

Format Building Design.
FAO: Shona Mackay
Holyrood Business Park
146 Duddingston Road West
Edinburgh
EH16 4AP

GEMML.
99 Drum Brae South
Edinburgh
EH12 8TD

Decision date: 31 August 2022

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

Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.
At Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Application No: 22/01177/FUL

DECISION NOTICE

With reference to your application for Planning Permission registered on 10 March 2022, 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 scale, form and design of this proposal is not keeping with characteristics of the wider townscape and this back-land development would disrupt the spatial character of the wider area. The proposal is contrary to policies Hou 1, Des 4 and Hou 4 of the adopted Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.
2. The proposal will result in an unreasonable loss of neighbouring amenity and is contrary to policy Des 5 of the adopted Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

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

Drawings 01,02A,03,04., represent the determined scheme. Full details of the application can be found on the [Planning and Building Standards Online Services](#)

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

The proposal does not comply with the development plan. It does not respect the spatial pattern of the surrounding area and is not of an appropriate design and is not in keeping with the surrounding style of dwellinghouses. This back-land development is not characteristic of the wider townscape and does not draw on the positive characteristics of the surrounding area. The proposal does not comply with Policy Hou 1 and will be detrimental to neighbouring amenity. There are no material considerations that outweigh this conclusion. Therefore, the principle of development is not acceptable.

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 Jackie McInnes directly at jackie.mcinnnes@edinburgh.gov.uk.



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 Land To The Rear Of, 99 Drum Brae South, Craigmount

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

**Item – Local Delegated Decision
Application Number – 22/01177/FUL
Ward – B03 - Drum Brae/Gyle**

Recommendation

It is recommended that this application be **Refused** subject to the details below.

Summary

The proposal does not comply with the development plan. It does not respect the spatial pattern of the surrounding area and is not of an appropriate design and is not in keeping with the surrounding style of dwellinghouses. This back-land development is not characteristic of the wider townscape and does not draw on the positive characteristics of the surrounding area. The proposal does not comply with Policy Hou 1 and will be detrimental to neighbouring amenity. There are no material considerations that outweigh this conclusion. Therefore, the principle of development is not acceptable.

SECTION A – Application Background

Site Description

The application site was part of the rear garden ground of the dwellinghouse at number 99 Drum Brae South and has been separated from the dwellinghouse by a 2 metre high timber fence. It fronts a private non-through road with a pedestrian path linking Drum Brae South and Craigmount Avenue North.

The street and surrounding area are predominantly residential although there are other land uses in the area, such as shops opposite the application property. Drum Brae South is a main thoroughfare with a high frequency bus route.

Description Of The Proposal

The proposal is for a one and a half storey new dwellinghouse on a garden area. It will be over two floors with open plan living space on the ground floor and two bedrooms on the upper floor. Wallhead dormers are proposed for the front (north) and rear (south)

elevations. The roof will be hipped and include rooflights and solar panels. Windows will be installed on the front and rear elevations, with a patio door at ground floor level on the rear. The entrance door will be in the west side elevation. A lower front brick boundary wall with railing detail on the top is also proposed. The existing metal gate will be replaced with a new gate.

Materials proposed are smooth render with quoin sandstone corners and sandstone lintels, plinths and surrounds. Red tiles will be used on the roof and dormer cheeks and brick for the front boundary wall.

Garden ground will be provided to the front and rear.

One vehicle parking space is proposed which will use an existing access. Refuse and recycling bins will be stored on the driveway.

Amended Scheme

Corrected site area discrepancy in submitted drawings.

Supporting Information

- Supporting Statement.

Relevant Site History

20/01301/FUL
Land To The Rear Of
99 Drum Brae South
Edinburgh

Construct new dwelling house with accommodation over two floors
Refused
18 September 2020

19/00798/FUL
99 Drum Brae South
Edinburgh
EH12 8TD
Erection of a studio mews dwelling-house on land to the rear.
Refused
3 July 2019

Other Relevant Site History

21 June 1995 - planning permission refused for part change of use of property to a children's nursery (application number 95/00976/FUL);

25 October 2002 - permission granted for house and dormer extension (application number 02/02892/FUL);

16 September 2004 - permission refused to alter and extend dwellinghouse (application number 04/02533/FUL);

24 February 2005 - permission granted for extension and alteration to house (application number 04/04394/FUL); and

14 December 2020 - Appeal against refusal of 20/01301/FUL to construct new dwelling house with accommodation over two floors (DPEA reference: PPA-230-2317).

