old garden landscape. There is an opportunity now to do something similar at the end of the garden of No 23, which I think would be a great shame to miss. I cannot see any merit in allowing Mr Reid or his clients to shirk their obligation either to CEC or to this special neighbourhood.

One final point of objection: Overlook.

Construction of the new house at 4 Windsor St Lane is under way, with the timber frame already built up to the level of the first floor. I am concerned that the height of this floor appears to be rather taller than the stipulated 1.8m height of the fence under discussion - which it is not supposed to be, if I have read the warrant plan for the building correctly. If I am right, the potential for overlook into my garden is increasing. Is the Council planning dept closely monitoring this construction site to make sure the approved plan is adhered to? I would like to be reassured that you are.

I note that when the mews house at No2 Windsor St Lane was developed, the site was excavated

to a considerable depth, allowing for a subterranean floor and courtyard garden at the back. That scheme obviated the risk of overlook into the garden of No 27. No such excavation is planned at No4 Windsor St Lane, which is fine - but it would be extremely aggravating if above-ground liberties were now to be taken with the planning process.

Yours truly,

James Fergusson

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: 4 Windsor St Lane EH7 5JZ

Reference 20/01041/FUL

Dear Ms Marshall,

I am writing to object to the above application from Kenneth Reid Architects, who wish to roll back on their obligation to finish the boundary wall in stone to match the adjoining walls, to a height of 1.8m. I am the owner of No 25 Windsor St; the wall in question is at the end of the garden at No 23, and so forms an important part of my back view.

My reasons for objecting are as follows:

Appearance of Area, Impact on a Conservation Area, Setting of a Listed Building

In his letter to you of 2 March 2020 (reference 1292/2.01/KCR), Mr Reid argues for the retention of the existing 'hit and miss' slat fence, which he says 'neatly fits into its locale very well.' I strongly contest this. The back boundary of every other garden on Windsor St is of dressed stone! The present one is completely out of character with the old and elegant boundaries of all the street's gardens.

Mr Reid appears to argue that the present boundary fence should be left in place because it is old. ('The existing divider has been in the same place, in the same style since 1982 when the previous owner had it erected'). This is misleading at best. The present fence was put up by neighbour, Gordon Menzies at No 23, in about 2015. I remember it going up very well. There was no fence to

speak of before that - just a thick stand of self-planted ash trees and a steep bank of brambles, much inhabited by foxes. There may once have been a fence there in the 1980s, but it was certainly long gone by the time my family moved into No 25 in 2008.

Mr Menzies, who runs an accountancy from the basement of No 23, put the fence up because he was worried about the security of his office. By his own admission, he erected the fence as quickly and cheaply as possible, I think using a local joiner who owed him a favour. It was in no way intended to become permanent. Planning permission was certainly not sought. How does that square with Mr Reid's notion that it 'screens in a soft manner that does not fight against the natural "grain" of the original walls'?

Mr Reid thinks the present slat fence 'pleasant to look at.' To those of us who actually have to look at it, however, it is an eyesore: a very obvious blot on the garden landscape of a Grade A Playfair Terrace. Mr Reid claims it 'provides a soft and a tactile surface on which touch'. The fence is actually made of cheap, rough-hewn tanalised timber; my children, who sometimes climb over that way to retrieve a football, have received splinters from it.

His argument that the fence 'encourages biodiversity and also has wildlife value' also seems dubious. There is very little 'shrubbery' growing now growing on either side of it. How and why is it better for wildlife than a stone wall would be? (It is also a bit much to argue for biodiversity when the preparations for the site included the felling of two of the few remaining mature trees in the gardens. The plot in its derelict state was like a mini-nature reserve!)

I might add that when the mews house at the end of No 27 Windsor St was developed (No 2 Windsor St Lane?), I think in the early 2000s, the developers were obliged to erect a new dividing wall built of stone in keeping with its surrounds. It looks good, and continues to weather gently into this 200-year-old garden landscape. There is an opportunity now to do something similar at the end of the garden of No 23, which I think would be a great shame to miss. I cannot see any merit in allowing Mr Reid or his clients to shirk their obligation either to CEC or to this special neighbourhood.

One final point of objection: Overlook.

