

Alan Hardie Architect.
FAO: Alan Hardie
Suite 4 Dundas House
Westfield Park
Eskbank
EH22 3FB

Mr Mohamad Yamin.
23 Minto Street
Edinburgh
EH9 1RQ

Decision date: 23 October 2020

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

Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

At 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Application No: 20/01975/FUL

DECISION NOTICE

With reference to your application for Planning Permission registered on 13 May 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 proposals will introduce an extension of an inappropriate size, position and design that encloses the remaining original rear facade of the listed building with an incongruous mansard roofed extension which would adversely impact on the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building and its setting within the Blacket Conservation Area, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve. The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2. The proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' as they do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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

Drawings 1-7, 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 proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' as they do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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 Diana Garrett directly at diana.garrett@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 20/01975/FUL At 23 Minto Street, Edinburgh, EH9 1RQ Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Item	Local Delegated Decision
Application number	20/01975/FUL
Wards	B15 - Southside/Newington

Summary

The proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' as they do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Links

<u>Policies and guidance for this application</u>	LDPP, LEN06, LEN03, LEN04, NSG, NSLBCA, OTH, HEPS, HESEXT, CRPBLA,
-------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

Report of handling

Recommendations

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

Background

2.1 Site description

The application site comprises an earlier 19th century Georgian townhouse with later alterations. The property is one of two near symmetrical classical houses constructed from cream sandstone ashlar, rusticated at ground; coursed rubble to sides and rear.

The property is a Category 'B' Listed building - listed on 14.12.1970 (ref: 29353).

This application site is located within the Blasket Conservation Area.

2.2 Site History

Planning history

04/03956/ADV - permission granted for 'Erection of an externally illuminated sign displaying the name of guest house (as amended)' 17.12.2004
05/00651/FUL - permission granted for 'Alteration to Minto guest house to form kitchen + extension to rear + side to form dayroom + bedrooms (as amended)' 10.06.2005
05/04211/FUL/LBC - application withdrawn to 'Build owners private residence plus parking for 5 cars (guest house)' 03.03.2006
06/01410/FUL/LBC - application withdrawn to 'Build owners private residence plus parking for 2 cars' 23.06.2006
07/04533/FUL/LBC - build owners private residence plus parking for 2 cars. Granted 17.04.2008 (FUL) and 13.05.2008 (LBC).
07/04533/VARY - non material variation - amendments to stone and slate details, dormer and window design, and removal of garage. Granted 17.09.2013.
12/02916/FUL and 2917/LBC - formation of new basement room and lightwell below existing dining room and create new vehicular access. Withdrawn October 2012.
14/01006/LBC - Proposed single storey extension to rear of property - granted 07.04.2014
15/01821/LBC & FUL - Erect single storey 'flat' roof extension to rear of property - granted 26.06.2015
19/02395/FUL and 19/02398/LBC - Extension to first floor above existing extension - refused 17.07.2019
20/01976/LBC - Extend at first floor level over existing ground floor extension to create three family bedrooms with showers - refused 22.10.2020

Enforcement history

04/00690/E29 - enforcement enquiry for 'Unauthorised Guest House Use' closed 10.11.2004
05/00067/E01 - enforcement enquiry for 'Advertisements hanging in window of property and one attached to the stone work at the front' closed 08.02.2005
08/00165/ENCOMP - enforcement enquiry closed for 'Position of extension (in front of building line)' closed 31.03.2008
13/00056/ELBB - enforcement enquiry closed 15.03.2013
13/00250/ENCOMP - closed 26.09.2013

Main report

3.1 Description Of The Proposal

It is proposed that the existing flat roofed single storey extension to the rear be extended to create first floor level accommodation. The additional storey will form an additional 3 bedrooms and a bathroom.

The application is a resubmission of the 2019 scheme. The materials have been revised for this current application..

The extension will be located over the footprint of the ground floor extension and take the form of a mansard roof with dormer windows finished in stone and slate.

Supporting Statement

The agent has provided a Supporting Statement.

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 proposals will preserve or enhance the special character and/or appearance of the conservation area;
- (b) the proposals will adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building;
- (c) public comments have been addressed;
- (d) the proposals will adversely affect neighbouring residential amenity; and
- (e) there are any equalities or human right implications.

(a) Impact on the special character and appearance of the conservation area

The Blasket Conservation Area Character Appraisal emphasises *the mix of substantial villas and terraces, the unified architectural form and materials, the sense of spaciousness derived from the generously proportioned gardens and large mature trees, and the predominance of residential uses*

The rear of the townhouse is clearly visible from the west end of Mayfield Terrace. Mayfield Terrace comprises one of the Blasket Conservation Area's five core streets and as a result is extremely sensitive to changes within its setting. The proposed extension, by virtue of its size, position, design and materials will adversely impact upon its strong setting and the conservation area by introducing a highly visible incongruous form of extension that encloses and as a result, obscures a significant part of the original random rubble sandstone elevation of the townhouse.

Although the property has been substantially altered and extended to a similar extent as many of the properties to the west side of Minto Street, the alterations and extensions have been designed using traditional subservient building forms, designs and materials to preserve views and the appreciation of the original townhouses to the rear.

The proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' as they do not preserve the special character or appearance of the conservation area.

(b) Impact on special interest of listed building

Historic Environment Scotland *Managing Change in the Historic Environment Guidance on 'Extensions'* states that proposed extensions:

- must protect the character and appearance of the building;
- should be subordinate in scale and form;
- should be located on a secondary elevation; and
- must be designed in a high quality manner using appropriate materials.

Furthermore, the Edinburgh City Local Plan Policies relating to proposals affecting listed buildings states that they will be permitted where:

- those alterations or extensions are justified;
 - there will be no unnecessary damage to historic structures or diminution of its interest;
- and

- where any additions are in keeping with other parts of the building

The building is a classically detailed Georgian semi-detached villa that has been altered and extended to a significant degree. This is similar to many of the properties to east of Minto Street where large extensions and back-land development within the rear gardens of many of the villas have been developed over time.

The proposals comprise a further extension to an already substantially altered and extended townhouse and involve the addition of accommodation at first floor level over a previous flat roofed rear extension - the design of which was modified to a flat-roof from an earlier approval for a hipped roof to tie in and balance up with a similar form of extension on the adjoining townhouse. Both of the adjoining properties existing extensions retain the prominence of the sandstone walls of their original rear elevations.

The proposals would add further accommodation to what is already an intensely used site and amounts to excessive and inappropriate over-development of the listed building. The rear of the townhouse is clearly visible from both within and out-with the site. The extension, by virtue of its extent, form, position will combine to impact on the special architectural interest of the Georgian sandstone townhouse to an unacceptable detrimental effect.

The proposals are contrary to the Historic Environment Scotland 'Managing Change' guidance on 'Extensions' and the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' as they will adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building to an unacceptable degree.