Consultation Engagement

No consultations.

Publicity and Public Engagement

Date of Neighbour Notification: 29 March 2022

Date of Advertisement: Not Applicable

Date of Site Notice: Not Applicable

Number of Contributors: 10

Section B - Assessment

Determining Issues

This report will consider the proposed development under Sections 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (the 1997 Act):

Do the proposals comply with the development plan?

If the proposals do comply with the development plan, are there any compelling material considerations for not approving them?

If the proposals do not comply with the development plan, are there any compelling material considerations for approving them?

In the assessment of material considerations this report will consider:

- the Scottish Planning Policy presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is a significant material consideration due to the development plan being over 5 years old;
- equalities and human rights;
- public representations; and
- any other identified material considerations.

Assessment

To address these determining issues, it needs to be considered whether:

a) The proposals comply with the development plan?

The Development Plan comprises the Strategic and Local Development Plans. The relevant Edinburgh Local Development Plan 2016 (LDP) policies to be considered are:

- LDP Housing policies Hou 1, Hou 4, Hou 3
- LDP Design policies Des 1, Des 4, Des 5
- LDP Transport policies Tra 2, Tra 3, Tra 4

- LDP Environment policies Env 21

The non-statutory Edinburgh Guidance is a material consideration that is relevant when considering policies.

Principle of development

Policy Hou 1 (Housing Development) in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) supports housing on suitable sites in the urban area, provided that the proposals are compatible with other policies in the Plan. The application site is in the urban area of the LDP and the street and surrounding area are residential in character.

The proposal does not comply with LDP policy Hou 1 as it does not comply with other policies of the Plan. The principle of the development of a house in this location is not acceptable.

Character and appearance

LDP Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context) requires development proposals to create or contribute towards a sense of place. The design should be based on an overall design concept that draws upon the positive characteristics of the surrounding area.

LDP Policy Des 4 (Development Design - Impact on Setting) also requires development proposals to have a positive impact on its surroundings, including the character of the wider townscape, having regard to its height and form, scale and proportions, including the spaces between the buildings, position of the buildings and other features on the site; and the materials and detailing.

LDP Policy Hou 4 (Housing Density) states that the density of a development on a site will be dependent on its characteristics and those of the surrounding area; the need to create an attractive residential environment within the development; the accessibility of the site to public transport; and the need to encourage and support the provision of local facilities necessary to high quality urban living. It goes on to explain that in established residential areas, proposals will not be permitted which would result in unacceptable damage to local character, environmental quality or residential amenity.

The Edinburgh Design Guidance states that back-land development must be designed to ensure that any proposed building is subservient to surrounding buildings and it does not have an adverse impact on spatial character.

The street and surrounding area consist predominantly of single storey bungalows set within generous plots with reasonable sized front and rear gardens. Some properties have been extended and have outbuildings, such as garages and sheds. Rear garden space and the spacing between residential properties sets the spatial pattern of the area and two storey buildings positioned in rear gardens is not an established characteristic. Whilst it is acknowledged that there are two existing houses positioned behind numbers 101 and 103 Drum Brae South, this is not typical of the pattern of development in the area and the permissions pre-date current policies. The dwellinghouse at number 101A is smaller and single storey than the proposed dwellinghouse and is more in keeping with the scale of dwellinghouses in the

surrounding area. Two storey dwellings are found in the wider surrounding area and form part of planned developments rather than individual houses within former garden plots.

The proposed dwellinghouse will occupy approximately 30% of the subdivided plot. The original dwellinghouse on the plot, before it was subdivided, occupied approximately 19% of its plot and a similar ratio of dwellinghouse footprint to plot size is the prevailing density pattern found in the surrounding area. The proposal will occupy just under a third of the plot size whereas the original house occupied just under a fifth of the original plot size. The proposal introduces a much denser development.