Construction of the new house at 4 Windsor St Lane is under way, with the timber frame already built up to the level of the first floor. I am concerned that the height of this floor appears to be rather taller than the stipulated 1.8m height of the fence under discussion - which it is not supposed to be, if I have read the warrant plan for the building correctly. If I am right, the potential for overlook into my garden is increasing. Is the Council planning dept closely monitoring this construction site to make sure the approved plan is adhered to? I would like to be reassured that you are.

I note that when the mews house at No2 Windsor St Lane was developed, the site was excavated

to a considerable depth, allowing for a subterranean floor and courtyard garden at the back. That scheme obviated the risk of overlook into the garden of No 27. No such excavation is planned at No4 Windsor St Lane, which is fine - but it would be extremely aggravating if above-ground liberties were now to be taken with the planning process.

Yours truly,

James Fergusson

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Mr Gordon Menzies

Address: 23b Windsor Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Commercial

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The current wooden fence in place at the end of the garden at 23b Windsor Street is a cheap structure I put in to hide the ugly hole in the ground beyond and also to make the rear of the office property a little more secure. Its wooden build structure does not fit in with the stone walls all around and it was never meant to be a permanent solution. After just a few years of it being put in it already needs maintenance and it will need replacing in due course as wood just does not stand the test of time. I feel that the only appropriate way to delineate between Windsor Street Lane and the back gardens of Windsor Street continues to be by a permanent stone wall. Windsor Street is a beautiful 'Playfair' Street and deserves to be maintained to the highest quality possible and it's just not acceptable to cut costs now and reduce the amenity for future occupiers. These properties were built to last as we know and as current custodians we owe a duty to care for the properties and maintain their quality.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Commercial

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The current wooden fence in place at the end of the garden at 23b Windsor Street is a cheap structure I put in to hide the ugly hole in the ground beyond and also to make the rear of the office property a little more secure. Its wooden build structure does not fit in with the stone walls all around and it was never meant to be a permanent solution. After just a few years of it being put in it already needs maintenance and it will need replacing in due course as wood just does not stand the test of time. I feel that the only appropriate way to delineate between Windsor Street Lane and the back gardens of Windsor Street continues to be by a permanent stone wall. Windsor Street is a beautiful 'Playfair' Street and deserves to be maintained to the highest quality possible and it's just not acceptable to cut costs now and reduce the amenity for future occupiers. These properties were built to last as we know and as current custodians we owe a duty to care for the properties and maintain their quality.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Mr Clive Albert

Address: 2F2, 23 Roseneath Place, Edinburgh EH9 1JD

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Ms Marshall,

I am an architect in Edinburgh and a friend of the owners at 23 Windsor St. I am objecting to the application on the basis of Appearance of Area, Impact on a Conservation Area, Setting of a Listed Building.

Planning 'precedent' has been set by an earlier development on Windsor Street Lane. The developer was required to erect a stone boundary wall in keeping with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of Category A Listed properties.

The same obligation has also been accepted by Planning & HES when determining the conditions for the development at 4 Windsor Street Lane.

I am objecting to the application. I agree with the decision of the previous two planning officers that a stone wall is more desirable than a timber fence in the listed context.

Yours sincerely,

Clive Albert

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Ms Marshall,

I am an architect in Edinburgh and a friend of the owners at 23 Windsor St. I am objecting to the application on the basis of Appearance of Area, Impact on a Conservation Area, Setting of a Listed Building.

Planning 'precedent' has been set by an earlier development on Windsor Street Lane. The developer was required to erect a stone boundary wall in keeping with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of Category A Listed properties.

The same obligation has also been accepted by Planning & HES when determining the conditions for the development at 4 Windsor Street Lane.

I am objecting to the application. I agree with the decision of the previous two planning officers that a stone wall is more desirable than a timber fence in the listed context.

Yours sincerely,

Clive Albert

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Catherine Brooke

Address: 27 Windsor st Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Ms Marshall,
Application no. 20/01041/FUL
4 Windsor St Lane.

My objection is the removal of condition 2 .

I believe Kenneth Reid Architects wish to change the boundary wall in stone that matches the existing walls to a "Slat fence".

I live at no.27 Windsor st , the house at the bottom of our garden no.2 Windsor st lane was developed in the year 2000 a strict policy was given for a stone wall thus making the development completely unnoticed the intention of a garden "slat" fence completely lowers the tone of these beautiful playfair terraced houses that we take so much care in maintaining. I am confused at Mr Reid's belief in wildlife value, the fence at present will last no longer than a few years before it decays while a wall is more environmentally friendly, better security and will stand for centuries. I also notice it appears to be taller than the stipulated planning warrant but I am sure you are closely monitoring the situation.