(c) Public comments

Objection

Material

- Impact on special interest of listed building: addressed in section 3.3 (b)
- Impact on special character and/or appearance of conservation area: addressed in section 3.3 (a)
- impact on amenity, intensification of use of site addressed in section 3.3 (d)

Non material

- increase in noise from guest house, addressed by separate legislation.
- impact on views, this is not a material planning matter

Support

- three letters in support of the application were received.

Community Council

- overdevelopment of site, addressed in section 3.3 (a) and (b)

- change of material to stone does not mitigate harm to listed building and conservation area, addressed in section 3.3 (a) and (b)

(d) Residential amenity

Given the position of the extension and the existence of higher extensions along the northern and southern boundaries of the semi-detached villa, any overshadowing or loss of daylight would fall upon the roof of the adjoining property's extension or be negligible. The proposals will not adversely affect the neighbouring residential amenity presently enjoyed by the occupants of the neighbouring property. The intensification and use of the property is not the subject of this application.

Conclusion

The proposals do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposals are unacceptable.

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

3.4 Conditions/reasons/informatives

Reasons:-

1. The proposals will introduce an extension of an inappropriate size, position and design that encloses the remaining original rear facade of the listed building with an incongruous mansard roofed extension which would adversely impact on the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building and its setting within the Blasket Conservation Area, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve. The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
2. The proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' as they do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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 the 13 May 2020.

A total of fifteen letters were received, 12 objecting and 3 supporting, including letters from three residents associations; an amenity body; neighbours and a Community Council. The letters of support were from neighbours.

A full assessment of the representations can be found in the main report in the Assessment section

Background reading / external references

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

Statutory Development

Plan Provision Urban Area within the Edinburgh Local Development Plan.

Date registered 13 May 2020

Drawing numbers/Scheme 1-7,
Scheme 1

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

Contact: Diana Garrett, Planning officer
E-mail: diana.garrett@edinburgh.gov.uk

Links - Policies

Relevant Policies:

Relevant policies of the Local Development Plan.

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

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 4 (Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions) identifies the circumstances in which alterations and extensions to listed buildings will be permitted.

Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines

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

Other Relevant policy guidance

The Historic Environment Policy for Scotland 2019 outlines Government policy on how we should care for the historic environment when taking planning decisions.

Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions sets out Government guidance on the principles that apply to extending listed buildings.

The Blacket Conservation Area Character Appraisal emphasises the mix of substantial villas and terraces, the unified architectural form and materials, the sense of spaciousness derived from the generously proportioned gardens and large mature trees, and the predominance of residential uses.

Appendix 1

Consultations

No consultations undertaken.

END

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing to lodge my objection to this extension. We live next door, which is a listed building and have windows facing south. The loss of sunlight and daylight and privacy will be significantly affected by a second floor extension by 23 Minto Street. In addition to the change to the appearance of the area for Grantully place, the impact on the conservation area, we work from home so will also be affected by any noise and disruption.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Patricia Santelices

Address: 22 Minto Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am writing to lodge my objection to this extension. We live next door, which is a listed building and have windows facing south. The loss of sunlight and daylight and privacy will be significantly affected by a second floor extension by 23 Minto Street. In addition to the change to the appearance of the area for Grantully place, the impact on the conservation area, we work from home so will also be affected by any noise and disruption.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Wendy Regaard

Address: Flat 1 22 Minto Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Application location 23 Minto Street, Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

I am the owner of flat 1, 22 Minto Street. I wish to object to this application on the following grounds:

- 1 All the proposed bedrooms are en-suite, leading to the question of whether this development is for a permanent family home, or whether there will be a future change of use to a guest house. A guest house involves noise, with taxis drawing up and much coming and going in front of number 22.
- 2 The applicant has mentioned a former planning decision to permit brick-built houses in Grantully Place behind number 22. This is of no relevance, since planning rules are now different. The historic built heritage of Edinburgh has suffered many indignities in the past - the situation is much better now.
- 3 The applicant has mentioned the glass atrium joining the two fine villas, which formerly formed part of the Minto Hotel. I would like to point out that a glass structure cannot be described as fully permanent - it is a vast improvement on the previous built structure, as it does not impair the integrity of the two adjacent villas.
- 4 The proposed development will have an adverse effect on the rear aspect of number 22. At present there is a pleasing view of the buildings from Mayfield Terrace and further erosion of the historic heritage of these listed houses is to be regretted. The street scene does not apply solely to the fronts of the buildings. Once a precedent is set, further applications are may follow. Minto Street is a fine, distinguished street, albeit now very busy, and is part of Edinburgh's social history.
- 5 A previous nearby development by this applicant has given rise to dissatisfaction; I believe that it was not consistent with the guidance policy for the Conservation Area. 6 I hope that the Council will not approve this application as I feel that Minto Street should be protected and has already suffered enough from insensitive changes.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Application location 23 Minto Street, Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

I am the owner of flat 1, 22 Minto Street. I wish to object to this application on the following grounds:

- 1 All the proposed bedrooms are en-suite, leading to the question of whether this development is for a permanent family home, or whether there will be a future change of use to a guest house. A guest house involves noise, with taxis drawing up and much coming and going in front of number 22.
- 2 The applicant has mentioned a former planning decision to permit brick-built houses in Grantully Place behind number 22. This is of no relevance, since planning rules are now different. The historic built heritage of Edinburgh has suffered many indignities in the past - the situation is much better now.
- 3 The applicant has mentioned the glass atrium joining the two fine villas, which formerly formed part of the Minto Hotel. I would like to point out that a glass structure cannot be described as fully permanent - it is a vast improvement on the previous built structure, as it does not impair the integrity of the two adjacent villas.
- 4 The proposed development will have an adverse effect on the rear aspect of number 22. At present there is a pleasing view of the buildings from Mayfield Terrace and further erosion of the historic heritage of these listed houses is to be regretted. The street scene does not apply solely to the fronts of the buildings. Once a precedent is set, further applications are may follow. Minto Street is a fine, distinguished street, albeit now very busy, and is part of Edinburgh's social history.
- 5 A previous nearby development by this applicant has given rise to dissatisfaction; I believe that it was not consistent with the guidance policy for the Conservation Area.
- 6 I hope that the Council will not approve this application as I feel that Minto Street should be protected and has already suffered enough from insensitive changes.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Ms Anna Regaard

Address: 21 Blacket Place Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:1. There is already over development of this site

2. There is potential in the future to use the new development for further guest accommodation (all rooms planned are ensuite) causing further noise, parking pressures and inconvenience to neighbouring properties. There is not sufficient parking in the area.

3. Recent development by the applicant in Mayfield Terrace has not been consistent with detailing and use of materials in guidance policy for the Conservation area.

4. The development will cause significant reduction to light levels affecting the neighbouring properties.

5) The development will negatively affect the skyline/view from the rear of the neighbouring properties with the obstruction of the line of sight from Mayfield Terrace, Grantully Place and Minto Street properties

6) The development will have a negative impact on the character of the Conservation area/ building heritage and is inappropriate and unattractive visually. It sets a precedent for further development of neighbouring listed properties.