The proposal for a one and a half storey house in former rear garden ground is not in keeping with the style of dwellinghouse nor with the spatial pattern of the surrounding area. This back-land development is not in keeping with the characteristics of the wider townscape. It is acknowledged that the current proposal has tried to address the reasons for refusal of 20/01301/FUL by reducing the storey level from two to one and a half and reducing the footprint of the house. However, the current design is not compatible with the style of dwellinghouses in the street and it will dominate this side street part of Drum Brae South. The proposal does not draw on the positive characteristics of the surrounding area.

The proposal does not comply with Policies Des 1, Des 4 or Hou 4.

Amenity

LDP Policy Des 5 (Development Design - Amenity) requires development proposals to demonstrate that neighbouring amenity of a development will have acceptable levels of amenity in relation to noise, daylight, sunlight, privacy or immediate outlook.

Neighbouring amenity

The rear garden of the proposed house is 9.1 metres from the neighbouring boundary to the south. The Edinburgh Design Guidance advises that 9 metres is the minimum distance between rear boundaries to maintain privacy. It also advises that new buildings should be spaced out so that reasonable levels of daylight to existing buildings are maintained. It also states that it is important that buildings are spaced far enough apart that reasonable levels of privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight can be achieved. The layout of buildings in an area will be used by the Council to assess whether the proposed spacing is reasonable.

The spatial pattern in this area is characterised by bungalows in extensive garden ground with depths of around 14 - 17 metres. Whilst there have been a few subdivisions of these gardens, the pattern is still largely consistent. The distances between properties in this area are greater than 9 metres. Although the rear ground floor patio door complies with the 9 metres minimum distance from the boundary, its positioning introduces a new orientation of rear windows i.e. facing onto the side of a rear garden, and reduced spacing between buildings and between buildings and neighbouring gardens. The proposal will introduce new overlooking from the upper floor rear window directly into the neighbouring rear garden to the south and along the rear gardens of the properties to the south from the upper level of the proposal. Such overlooking directly into rear private outdoor amenity spaces would not normally be

expected due to the spatial pattern and established characteristics of the surrounding area.

The windows on the front elevation of the proposed dwellinghouse will overlook a road/lane used by the public and will look onto a high wall and high gates. The upper window will be able to look along the rear gardens to the north of the site and cause new overlooking of private rear garden areas.

Information on daylighting and overshadowing is included in the drawings. Most of the overshadowing will occur outwith the application site and in neighbouring gardens. Approximately 14% of overshadowing will fall on the east neighbouring garden ground and approximately 16% of overshadowing will fall on the west neighbouring garden ground. Some loss of sunlight will also be experienced. Neighbouring properties will experience new overshadowing of private garden space and this is unacceptable.

The Edinburgh Design Guidance recognises that people value the ability to look outside, whether to gardens, streets or more long-distance views. Neighbouring properties to the east and west will have an outlook of a blank rendered elevation approximately 3.3 metres high plus the roof, a total height of approximately 5.4 metres. The proposal will create a poorer outlook for existing neighbouring properties.

Although noise and disturbance from a single dwellinghouse would be what would be expected from residential use, the front door on the western elevation would create more activity. This in turn would cause noise to be experienced in the neighbouring private rear garden on a more regular basis than what would be expected and what is currently experienced. It would be compounded by the door being so close, approximately 1 metre, to the rear neighbouring boundary. Given the closeness of the door to the boundary, there is also a concern that this will also impact on personal security of neighbours and adversely affect amenity. Anti-social behaviour such as noise disturbance can be dealt with through relevant legislation, such as by Police Scotland or Environmental Health Acts.

The proposal does not comply with policy Des 5 and will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Amenity of future occupiers

LDP Policy Des 5 (Development Design - Amenity) states that planning permission will be granted for the development where it is demonstrated that the amenity of neighbouring residents will not be adversely affected.

LDP Policy Hou 4 (Housing Density) takes account of the need to create an attractive residential environment within the development.

LDP Policy Hou 3 (Private Green Space in Housing Development) requires developments to provide adequate provision for green space to meet the needs of future residents.

The Edinburgh Design Guidance states that private open space/gardens should be designed for a range of functions.

Edinburgh Design Guidance requires a minimum internal floor area of 66 square metres for a two-bedroom unit. The proposed internal floor space of 76 square metres exceeds this minimum requirement and is acceptable.