The taller building with slat fence will therefore look out of place and not in keeping with our grade A listed buildings.

Best wishes

Katie

Comments for Planning Application 20/01041/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01041/FUL

Address: 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Proposal: Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Case Officer: Laura Marshall

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Ms Marshall,
Application no. 20/01041/FUL
4 Windsor St Lane.

My objection is the removal of condition 2 .

I believe Kenneth Reid Architects wish to change the boundary wall in stone that matches the existing walls to a "Slat fence".

I live at no.27 Windsor st , the house at the bottom of our garden no.2 Windsor st lane was developed in the year 2000 a strict policy was given for a stone wall thus making the development completely unnoticed the intention of a garden "slat" fence completely lowers the tone of these beautiful playfair terraced houses that we take so much care in maintaining. I am confused at Mr Reid's belief in wildlife value, the fence at present will last no longer than a few years before it decays while a wall is more environmentally friendly, better security and will stand for centuries. I also notice it appears to be taller than the stipulated planning warrant but I am sure you are closely monitoring the situation.

The taller building with slat fence will therefore look out of place and not in keeping with our grade A listed buildings.

Best wishes

Katie

Business Centre G.2 Waverley Court 4 East Market Street Edinburgh EH8 8BG Email: planning.support@edinburgh.gov.uk

Applications cannot be validated until all the necessary documentation has been submitted and the required fee has been paid.

Thank you for completing this application form:

ONLINE REFERENCE 100041172-008

The online reference is the unique reference for your online form only. The Planning Authority will allocate an Application Number when your form is validated. Please quote this reference if you need to contact the planning Authority about this application.

Applicant or Agent Details

Are you an applicant or an agent? * (An agent is an architect, consultant or someone else acting on behalf of the applicant in connection with this application)

Applicant Agent

Agent Details

Please enter Agent details

Company/Organisation:	Kenneth Reid Architects		
Ref. Number:		You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
First Name: *	Kenneth	Building Name:	
Last Name: *	Reid	Building Number:	39
Telephone Number: *	01314528590	Address 1 (Street): *	Braid Farm Road
Extension Number:		Address 2:	
Mobile Number:		Town/City: *	Edinburgh
Fax Number:		Country: *	Scotland
		Postcode: *	EH10 6LE
Email Address: *	kreid@krarchitects.co.uk		

Is the applicant an individual or an organisation/corporate entity? *

Individual Organisation/Corporate entity

Applicant Details

Please enter Applicant details

Title:	<input type="text"/>	You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
Other Title:	<input type="text"/>	Building Name:	<input type="text"/>
First Name: *	<input type="text"/>	Building Number:	<input type="text" value="8"/>
Last Name: *	<input type="text"/>	Address 1 (Street): *	<input type="text" value="Corstorphine Road"/>
Company/Organisation	<input type="text" value="Lochside Homes Ltd"/>	Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number: *	<input type="text"/>	Town/City: *	<input type="text" value="Edinburgh"/>
Extension Number:	<input type="text"/>	Country: *	<input type="text" value="Scotland"/>
Mobile Number:	<input type="text"/>	Postcode: *	<input type="text" value="EH12 6HN"/>
Fax Number:	<input type="text"/>		
Email Address: *	<input type="text" value="kreid@krarchitects.co.uk"/>		

Site Address Details

Planning Authority:	<input type="text" value="City of Edinburgh Council"/>
Full postal address of the site (including postcode where available):	
Address 1:	<input type="text" value="4 WINDSOR STREET LANE"/>
Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Address 3:	<input type="text"/>
Address 4:	<input type="text"/>
Address 5:	<input type="text"/>
Town/City/Settlement:	<input type="text" value="EDINBURGH"/>
Post Code:	<input type="text" value="EH7 5JZ"/>

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

Northing	<input type="text" value="674580"/>	Easting	<input type="text" value="326367"/>
----------	-------------------------------------	---------	-------------------------------------

Description of Proposal

Please provide a description of your proposal to which your review relates. The description should be the same as given in the application form, or as amended with the agreement of the planning authority: *
(Max 500 characters)

Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

Type of Application

What type of application did you submit to the planning authority? *

- Application for planning permission (including householder application but excluding application to work minerals).
- Application for planning permission in principle.
- Further application.
- Application for approval of matters specified in conditions.