7) The development will overlook other properties resulting in a lack of privacy.

8) Previous development in Grantully Place was undertaken at a time prior to the controls appropriate for Conservation areas/Listed buildings so are of no relevance. The Minto Street Hotel conversion glass atrium is neither accommodation or permanent structure so is of no relevance.

Minto Street contains of some of the oldest and most important listed buildings in the south of Edinburgh which make them inappropriate for this type of development.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:1. There is already over development of this site

2. There is potential in the future to use the new development for further guest accommodation (all rooms planned are ensuite) causing further noise, parking pressures and inconvenience to neighbouring properties. There is not sufficient parking in the area.

3. Recent development by the applicant in Mayfield Terrace has not been consistent with detailing and use of materials in guidance policy for the Conservation area.

4. The development will cause significant reduction to light levels affecting the neighbouring properties.

5) The development will negatively affect the skyline/view from the rear of the neighbouring properties with the obstruction of the line of sight from Mayfield Terrace, Grantully Place and Minto Street properties

6) The development will have a negative impact on the character of the Conservation area/ building heritage and is inappropriate and unattractive visually. It sets a precedent for further development of neighbouring listed properties.

7) The development will overlook other properties resulting in a lack of privacy.

8) Previous development in Grantully Place was undertaken at a time prior to the controls appropriate for Conservation areas/Listed buildings so are of no relevance. The Minto Street Hotel conversion glass atrium is neither accommodation or permanent structure so is of no relevance.

Minto Street contains some of the oldest and most important listed buildings in the south of Edinburgh which make them inappropriate for this type of development.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Anne Henderson

Address: 4 Mayfield Terrace Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We are concerned about the impact of this extension on the local area. There is considerable traffic and parking problems in the street already due to the business run from the building in the grounds that was initially supposed to be a garage. It seems likely that this will just be used to extend the bed and breakfast business.

The modern look of the extension is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We are concerned about the impact of this extension on the local area. There is considerable traffic and parking problems in the street already due to the business run from the building in the grounds that was initially supposed to be a garage. It seems likely that this will just be used to extend the bed and breakfast business.

The modern look of the extension is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Marie Ogilvie

Address: 62/3 Blacket Place Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The older development in Grantully Place already blocks out the view from my ground and garden flat across to 23 Minto Street and beyond to Blackford Hill. However, my car is garaged directly opposite the proposed development at the rear of no 23, where the entrance to their parking area is, at the west end of Mayfield Terrace. Hence I am all too aware of the increased traffic already exiting Mayfield Terrace on to Minto Street, and the lack of any additional space for parking in that area.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

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 older development in Grantully Place already blocks out the view from my ground and garden flat across to 23 Minto Street and beyond to Blackford Hill. However, my car is garaged directly opposite the proposed development at the rear of no 23, where the entrance to their parking area is, at the west end of Mayfield Terrace. Hence I am all too aware of the increased traffic already exiting Mayfield Terrace on to Minto Street, and the lack of any additional space for parking in that area.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Miss Iqra Khan

Address: 6 Minto Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Having looked at the application, it seems to be a reasonable way to support a local family, whilst appreciating the need for them to live on site to run their business. The changes to the current extension would improve its appearances in terms of the conservation area.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Having looked at the application, it seems to be a reasonable way to support a local family, whilst appreciating the need for them to live on site to run their business. The changes to the current extension would improve its appearances in terms of the conservation area.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Ms Nora Wilson

Address: Blossom Guest House 8 Minto Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Commercial

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I have looked at this application and as I am a guest house owner I completely support it. I understand how important it is to have comfortable private living accommodation for your family, given that work and home are at the same place. I wish them all the success.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Commercial

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I have looked at this application and as I am a guest house owner I completely support it. I understand how important it is to have comfortable private living accommodation for your family, given that work and home are at the same place. I wish them all the success.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Mr Tony Harris (Grange/Prestonfield Community Council)

Address: 21 Mentone Terrace Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Community Council

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Summary of Applications: 20/01975/FUL & 20/01976/LBC are to provide at first floor level on top of an existing rear extension a mansard roofed addition to provide 3 additional bedrooms, stated to be for family use. That part of 23 Minto Street shown on the drawings as family dwelling has 4 bedrooms, which these proposals would increase to 7. The rest of 23 Minto Street is in the ownership of the applicant and is in use as a guesthouse. Also shown as being in the ownership of the applicant is the separate dwelling to the east now referred to as 1b Mayfield Terrace with adjoining it another building incorporating 3 lock-up garages.

Site: The application site is shown as the footprint of the owner's family accommodation plus a small enclosed yard and the garden ground between the existing rear extension and 1b Mayfield Terrace. Adjoining 23 Minto Street to the south are 23a and 23b, the other part of this B Listed semi-detached villa pair (Listing reference LB 29353), 23b being a "lodge" flat with a separate entrance off Mayfield Terrace.

Changes from last year: These new applications are similar to 19/02395/FUL and 19/02398/LBC refused by Notifications of Decision dated 17 July 2019, with the following changes:-

- (i) The mansard roof gable ends are now to be in natural stone, previously in facing brick.
- (ii) The 3 additional bedrooms are now to be part of the owner's accommodation, whereas previously the intention was to create 3 similar additional bedrooms for the guesthouse, the application site then being the whole of 23 Minto Street.

GPCC Comments: Grange/Prestonfield Community Council (GPCC) objected to last year's applications and agreed with the reasons for refusal by CEC, as set out in the Reports of Handling and Notifications of Decision of 17th July 2019. GPCC considers that the changes made in these

new applications do not support different conclusions and decisions, for the following reasons:-

(i) The change to sandstone for the mansard roof gable ends, although a small beneficial change in proposed materials, still does not mitigate other adverse impacts referred to in the Reports of Handling, such as "The proposals would add further accommodation to what is already an intensely used site and amounts to excessive and inappropriate over-development of the listed building". We consider that the change to sandstone for the gable ends alone would not remove the detrimental effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, caused by a massive and incongruous mansard roofed extension and dormers at first floor level. This proposed scheme would not preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of the Blacket Conservation Area.

(ii) There is no greater justification for the 3 additional bedrooms in the mansard roofed first floor extension to be part of the owner's family accommodation than to be part of the guesthouse, as proposed last year. We consider that the "Client Supporting Statement" with the application documents add nothing new in planning terms and should be disregarded. The planning history of the whole 23 Minto Street site shows varying approaches to the division between guesthouse and owner's accommodation. When what is now referred to as 1b Mayfield Terrace was in course of development as owner's private residence, being granted planning consent for that purpose in April 2008 as part of 23 Minto Street, a further application 14/01801/FUL was made for change of use of this separate dwelling from residential to Class 7 guesthouse. This was ruled as not development as it was "not a separate planning unit. It is therefore concluded that the application concerns the reallocation of use within the same site and that no change of use is occurring", so planning permission was not required. The site of the present applications is part of 23 Minto Street and separating this for planning application purposes from what in the past has been part of the same site and describing it as family dwelling should not now be used to justify yet further development of an already over-developed site.