Living spaces within the proposed development will be capable of receiving adequate levels of daylight as windows and doors are suitably located to ensure habitable rooms will receive a sufficient level of daylight. The living area will benefit from daylight from being dual aspect and daylight to upper floor habitable rooms will be supplemented by rooflights. A satisfactory level of daylighting to habitable rooms will be achievable. The proposal will provide adequate internal amenity for future occupiers.

Overlooking of the proposed dwellinghouse, including into the windows, will be possible from the neighbouring properties. However, the applicant and other future occupiers will be aware of this when viewing the house and will be able to screen windows, such as through the use of obscured glass or window dressings.

A rear garden will be provided and this is a satisfactory amount and type of private outdoor amenity space.

The proposal complies with policies Des 5, Hou4 and Hou 3 and will, therefore, provide adequate amenity space for future occupants.

Parking and road safety

LDP Policies Tra 2 - Tra 4 sets out the requirements for private car and cycle parking. The Council's Parking Standards are set out in the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

The Roads Authority has no comments to make on this planning application.

One parking space will be provided and this complies with the parking standards in the Edinburgh Design Guidance. Two cycle parking spaces are required and no cycle parking is shown on the drawings. However, there is scope to provide cycle parking in the garden ground. Should planning permission be granted, it is recommended that a condition or informative relating to the provision of cycle parking is attached to the permission.

There are no roads authority or transport issues.

Flooding and drainage

LDP Policy Env 21 (Flood Protection) states that planning will not be granted for development that would increase flood risk or be at risk of flooding.

A Surface Water Management Plan would be required to ensure the proposed dwellinghouse does not flood and that it will not result in the flooding of neighbouring properties or the road. A condition for any grant of planning permission would be required to ensure that the associated drainage of the site is acceptable. It is recommended that a Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) is required should the planning permission be granted.

Waste

The drawings show that bins will be stored in the driveway. Any domestic collection of waste would need to be agreed in advance with Waste and Cleaning Services before developing the site.

Conclusion in relation to the Development Plan

The proposal does not comply with LDP policy Hou 1 and the principle of development is not acceptable. The proposal will introduce a denser development at odds with the surrounding spatial character and townscape. It will cause an unreasonable loss to neighbouring amenity due to the adverse impact on privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook. Future occupiers would have a satisfactory living environment. There are no transport issues.

b) There are any other material considerations which must be addressed?

The following material planning considerations have been identified:

SPP - Sustainable development

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) is a significant material consideration due to the LDP being over 5 years old. Paragraph 28 of SPP gives a presumption in favour of development which contributes to sustainable development. Paragraph 29 outlines the thirteen principles which should guide the assessment of sustainable development.

The proposal does not comply with Paragraph 29 of SPP. It is over development of the site and will not protect the amenity of existing development.

Emerging policy context

The Draft National Planning Framework 4 has been consulted on but has not yet been adopted. As such, little weight can be attached to it as a material consideration in the determination of this application.

While City Plan 2030 represents the settled will of the Council, it has not yet been submitted to Scottish Ministers for examination. As such, little weight can be attached to it as a material consideration in the determination of this application.

Equalities and human rights

Due regard has been given to section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010. No impacts have been identified.

Consideration has been given to human rights. No impacts have been identified through the assessment and no comments have been received in relation to human rights.

Public representations

A summary of the representations is provided below:

material considerations

- impact on townscape/character of area. Addressed in a) under Character and appearance.
- density. Addressed in a) under Character and appearance.
- design. Addressed in a) under Character and appearance.
- noise, disturbance and security. Addressed in a) under Amenity.
- loss of privacy and overlooking. Addressed in a) under Amenity.
- loss of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. Addressed in a) under Amenity.
- impact on outlook. Addressed in a) under Amenity.
- road safety, traffic and parking issues. Addressed in a) under Parking and road safety.

non-material considerations

- innaccurate information in Supporting Statement. This is information only and would not form part of approved drawings.

Conclusion in relation to identified material considerations

The proposals do not raise any issues in relation to other material considerations identified.

Overall conclusion

The proposal does not comply with the development plan. It does not respect the spatial pattern of the surrounding area and is not of an appropriate design, in keeping with the surrounding style of dwellinghouses. This back-land development is not characteristic of the wider townscape and does not draw on the positive characteristics of the surrounding area. The proposal does not comply with Policy Hou 1 and will be detrimental to neighbouring amenity. There are no material considerations that outweigh this conclusion. Therefore, the principle of development is not acceptable.