What does your review relate to? *

- Refusal Notice.
- Grant of permission with Conditions imposed.
- No decision reached within the prescribed period (two months after validation date or any agreed extension) – deemed refusal.

Statement of reasons for seeking review

You must state in full, why you are seeking a review of the planning authority's decision (or failure to make a decision). Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. If necessary this can be provided as a separate document in the 'Supporting Documents' section: * (Max 500 characters)

Note: you are unlikely to have a further opportunity to add to your statement of appeal at a later date, so it is essential that you produce all of the information you want the decision-maker to take into account.

You should not however raise any new matter which was not before the planning authority at the time it decided your application (or at the time expiry of the period of determination), unless you can demonstrate that the new matter could not have been raised before that time or that it not being raised before that time is a consequence of exceptional circumstances.

A separate document has been uploaded in the 'Supporting Documents' section titled: '1292_Notice of Review_Statement_10-08-20'

Have you raised any matters which were not before the appointed officer at the time the Determination on your application was made? *

Yes No

If yes, you should explain in the box below, why you are raising the new matter, why it was not raised with the appointed officer before your application was determined and why you consider it should be considered in your review: * (Max 500 characters)

Please provide a list of all supporting documents, materials and evidence which you wish to submit with your notice of review and intend to rely on in support of your review. You can attach these documents electronically later in the process: * (Max 500 characters)

1292_Notice of Review_Statement_10-08-20. 1292_Notice of Review_Summary of consents and documents submitted_10-08-20. 1292_Notice of Review_Timeline_10-08-20. 1292_Notice of Review_Correspondence with CEC Planning_28-05-30.

Application Details

Please provide the application reference no. given to you by your planning authority for your previous application.

20/01041/FUL

What date was the application submitted to the planning authority? *

03/03/2020

What date was the decision issued by the planning authority? *

11/06/2020

Review Procedure

The Local Review Body will decide on the procedure to be used to determine your review and may at any time during the review process require that further information or representations be made to enable them to determine the review. Further information may be required by one or a combination of procedures, such as: written submissions; the holding of one or more hearing sessions and/or inspecting the land which is the subject of the review case.

Can this review continue to a conclusion, in your opinion, based on a review of the relevant information provided by yourself and other parties only, without any further procedures? For example, written submission, hearing session, site inspection. *

Yes No

In the event that the Local Review Body appointed to consider your application decides to inspect the site, in your opinion:

Can the site be clearly seen from a road or public land? *

Yes No

Is it possible for the site to be accessed safely and without barriers to entry? *

Yes No

If there are reasons why you think the local Review Body would be unable to undertake an unaccompanied site inspection, please explain here. (Max 500 characters)

Access is only available through the operational construction site that is erecting the dwellings to which the application under review is associated. Not visible from any public vantage points.

Checklist – Application for Notice of Review

Please complete the following checklist to make sure you have provided all the necessary information in support of your appeal. Failure to submit all this information may result in your appeal being deemed invalid.

Have you provided the name and address of the applicant?. *

Yes No

Have you provided the date and reference number of the application which is the subject of this review? *

Yes No

If you are the agent, acting on behalf of the applicant, have you provided details of your name and address and indicated whether any notice or correspondence required in connection with the review should be sent to you or the applicant? *

Yes No N/A

Have you provided a statement setting out your reasons for requiring a review and by what procedure (or combination of procedures) you wish the review to be conducted? *

Yes No

Note: You must state, in full, why you are seeking a review on your application. Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. You may not have a further opportunity to add to your statement of review at a later date. It is therefore essential that you submit with your notice of review, all necessary information and evidence that you rely on and wish the Local Review Body to consider as part of your review.

Please attach a copy of all documents, material and evidence which you intend to rely on (e.g. plans and Drawings) which are now the subject of this review *

Yes No

Note: Where the review relates to a further application e.g. renewal of planning permission or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition or where it relates to an application for approval of matters specified in conditions, it is advisable to provide the application reference number, approved plans and decision notice (if any) from the earlier consent.

Declare – Notice of Review

I/We the applicant/agent certify that this is an application for review on the grounds stated.