Conclusion: For the reasons set out above GPCC, considers that these new applications are no more justified than those refused last year. The reasons for refusal were then set out in detail in the Reports of Handling and need not be repeated in these comments. GPCC objects to these new applications and requests that they be refused.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Community Council

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Summary of Applications: 20/01975/FUL & 20/01976/LBC are to provide at first floor level on top of an existing rear extension a mansard roofed addition to provide 3 additional bedrooms, stated to be for family use. That part of 23 Minto Street shown on the drawings as family dwelling has 4 bedrooms, which these proposals would increase to 7. The rest of 23 Minto Street is in the ownership of the applicant and is in use as a guesthouse. Also shown as being in the ownership of the applicant is the separate dwelling to the east now referred to as 1b Mayfield Terrace with adjoining it another building incorporating 3 lock-up garages.

Site: The application site is shown as the footprint of the owner's family accommodation plus a small enclosed yard and the garden ground between the existing rear extension and 1b Mayfield Terrace. Adjoining 23 Minto Street to the south are 23a and 23b, the other part of this B Listed semi-detached villa pair (Listing reference LB 29353), 23b being a "lodge" flat with a separate entrance off Mayfield Terrace.

Changes from last year: These new applications are similar to 19/02395/FUL and 19/02398/LBC refused by Notifications of Decision dated 17 July 2019, with the following changes:-

- (i) The mansard roof gable ends are now to be in natural stone, previously in facing brick.
- (ii) The 3 additional bedrooms are now to be part of the owner's accommodation, whereas previously the intention was to create 3 similar additional bedrooms for the guesthouse, the application site then being the whole of 23 Minto Street.

GPCC Comments: Grange/Prestonfield Community Council (GPCC) objected to last year's applications and agreed with the reasons for refusal by CEC, as set out in the Reports of Handling and Notifications of Decision of 17th July 2019. GPCC considers that the changes made in these

new applications do not support different conclusions and decisions, for the following reasons:-

(i) The change to sandstone for the mansard roof gable ends, although a small beneficial change in proposed materials, still does not mitigate other adverse impacts referred to in the Reports of Handling, such as "The proposals would add further accommodation to what is already an intensely used site and amounts to excessive and inappropriate over-development of the listed building". We consider that the change to sandstone for the gable ends alone would not remove the detrimental effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, caused by a massive and incongruous mansard roofed extension and dormers at first floor level. This proposed scheme would not preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of the Blacket Conservation Area.

(ii) There is no greater justification for the 3 additional bedrooms in the mansard roofed first floor extension to be part of the owner's family accommodation than to be part of the guesthouse, as proposed last year. We consider that the "Client Supporting Statement" with the application documents add nothing new in planning terms and should be disregarded. The planning history of the whole 23 Minto Street site shows varying approaches to the division between guesthouse and owner's accommodation. When what is now referred to as 1b Mayfield Terrace was in course of development as owner's private residence, being granted planning consent for that purpose in April 2008 as part of 23 Minto Street, a further application 14/01801/FUL was made for change of use of this separate dwelling from residential to Class 7 guesthouse. This was ruled as not development as it was "not a separate planning unit. It is therefore concluded that the application concerns the reallocation of use within the same site and that no change of use is occurring", so planning permission was not required. The site of the present applications is part of 23 Minto Street and separating this for planning application purposes from what in the past has been part of the same site and describing it as family dwelling should not now be used to justify yet further development of an already over-developed site.

Conclusion: For the reasons set out above GPCC, considers that these new applications are no more justified than those refused last year. The reasons for refusal were then set out in detail in the Reports of Handling and need not be repeated in these comments. GPCC objects to these new applications and requests that they be refused.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Iram Shakeel

Address: 47 Minto street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Commercial

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I think it's a lovely idea, I know them personally and it's for the families residence. I see no issue with this.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Commercial

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I think its a lovely idea, I know them personally and it's for the families residence. I see no issue with this.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Org Doric House and Grantully Place Residents Association

Address: 21 Minto Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Residents Association

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Residents Association - On behalf of our residents and owners.

No Neighbour Notification received

- 1) Potential in future to use the new development for further guest house accommodation (all the rooms are en-suite) providing further noise, parking pressures and inconvenience to neighbouring properties. There is not sufficient parking in area.
- 2) There is already an over-development of their site.
- 3) Recent development by the applicant in Mayfield Terrace has not been consistent with detailing and use of materials in guidance policy for the conservation area.
- 4) Development will cause significant reduction to light levels affecting neighbouring properties.
- 5) Development will negatively affect the skyline/view from the rear of the neighbouring properties with the obstruction of the line of site from Mayfield Terrace and Minto Street properties.
- 6) The development will have a negative impact on the character of the Conservation area and building heritage. It sets a precedent for further development of neighbouring listed properties.
- 7) The development will overlook other properties resulting in a lack of privacy.
- 8) Previous development in Grantully Place was undertaken at a time prior to the controls appropriate for Conservation areas/Listed buildings so are of no relevance.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Residents Association

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Residents Association - On behalf of our residents and owners.

No Neighbour Notification received

- 1) Potential in future to use the new development for further guest house accommodation (all the rooms are en-suite) providing further noise, parking pressures and inconvenience to neighbouring properties. There is not sufficient parking in area.
- 2) There is already an over-development of their site.
- 3) Recent development by the applicant in Mayfield Terrace has not been consistent with detailing and use of materials in guidance policy for the conservation area.
- 4) Development will cause significant reduction to light levels affecting neighbouring properties.
- 5) Development will negatively affect the skyline/view from the rear of the neighbouring properties with the obstruction of the line of site from Mayfield Terrace and Minto Street properties.
- 6) The development will have a negative impact on the character of the Conservation area and building heritage. It sets a precedent for further development of neighbouring listed properties.
- 7) The development will overlook other properties resulting in a lack of privacy.
- 8) Previous development in Grantully Place was undertaken at a time prior to the controls appropriate for Conservation areas/Listed buildings so are of no relevance.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Mr Kenneth Merriman

Address: 21/3 Minto Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: No Neighbour Notification received

- 1) Potential in future to use the new development for further guest house accommodation (all the rooms are en-suite) providing further noise, parking pressures and inconvenience to neighbouring properties. There is not sufficient parking in area.
- 2) There is already an over-development of their site.
- 3) Recent development by the applicant in Mayfield Terrace has not been consistent with detailing and use of materials in guidance policy for the conservation area.
- 4) Development will cause significant reduction to light levels affecting neighbouring properties.
- 5) Development will negatively affect the skyline/view from the rear of the neighbouring properties with the obstruction of the line of site from Mayfield Terrace and Minto Street properties.
- 6) The development will have a negative impact on the character of the Conservation area and building heritage. It sets a precedent for further development of neighbouring listed properties.
- 7) The development will overlook other properties resulting in a lack of privacy.
- 8) Previous development in Grantully Place was undertaken at a time prior to the controls appropriate for Conservation areas/Listed buildings so are of no relevance.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: No Neighbour Notification received

- 1) Potential in future to use the new development for further guest house accommodation (all the rooms are en-suite) providing further noise, parking pressures and inconvenience to neighbouring properties. There is not sufficient parking in area.
- 2) There is already an over-development of their site.
- 3) Recent development by the applicant in Mayfield Terrace has not been consistent with detailing and use of materials in guidance policy for the conservation area.
- 4) Development will cause significant reduction to light levels affecting neighbouring properties.
- 5) Development will negatively affect the skyline/view from the rear of the neighbouring properties with the obstruction of the line of site from Mayfield Terrace and Minto Street properties.
- 6) The development will have a negative impact on the character of the Conservation area and building heritage. It sets a precedent for further development of neighbouring listed properties.
- 7) The development will overlook other properties resulting in a lack of privacy.
- 8) Previous development in Grantully Place was undertaken at a time prior to the controls appropriate for Conservation areas/Listed buildings so are of no relevance.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Scothorne for the Blacket Association

Address: 7 Alfred Place Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Residents Association

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: On 20th June 2019 The Blacket Association strongly objected to Applications 19/02395/FUL and 19/02398/LBC for the development of a new second floor development within a Mansard roof at 23 Minto Street. This application was subsequently refused.

This new planning application appears to be almost identical with the exception of the intended use by the owners and the change of material on the side wall from brick to stone.

Neither of these changes alters our view of this development.

The rear of this building is highly visible on the route out of Mayfield Terrace onto Minto Street, to the extent that its contribution to local amenity and appearance should be considered as a frontage would be.

The building has already been substantially altered and this application fails to add any coherence to the appearance of the B listed building and will hide a significant part of its original rear stone wall. The development will enclose the original rear of 23 Minto Street and have an adverse impact on the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building and its setting within the Blacket Conservation Area. The use of a near vertical rear elevation is inappropriate and fails to have any relationship to the original buildings around it.

The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development'. They do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

In addition, the proposed development will directly overlook the private garden of the adjacent property at 21 Minto Street and for part of the day block the direct sunlight, as the development is on its south side.

The proposal therefore adversely affects the amenity of the Conservation Area and the appearance of the B Listed building. We hope you will refuse it.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Residents Association

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: On 20th June 2019 The Blacket Association strongly objected to Applications 19/02395/FUL and 19/02398/LBC for the development of a new second floor development within a Mansard roof at 23 Minto Street. This application was subsequently refused.

This new planning application appears to be almost identical with the exception of the intended use by the owners and the change of material on the side wall from brick to stone.

Neither of these changes alters our view of this development.

The rear of this building is highly visible on the route out of Mayfield Terrace onto Minto Street, to the extent that its contribution to local amenity and appearance should be considered as a frontage would be.

The building has already been substantially altered and this application fails to add any coherence to the appearance of the B listed building and will hide a significant part of its original rear stone wall. The development will enclose the original rear of 23 Minto Street and have an adverse impact on the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building and its setting within the Blacket Conservation Area. The use of a near vertical rear elevation is inappropriate and fails to have any relationship to the original buildings around it.

The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development'. They do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

In addition, the proposed development will directly overlook the private garden of the adjacent property at 21 Minto Street and for part of the day block the direct sunlight, as the development is on its south side.

The proposal therefore adversely affects the amenity of the Conservation Area and the appearance of the B Listed building. We hope you will refuse it.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Dr The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland

Address: 15 Rutland Square, Edinburgh EH1 2BE

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Amenity Body

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above planning applications. The proposals concern a B listed

semi-detached villa within the boundaries of the Blasket conservation area in Edinburgh. The Forth & Borders

Cases Panel of the AHSS has considered the proposal and wishes to make the following comments.

The applicant proposes to erect a mansard roof over an existing single-storey extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms. We note that this is a revised application (Ref: 19/02395/FUL was refused on 17 July 2019 due to inappropriate size, position and design). The AHSS considers that the proposed works are still of inappropriate size as they would obscure the rear façade of the original building which would result in further loss of historic fabric to an already altered and compromised property. Not only does the overall massing of the proposed extension breach the guidelines on subservience to existing structures, but the proposed work neither preserves nor enhances the historic interest of the building nor the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The Development Quality Handbook policy on Villa Areas and the Grounds (page 5):

"Proposals should avoid the appearance of miniaturisation e.g. the effect of smaller modern storey heights

leading to reduced window proportions. Where development is in the grounds of an existing villa it should

be subservient to the main villa and of simpler detail to avoid competing with it."

Blacket Conservation Area Character Appraisal (page 21)

"Any development should be restricted in height and scale in order to protect the character of the surrounding area. New design must respect the existing spatial pattern, massing and traditional materials."

Accordingly, the AHSS wishes to object to this proposal.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Amenity Body

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above planning applications. The proposals concern a B listed

semi-detached villa within the boundaries of the Blasket conservation area in Edinburgh. The Forth & Borders

Cases Panel of the AHSS has considered the proposal and wishes to make the following comments.

The applicant proposes to erect a mansard roof over an existing single-storey extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms. We note that this is a revised application (Ref: 19/02395/FUL was refused on 17 July 2019 due to inappropriate size, position and design). The AHSS considers that the proposed works are still of inappropriate size as they would obscure the rear façade of the original building which would result in further loss of historic fabric to an already altered and compromised property. Not only does the overall massing of the proposed extension breach the guidelines on subservience to existing structures, but the proposed work neither preserves nor enhances the historic interest of the building nor the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The Development Quality Handbook policy on Villa Areas and the Grounds (page 5):

"Proposals should avoid the appearance of miniaturisation e.g. the effect of smaller modern storey heights

leading to reduced window proportions. Where development is in the grounds of an existing villa it should

be subservient to the main villa and of simpler detail to avoid competing with it."

Blacket Conservation Area Character Appraisal (page 21)

"Any development should be restricted in height and scale in order to protect the character of the surrounding area. New design must respect the existing spatial pattern, massing and traditional materials."

Accordingly, the AHSS wishes to object to this proposal.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Dr The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland

Address: 15 Rutland Square, Edinburgh EH1 2BE

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Amenity Body

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above planning applications. The proposals concern a B listed

semi-detached villa within the boundaries of the Blacket conservation area in Edinburgh. The Forth & Borders

Cases Panel of the AHSS has considered the proposal and wishes to make the following comments.