Declaration Name: Mr Kenneth Reid

Declaration Date: 10/08/2020



From: Kenneth Reid
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2020 3:18 PM
To: 'Laura Marshall 2'
Subject: RE: 20/01041/FUL: 4 Windsor Street Lane

Good Afternoon Laura

We have consulted with our client and they would contend that a timber fence to be appropriate in this instance and within the New town Conservation Area and wish to draw your attention to one example where this has been successfully employed as a new intervention between 2 existing stone walls, in a similar manner as our proposal.

I attach for your consideration an image of Cumberland Street Mews development which was granted just back in 2012 which shows that a timber fence “softens” the whole residential ambience of the garden space as opposed to having 4 hard surfaces within a relatively small courtyard garden which if all 4 were solid / stone it can only add to the reverberation noise when a collective family use the space.

In respect to the objections noted below , most are dealt with by above precedent however, in respect to privacy, can I suggest that an additional timber boarding could be installed on our clients side if it was felt necessary , we are happy to negotiate this with the appropriate neighbour if need be .

We understand from your viewpoint over the height of the boundary fence a 1.8m is a fairly standard height between neighbouring properties gardens so hopefully no issue there..

We look forward to hearing from you further.

Regards
Ken

Kenneth Reid

kreid@krarchitects.co.uk



Kenneth Reid Architects

39 Braid Farm Road
Edinburgh
EH10 6LE

T. 0131 452 8590

F. 0131 452 8591

www.krarchitects.co.uk

Kenneth Reid Architects is the trading name of Kenneth Reid Limited. Registered in Scotland No. SC267234

Disclaimer:

This email, the information contained within and its attachments, is confidential and intended solely for the addressee(s), and maybe legally privileged or prohibited from disclosure and unauthorised use. If you are not the named addressee you may not copy or disclose this information to any other person. If you receive this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete all copies from your systems. KRA accepts no responsibility for the correctness and completeness of any drawing data attached. Reliance should be placed on the 'Hard Copy'. The recipient is responsible for verifying its correctness and completeness with the 'Hard Copy'. KRA do not accept any liability for viruses transmitted.



1292 Residential Development, Windsor Street Lane, Edinburgh

Planning Application Ref: 20/01041/FUL

Notice of Review – Statement

Reasons cited for refusal of application;

1. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Env3 in respect of Listed Buildings – Setting, as the use of a timber fence is not an appropriate boundary treatment against the setting of the listed buildings.
2. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Env6 in respect of Conservation Areas – Development, as the use of a timber fence is not an appropriate material for the character of the conservation area.
3. The proposal is contrary to the local Development Plan Policy Des 5 in respect of Development Design – Amenity, as there is a need to ensure 1.8 high stone wall is erected to safeguard neighbouring amenity from overlooking.

Please refer to:

- 1292_Notice of Review_Summary of consents and documents submitted_10-08-20
- 1292_Notice of Review_Timeline_10-08-20
- 1292_Notice of Review_Correspondence with CEC Planning_28-05-30

Statement on reasons for request for review;

With regards the refusal of the above noted application we would present 3 main points regarding our grievance with the refusal, 3 rebuttals of the reasons cited for refusal and a final point regarding the role of planning in this matter.

1. The principle of timber fencing was established on previous consents. Indeed approval of the finish of the timber fence is noted as condition 5 of planning application ref. 17/00890/FUL “...*elevation details of the proposed timber fence as shown on Drawing 2B shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.*”
2. Timber fencing can be a suitable material for the site. Notwithstanding the fact that the current boundary condition is a timber fence which accords privacy to the adjacent property, we outlined in our correspondence by email to the planning officer on the 28/05/30 (a copy of which is submitted alongside this statement as it does not appear on the Planning Portal) that we feel that a timber fence in this location is more appropriate in this location. We also attempted to address the perceived deficiency of the planning officers opinion by presenting an example of a timber fence in a similar location (within the New Town conservation area) by way of precedent, however this was not taken into account of and a refusal was issued without any consideration, indeed any reply. Despite our client showing good faith (a request for extension of determination deadline was readily accepted) that a discussion could take place, especial with regards the planning history of the site.