The applicant proposes to erect a mansard roof over an existing single-storey extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms. We note that this is a revised application (Ref: 19/02395/FUL was refused on 17 July 2019 due to inappropriate size, position and design). The AHSS considers that the proposed works are still of inappropriate size as they would obscure the rear façade of the original building which would result in further loss of historic fabric to an already altered and compromised property. Not only does the overall massing of the proposed extension breach the guidelines on subservience to existing structures, but the proposed work neither preserves nor enhances the historic interest of the building nor the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The Development Quality Handbook policy on Villa Areas and the Grounds (page 5):

"Proposals should avoid the appearance of miniaturisation e.g. the effect of smaller modern storey heights

leading to reduced window proportions. Where development is in the grounds of an existing villa it should

be subservient to the main villa and of simpler detail to avoid competing with it."

Blacket Conservation Area Character Appraisal (page 21)

"Any development should be restricted in height and scale in order to protect the character of the surrounding area. New design must respect the existing spatial pattern, massing and traditional materials."

Accordingly, the AHSS wishes to object to this proposal.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Amenity Body

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above planning applications. The proposals concern a B listed

semi-detached villa within the boundaries of the Blasket conservation area in Edinburgh. The Forth & Borders

Cases Panel of the AHSS has considered the proposal and wishes to make the following comments.

The applicant proposes to erect a mansard roof over an existing single-storey extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms. We note that this is a revised application (Ref: 19/02395/FUL was refused on 17 July 2019 due to inappropriate size, position and design). The AHSS considers that the proposed works are still of inappropriate size as they would obscure the rear façade of the original building which would result in further loss of historic fabric to an already altered and compromised property. Not only does the overall massing of the proposed extension breach the guidelines on subservience to existing structures, but the proposed work neither preserves nor enhances the historic interest of the building nor the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The Development Quality Handbook policy on Villa Areas and the Grounds (page 5):

"Proposals should avoid the appearance of miniaturisation e.g. the effect of smaller modern storey heights

leading to reduced window proportions. Where development is in the grounds of an existing villa it should

be subservient to the main villa and of simpler detail to avoid competing with it."

Blacket Conservation Area Character Appraisal (page 21)

"Any development should be restricted in height and scale in order to protect the character of the surrounding area. New design must respect the existing spatial pattern, massing and traditional materials."

Accordingly, the AHSS wishes to object to this proposal.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Mr Juan Santelices

Address: 22 Minto Street Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:20/01975/FUL and 20/01975/LBC - 23 Minto Street, EH9 1RQ

Firstly, we are not sure why we were only informed of the application 20/01975/FUL and not of the almost identical application 19/02398/LBC for the development of a new second floor development within a Mansard roof at 23 Minto Street which we never received?

The building next door to ours has already been substantially altered. It appears to continue submitting extension proposal after extension proposal rather than make it clear from the very initial application what they were intending to do with the property. It is likely that if they had done this it would have contravened Plan Policies for Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' and would have been rejected. Instead, the owners appear to be changing its appearance step by step in a bid to get it through planning permissions.

It is clear that this application fails to add any coherence to the appearance of the B listed building and will hide a significant part of its original rear stone wall. The proposed works do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Finally, living next door to the proposed development, we are also concerned about negative impact on noise, privacy and direct sunlight during and after the works are completed. It will block direct sunlight for private gardens and windows in both Grantully Place and 22 Minto Street that are on the south side.

Comments for Planning Application 20/01975/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/01975/FUL

Address: 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Proposal: Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

Case Officer: Diana Garrett

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:20/01975/FUL and 20/01975/LBC - 23 Minto Street, EH9 1RQ

Firstly, we are not sure why we were only informed of the application 20/01975/FUL and not of the almost identical application 19/02398/LBC for the development of a new second floor development within a Mansard roof at 23 Minto Street which we never received?

The building next door to ours has already been substantially altered. It appears to continue submitting extension proposal after extension proposal rather than make it clear from the very initial application what they were intending to do with the property. It is likely that if they had done this it would have contravened Plan Policies for Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' and would have been rejected. Instead, the owners appear to be changing its appearance step by step in a bid to get it through planning permissions.

It is clear that this application fails to add any coherence to the appearance of the B listed building and will hide a significant part of its original rear stone wall. The proposed works do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Finally, living next door to the proposed development, we are also concerned about negative impact on noise, privacy and direct sunlight during and after the works are completed. It will block direct sunlight for private gardens and windows in both Grantully Place and 22 Minto Street that are on the south side.

WEST BLACKET ASSOCIATION

Head of Planning & Transport, PLACE
4 East Market Street
Edinburgh EH8 8BG
Waverley Court fao Diana Garrett

Bartholomew House Flat 3
12 Duncan Street
Edinburgh EH9 1SZ
5 June 2020

Dear Diana,

Re 20/01975/FUL & 20/01976/LBC 23 Minto St, Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

- 1. STRONGLY OBJECT:** The West Blacket Association (WBA) objects strongly to approval for this latest proposal for adding a mansard first floor extension onto a 2015-approved extension. The 2015 approval was cut back to a shorter extension than had been requested. Applications 19/02395/FUL & 19/02398/LBC sought to add an almost identical mansard roof to that currently proposed and those were refused. The only significant difference with these new applications is facing the upper level 'party wall' in stone. Other arguments are not material and are addressed below. **We would therefore argue that the current applications should not have been accepted as they replicate a recent & previously rejected proposal.**
- 2. INACCURACIES:** Contrary to the assertions in the client supporting statement document this guest house has been subjected to successive extension over recent years, as is accepted in the 2019 report of handling. Other claims in the client statement comparing his proposal with surrounding properties are irrelevant, as is the request for additional family accommodation when the former 'owners accommodation' approved in 2007 has been left out of the 'application site boundary'. **The property boundary shown in the location plan remains inaccurate, as similarly but not identically was that for the 2019 applications, as the red line does not enclose the entire footprint of 23 Minto Street, and the blue line at the rear wrongly encloses the 3 lock-up garages in private ownership to the east, but omits the 'owners accommodation' (which we believe may be rented out).** I drew attention to this error in my objection of 18 June 2019 to the 2019 applications, and also then drew attention to the need to update the Planning records to properly address separate property ownerships.
- 3. DOES NOT COMPLY WITH PLANNING POLICIES:** Over & above the accuracy of the information, & our argument that these represent repeat applications which should have not been accepted, **we believe the proposal fails to comply with Planning Policies Env 3, Env 4, Env 6 and the Blacket Conservation Area Character Appraisal and should therefore be refused.** We also request that Planning retrospectively review their records to address the separate property ownerships involved to avoid continuing confusion. That should be 23, 23A and 23B with the (owners' accommodation) cottage as part of 23 & not given a contrived separate address.

The planning history of this site is complicated but has been made more so by a lack of continuity due to different agents being employed over time, and by the submission of ambiguous or even inaccurate information. The quality of drawings is now satisfactory but, as indicated above, there are errors which have not been picked up and corrected, & which the owner is probably happy to leave unclear.

Yours faithfully

Ian Carter for West Blacket Association

Copies to Grange Prestonfield Community Council, Blacket Association, and Councillors Burgess, Orr, Perry and Rose.

Douglas and Rosemary Currie
21/2 Minto Street
EDINBURGH EH9 1RQ
(0131 - 667 6494)
douglascurrie@btinternet.com

9th June 2020

Dear Diana Gerratt,
(see others)

I receive a photo copy from an email sent to me yesterday by our resident committee representative. As you will see from my address, I live in the Drive/Gravelly Place complex. Our designated parking space is near the wall adjoining 23 Winton St.

I don't understand why we were not informed of this planning application at the correct time.

I feel this objection will mean some loss of privacy for them of us in Wn. 21 + 22 especially if there are to be windows in the north + east walls.

It would also inevitably cast a shadow over our car park at certain times in the sun; couple of car spaces time are would find our car difficult to de-ice, even with the protection we currently use for the windows.

The garden area behind no 22, which is very well maintained, has Mrs Evans, the resident with an immediate contact. But she + her husband have been caught in USA by the

lockdown restrictions + she will not know about this application.

I fear the objection might also be noisy + should the family decide to use it for their 5th guests there could be problems with car parking.

As I am not at all confident using online communication other than email, I phoned the office today but was told only emergency calls were being taken.

I have no wish to upset my neighbour in no. 23, but because I have no idea what others are thinking, I am emboldened to write.

If I am the only person questioning the application, I will withdraw my complaint.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Application no 20/01975/FOL
20/01976/LBC

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 100340788-001

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:	Alan Hardie Architect		
Ref. Number:		You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
First Name: *	Alan	Building Name:	
Last Name: *	Hardie	Building Number:	5
Telephone Number: *	07706 270072	Address 1 (Street): *	Mitchell Street
Extension Number:		Address 2:	
Mobile Number:		Town/City: *	DALKEITH
Fax Number:		Country: *	United Kingdom
		Postcode: *	EH22 1JQ
Email Address: *	alan@alanhardie.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" value="Mr"/>	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" value="Mohamad"/>	Building Number:	<input type="text" value="23"/>
Last Name: *	<input type="text" value="Yamin"/>	Address 1 (Street): *	<input type="text" value="Minto Street"/>
Company/Organisation	<input type="text"/>	Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number: *	<input type="text" value="██████████"/>	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="EH9 1RQ"/>
Fax Number:	<input type="text"/>		
Email Address: *	<input type="text" value="████████████████████████████████████████"/>		

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="23 MINTO STREET"/>
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="EH9 1RQ"/>

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

Northing	<input type="text" value="671904"/>	Easting	<input type="text" value="326722"/>
----------	-------------------------------------	---------	-------------------------------------

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)

Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

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.

Refer to Request for Review Letter in "Supporting Documents" section.

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)

Request for Review letter and Client supporting statement for Review.

Application Details

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

20/01975/FUL

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

18/05/2020

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

23/10/2020

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)

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 Alan Hardie

Declaration Date: 17/12/2020

Proposal Details

Proposal Name	100340788
Proposal Description	Notice of Review
Address	23 MINTO STREET, EDINBURGH, EH9 1RQ
Local Authority	City of Edinburgh Council
Application Online Reference	100340788-001

Application Status

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

Attachment Details

Notice of Review	System	A4
Request for Review letter	Attached	A4
Client supporting statement for Review	Attached	A4
Decision Notice for Application No 20_01975_FUL	Attached	A4
Decision Notice for Application No 19_02395_FUL	Attached	A4
Notice_of_Review-2.pdf	Attached	A0
Application_Summary.pdf	Attached	A0
Notice of Review-001.xml	Attached	A0

City of Edinburgh Planning Local Review Body,
G.2, Waverley Court,
4 East Market Street,
Edinburgh, EH8 8BG

Dear Sirs,

Application for Review: reference 20/01975/FUL & 20/01976/LBC Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms at 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

I am writing in support of my request for review of the decision to refuse planning consent with respect of my application number 20/01975/FUL and 20/01976/LBC. I previously submitted a design which involved the use of brick and a mansard roof; this new application is an attempt to create a design which better complements the conservation area whilst meeting the needs of my family. I was disappointed to find that the council's response to the amended application was to copy and paste the text from the previous refusal. I believe this was done without due attention as you will find when you review the plans that the report made reference to elements of the original design which are not present in this application. As a result I am requesting to appeal the decision and I am grateful for your time and attention to this proposal.

The proposal is for an extension to the three bedroom family residence attached to the Georgian townhouse currently used as a guest house. It is the home for a growing family which at present includes seven adults and a new born baby. It is of critical importance to the ongoing physical and mental wellbeing of my family that we are able to have adequate owner's living space without using the part of the building required for the business. The unprecedented events of this year have meant we have all had to re-evaluate our long term plan and I believe this extension is the only way that my wife and I can retire and continue to live in our home whilst the business is run by the next generation.

The refusal of the application made some statements about the nature of the proposal which I feel are inaccurate/ do not take into consideration the precedents set by other developments in the area. I would be grateful if you would consider the points below which are in response to the areas detailed in Section 3 of the Report of Handling.

(A) Impact on special interest of a listed building

I understand that the Historic Environment Guidance on Extensions states that the proposal must be subordinate in scale and form, and as such the council has determined that development should retain the prominence of the sandstone walls of the original rear elevations. Although a very small part of the building is visible from outwith the site, the

development will be seen against the backdrop of the large development of Grantully place which is built entirely in brick and does not bear any resemblance to the surrounding Georgian buildings. Please see below which is a picture of the back of my property showing the place where my proposed extension would be and the property directly next door which has already been far more significantly extended (and finished in sandstone).



(B) Impact on the special character of the conservation area

As previously noted, many of the properties in east Minto Street have made significant developments in the rear gardens, including the recent conversion of the old Minto Hotel just a few doors up the road which also involved a glass fronted extension which is certainly not in keeping with any Georgian architectural interest. Please see the following pictures which show the rear of 19 Minto Street, the entire rear prominence of which has been obscured by a brick extension, and the large new building erected 2 years ago on the site of the old Minto Hotel. My previous application for a mansard roof was refused although the travel lodge build just a few years ago involved significant extension of a Georgian townhouse on our road, including a large mansard roof.



In the interest of fairness and consistency it seems that my proposal, which will be far smaller than other extensions in the area and will leave the original building intact, deserves further consideration. Some adaptation to these buildings is necessary in order to meet the demands of an age where their use is vastly different from when they were originally designed and I believe that my proposal is not detrimental to the historical value of the property.

In a time when self employed families such as mine are drowning in debt and unable to compete with the big hotels, I believe the council is unfairly disadvantaging us by allowing big developers such as Travel lodge, Minto Hotel or Northumberland hotel to build massive extensions for commercial gain, while local families such as ourselves are refused adequate space to live. As such I would be grateful for your further consideration regarding this application and would be pleased to work constructively to make whatever adjustments to the design deemed necessary to best complement the conservation area.