3. Our third point concerns the timing of the introduction of the condition. Edinburgh Planning department have had ample opportunity to impose the requirement for a stone wall in this location however, as is clear from the timeline presented alongside this statement the requirement was only presented well beyond the start of the project. Whilst business concerns are not the principle concern of the statutory authority we would have anticipated a measure of assistance as our client has developed a site which has lain as a derelict and unsanitary ruin and gap site with unchecked vegetation growing for a significant number of years. From our point of view a contractor was appointed and a contract entered into based on a certain level of risk which has unfairly been exceeded. Fundamentally it is unfair that our client should have such a significant outlay at such a late stage, there has been no opportunity to factor this cost into the project cost. By adding this condition so blasé at a late stage it is punitive to our client. We would note that additional cost has been added to the requirement as the garden can only be accessed through the building, inflating the cost of any construction as it has to be carried by hand through the half built dwelling.
4. Regarding item 1 noted in **Reasons cited for refusal, in relation to Des 3**; we do not believe that the retention of an existing timber fence is *'detrimental to the architectural character, appearance or historic interest of the building, or to its setting'*. In addition to the fact that the boundary condition would remain the same we would note it's remoteness from the listed buildings on Windsor Street and the restricted opportunities to view the fence.
5. Regarding item 2 noted in **Reasons cited for refusal, in relation to Des 6**; we would not consider retention of an existing fence 'development'. Our client could have considered a reasonable request to enhance the New Town conservation area, in addition to already presenting proposals which are sensitive to the location, heritage and built form of the site in the overall design. However, these must be requested in a timely manner (See item 3 above) there has been ample opportunity to engage and make a request for alternative boundary conditions to be presented however this has not occurred. This could have occurred at the submission of application 17/00890/FUL or application 19/05028/FUL or when a specialist stone consultant was engaged to advise on the suitability of the stone of the existing building be retained for re-use to assist with application ref 18/03308/FUL.
6. Regarding item 3 noted in **Reasons cited for refusal, in relation to Des 5**; we do not accept that the timber fence accords any less privacy to the adjacent garden that a wall to the same height would achieve. However, our client has stated that they are open to the possibility of providing an improved quality fence, if that is deemed necessary.
7. With regards the original condition attached to application 19/05028/FUL we cannot recall an occasion where such an arbitrary statement can be inserted into a planning application. It our understanding that it is not within the councils remit to design garden walls. Surely a sensible response to the request to retain the existing timber fence would have been to deliver a mixed decision or to request that the applicant amend their proposals. In short, require that the applicant submitted proposals to maintain the privacy of neighbouring gardens in accordance with Env3, Env 6 and Des 5 to be considered. For the planning authority to act as a designer and evaluator in this instance is surely overreach of their remit.



1292 Residential Development, Windsor Street Lane, Edinburgh

Planning Application Ref: 20/01041/FUL

Notice of Review – Summary of relevant consents and documents submitted

Application Ref: 20/01041/FUL – Removal of condition 2: "The boundary wall shall be finished in stone to match adjoining stone walls. The height of the boundary shall measure 1.8m.

An application for removal of Condition 2 from consent 19/05028/FUL. Application Refused 11/06/20.

Drawings/information submitted:

03/03/20	1292 P(2-)001	Location Plan
03/03/20	Supporting Letter	
28/05/20	Email correspondence with Planning Officer (not available to view on portal, a copy has been submitted in support of Notice of Review application titled: '1292; Notice of Review, Correspondence with CEC Planning, 28-05-30')	

Application ref: 19/05028/FUL - / Remove derelict 2 storey house and replace with 2no. mews house units on site and adjoining gap site. Per consented application ref: 17/00890/FUL with minor adjustments / 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

An Application for adjustments to consent 17/00890/FUL. This included the solar panels to the roof, a different rooflight arrangement, adjustment to the timber shutter feature, lead copes and sliding doors to the rear. It also noted that the existing slatted fence to the rear garden of 4a would be retained. Granted 10/01/20, however had a condition (condition 2) attached that a 1.8m high stone wall was required to the garden of 4a.

Drawings/information submitted:

21/10/19	0821 P2(2-)001A	Location Plan
21/10/19	Design Statement	
21/10/19	0821 P2(2-)006A	Roof Plan
21/10/19	0821 P2(2-)005A	Front Elevation and Sections AA, BB
21/10/19	0821 P2(2-)004B	Ground, First and Second Floor Plans
21/10/19	0821 P2(2-)003B	Front & Rear Elevations As Existing
09/01/20	0821 P2(2-)007C	Rear Elevations

Application ref: 18/03308/FUL - Removal of condition 4 of planning permission 17/00890/FUL.