Yours Sincerely,

M. Yamin

Alan Hardie Architect.
FAO: Alan Hardie
Suite 4 Dundas House
Westfield Park
Eskbank
UK
EH22 3FB

Mr Mohamad Yamin.
23 Minto Street
Edinburgh
Scotland
EH9 1RQ

Decision date: 17 July 2019

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

Erect mansard roof on existing extension to create additional bedrooms at first floor level.

At 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Application No: 19/02395/FUL

DECISION NOTICE

With reference to your application for Planning Permission registered on 21 May 2019, 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:-

Reason for Refusal:-

1. The proposals will introduce an extension of an inappropriate size, position and design that encloses the remaining original rear facade of the listed building with an incongruous brick-built mansard roofed extension to adversely impact on the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building and its setting within the Blacket Conservation Area the character or appearance of which it is desirable to

preserve . The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2. The proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' as they do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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

Drawings 01 - 08, 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 proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' as they do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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 Daniel Lodge directly on 0131 529 3901.

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.

Alan Hardie Architect.
FAO: Alan Hardie
Suite 4 Dundas House
Westfield Park
Eskbank
EH22 3FB

Mr Mohamad Yamin.
23 Minto Street
Edinburgh
EH9 1RQ

Decision date: 23 October 2020

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

Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family bedrooms with shower rooms.

At 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ

Application No: 20/01975/FUL

DECISION NOTICE

With reference to your application for Planning Permission registered on 13 May 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 proposals will introduce an extension of an inappropriate size, position and design that encloses the remaining original rear facade of the listed building with an incongruous mansard roofed extension which would adversely impact on the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building and its setting within the Blacket Conservation Area, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve. The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2. The proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' as they do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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

Drawings 1-7, 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 proposals are contrary to the Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policies Env 4 'Listed Buildings - Alterations and Extensions' and Env 6 'Conservation Areas - Development' as they do not have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting and adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. In addition, the proposals do not preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The proposed works therefore fail to comply with sections 14 and 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 as they do not preserve the special interest of the listed building or preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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 Diana Garrett directly at diana.garrett@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.

Alan Hardie Architect

5 Mitchell Street,
Dalkeith,
EH22 1JQ

17/12/2020
2019-022A.08.AH.01

City of Edinburgh Planning Local Review Body,
G.2, Waverley Court,
4 East Market Street,
Edinburgh, EH8 8BG

Dear Sirs

**Request for Review: reference 20/01975/FUL & 20/01976/LBC
Extension to first floor above existing extension to create additional family
bedrooms with shower rooms at 23 Minto Street Edinburgh EH9 1RQ**

With reference to the Decision for the above, dated 23rd October 2020, my clients have requested that this be submitted to the Local Review Body. They believe that the reason for refusal was based on a subjective opinion and, they are also of the view that this Decision was not properly assessed, for reasons explained below and in their accompanying letter (enclosed).

BACKGROUND

The present arrangement comprises a flat roofed stone-faced single storey extension (14/00233/FUL amended from hipped to flat roof 15/01821/FUL) which is used as the family's private lounge. This is accessed from an earlier extension comprising kitchen and first floor bedrooms (05/00651/FUL) which are used by the client and his family. The rest of the house – the Listed Townhouse, is run as a Guest House. The façade of the original house to Minto Street and to the rear garden remain unaltered.

DESIGN PROPOSALS

As my client explains in his accompanying statement, the current layout is now no longer fit for purpose for use as a family home and also operate as a viable business. The purpose of the application was to provide the family with much-needed additional bedrooms and toilet facilities at first floor level by building over the ground floor lounge. Following an earlier

Application Refusal (19/02395/FUL and 19/02398/LBC) the client accepted that as brick was specifically referred to as a Reason for Refusal, the use of stone to the gable was preferable to brick and the design amended accordingly and re-submitted in the belief that this addressed a principle concern.

REASONS FOR REQUEST FOR REVIEW

1. A review of the decision is sought, as it is my client's opinion that in the Reasons for Refusal in the Decision Notice it states that the proposals "*would adversely impact on the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building and its setting within the Blacket Conservation Area*" is a purely subjective opinion. It could be easily argued that this is simply not the case - and that the proposal has no impact on the "*special architectural and historical interest of the listed building*" as it is proposed to build over an existing modern extension and abuts another modern extension and the proposal utilises traditional stone and slate.

Furthermore, it can be readily argued that the proposed extension does not impact the Listed Building's "*setting within the Blacket Conservation Area*" as the proposed extension can only be briefly viewed from Mayfield Terrace and the proposed natural stonework and slate roof would only be seen against a backdrop of brick and facing block of the neighbouring extension and flats. Refer photo below – client's single story extension bottom left, upon which a stone and slate upper floor is proposed, with the backdrop of brick and facing block developments against which the stone and slate extension would be viewed. My client also explains in his letter why he feels that there are recent new-builds in the immediate vicinity which easily have far greater impact on the Conservation area than his modest proposals – refer photos included in my client's supporting statement.



Alan Hardie Architect

5 Mitchell Street,
Dalkeith,
EH22 1JQ

17/12/2020
2019-022A.08.AH.01

2. My client also feels that the Case Officer, regrettably, did not properly assess the revised application. Whilst he understands that Case Officers are under pressure with home working due to the Covid restrictions, it does rather appear that her reasons for refusal appear to be no more than a "copy and paste" of the previous refusal, as she did not take cognisance of the change of material from brick to stone. Also, for the record, the critical dates are as follows:
 - Applications for Planning Consent and Listed Building Consent registered on 18th May 2020 with target dates of 12th July 2020.
 - The Case Officer was emailed by me on 26th August with an enquiry as to progress. I received neither acknowledgment nor reply.
 - The Case Officer was emailed by me on 8th September with another enquiry and again, I received neither acknowledgment nor reply.
 - Rather reluctantly, I emailed the Planning Department office email address on 16th October (five months after Registration) advising that I had received neither replies nor acknowledgments from the Case Officer and stressing that my client's own family and business circumstances was being made ever more difficult with the lock-down and restrictions - and requesting notification as to when a decision might be made.
 - Because of that email it seems, the Decision letters were received one week later. As mentioned, the Refusal does seem to have been "copied and pasted" using identical wording to the original refusal and still reference brick, not stone as proposed. It does appear to have been rushed, without much thought despite it being over three months beyond the target date of 12th July 2020.

My client does not wish to apportion blame to an individual officer, he merely asks for assurances that his application has been properly assessed, his efforts to address earlier concerns about materials have been acknowledged, and that cognisance has been taken of his plea in the original supporting statement about his family's circumstances.

As such, I would ask that you now refer to his letter accompanying this Request for Review.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Alan Hardie.

Alan Hardie Architect

Enc.