Application for removal of condition 4 of consent 17/00890/FUL for re-use of existing stone was not in good enough condition for re-use. Granted 17/06/18.

Drawings/information submitted:

02/07/18	1292 P(2-)001	Location Plan
02/07/18	0821 P2(2-)005	Front Elevation and Sections AA, BB
02/07/18	0821 P2(2-)003A	Front & Rear Elevations As Existing
02/07/18	Supporting Statement Stone Consultant 140618	

Application ref: 17/00890/FUL – Remove derelict 2 storey house and replace with 2no. mews house units on site and adjoining gap site (as amended). | 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Main application for two mews houses. Granted 21/07/17. It was proposed in this application that the height of existing walls be increased by the use of new timber fencing to 1.8m. A condition (condition 5) was attached to this consent that the finish of the timber fencing had to be approved by planning.

Drawings/information submitted:

01/03/17	0821 P2(2-)006	Roof Plan
01/03/17	0821 P2(2-)001	Location Plan
01/03/17	0821 P2(2-)005	Front Elevation and Sections AA, BB
13/03/17	Design Statement	
21/06/17	0821 P2(2-)004A	Ground, First and Second Floor Plans
21/06/17	0821 P2(2-)007A	Rear Elevations
21/06/17	0821 P2(2-)003A	Front & Rear Elevations As Existing
23/06/17	Bat Survey Report	
23/06/17	Noise Impact Assessment	
23/06/17	Structural Survey Report	

Application ref: 17/01135/CON – Complete Demolition in a Conservation Area. | 4 Windsor Street Lane Edinburgh EH7 5JZ

Conservation consent for demolition of existing building. Granted 21/07/17.

Drawings/information submitted:

13/03/17	C2(2-)001	Location Plan
13/03/17	C2(2-)003	Front and Rear Elevations As Proposed
13/03/17	C2(2-)002	Block Plan As Existing and Proposed
13/03/17		Image 1 of Existing
13/03/17		Image 2 of Existing
23/06/17		Structural Survey Report
23/06/17	P2(2-)003A	Front and Rear Elevations As Existing



1292 Residential Development, Windsor Street Lane, Edinburgh

Planning Application Ref: 20/01041/FUL

Notice of Review – Timeline

Timeline:

11/06/20	<u>20/01041/FUL</u> - Application for removal of Condition 2 from consent 19/05028/FUL, REFUSED
28/05/20	Email submission of precedent example and attempt to engage regarding Planning Officer's concerns submitted.
04/05/20	Email confirmation from Kenneth Reid Architects that extension of time acceptable
27/04/20	Correspondence from Planning Officer requesting extension of time due to neighbour notification delay.
06/03/20	Application Ref: <u>20/01041/FUL validated by Edinburgh Planning Department</u>
10/01/20	<u>19/05028/FUL</u> - Application for adjustments to consent 17/00890/FUL, GRANTED <u>with condition introducing requirement for a 1.8m high stone wall appearing for the first time.</u>
21/10/19	Construction of two dwelling houses begins on site
16/01/19	Notice of initiation of development submitted
14/01/19	Demolition of existing building begun
30/08/18	Notice of initiation of development submitted (demolition)
17/06/18	<u>18/03308/FUL</u> - Application for removal of condition 4 of consent 17/00890/FUL for re-use of existing stone GRANTED
21/07/17	<u>17/00890/FUL</u> - Main application for two mews houses GRANTED.
21/07/17	<u>17/01135/CON</u> - Conservation consent for demolition of existing building. GRANTED

Proposal Details

Proposal Name	100041172
Proposal Description	Two Mews Houses
Address	4 WINDSOR STREET LANE, EDINBURGH, EH7 5JZ
Local Authority	City of Edinburgh Council
Application Online Reference	100041172-008

Application Status

Form	complete
Main Details	complete
Checklist	complete
Declaration	complete
Supporting Documentation	complete
Email Notification	complete

Attachment Details

Notice of Review	System	A4
1292_Notice of Review_Statement_10-08-20	Attached	A4
1292_Notice of Review_Summary of consents and documents submitted_10-08-20	Attached	A4
1292_Notice of Review_Timeline_10- 08-20	Attached	A4
1292_Notice of Review_Correspondence with CEC Planning_28-05-30	Attached	A4
Notice_of_Review-2.pdf	Attached	A0
Application_Summary.pdf	Attached	A0
Notice of Review-008.xml	Attached	A0