Section C - Conditions/Reasons/Informatives

The recommendation is subject to the following;

Reasons

1. The scale, form and design of this proposal is not keeping with characteristics of the wider townscape and this back-land development would disrupt the spatial character of the wider area. The proposal is contrary to policies Hou 1, Des 4 and Hou 4 of the adopted Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.
2. The proposal will result in an unreasonable loss of neighbouring amenity and is contrary to policy Des 5 of the adopted Edinburgh Local Development Plan (LDP) and the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

Background Reading/External References

To view details of the application go to the [Planning Portal](#)

Further Information - [Local Development Plan](#)

Date Registered: 10 March 2022

Drawing Numbers/Scheme

01,02A,03,04.

Scheme 2

David Givan
Chief Planning Officer
PLACE
The City of Edinburgh Council

Contact: Jackie McInnes, Planning officer
E-mail: jackie.mcinnnes@edinburgh.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Consultations

No consultations undertaken.

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Graham Thompson

Address: 1B Craigs Avenue Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am objecting to this application due to:

- 1) Increase in traffic and parking on a route heavily used by children and other pedestrians
- 2) Increase in noise and disturbance in the area.

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Alexander Fraser

Address: 103A Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I am objecting to this application due to:

Traffic and parking issues in an already busy road/lane.

Safety of penetrations especially children as this route is used heavily by schoolchildren.

Increased noise and disturbance in a quiet residential area.

Loss of privacy in my back garden and rooms to rear of house.

Loss of daylight and sunlight due to position of proposed building.

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Liam Hudson

Address: 99 Drum Brae South Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Firstly, I am disappointed in the local council to once again open this planning application after my neighbours and I firmly objected this proposal in 2020. Surely the comments made by the land inspector opposing the original proposal appeal should be evidence enough that the land to the rear of 99 Drum Brae South is unsuitable for a residential property. It perplexes me that a change in roof colour and a other cosmetic changes warrant a full redo of the planning consideration.

Speaking as the owner of 99 Drum Brae S - the applying party continues to reference our buying agreement, stating that we are in favor of a residential property being built to the rear of our land, but this is incorrect. Although on buying the property at 99 Drum Brae, we agreed to the ORIGINAL planning permission, our contract stated that we are well within our rights to object against any alteration to the original planning application. As the applying party is keen to show, there have been many alterations to the property blueprint, and we believe that the approval of the application would negatively affect the surrounding community and our own livelihood.

Drawing on the comments of Gordan Reid, the reporter that denied the appeal application in 2020. He stated ' Concerns were raised by adjoining neighbours that the appeal proposal would adversely affect the immediate outlook from the rear of their properties. Given the height of the appeal proposal, the blank side elevations and its proximity to the adjoining properties at 58 Craigmount Avenue North and particularly 99 Drum Brae South, I find that it would introduce a visually dominant feature that would adversely affect the immediate outlook enjoyed by residents from the rear windows and gardens of these properties.' Although the new application has altered some cosmetic features, the fact remains that 'a visually dominant feature would adversely affect' the outlook of both my property and neighbours at 58 Craigmount Avenue. In a post-Covid world where many of my neighbours, including myself are working from home, this negative impact to

our immediate outlook is unacceptable.

Also, Gordon Reid stated 'Given the reduced size of the garden ground at 99 Drum Brae South the adverse impact on the use of the available garden ground at this property would be the most significant. I consider that the overall loss of sunlight, although not affecting all of the available garden ground, would still be sufficient to adversely impact on the use of these areas by the occupiers of the properties.' This also hasn't entirely been fixed by the applying party. Sure, they have provided 'sun maps, but the fact remains that the garden property at 99 Drum Brae was halved to accommodate this planning proposal, and any further encroachment, however small, must be deemed unacceptable.

Additionally, further mentioning Gordon Reids comments - the addition of a property in the miniscule parch of land behind Drum Brae south would 'introduce a much denser development which would adversely affect the established local character of the area' - no amount of cosmetic adjustments can change this fact, and it is my belief that it flies in direct violation of Policy HOU 4 in regards to housing density.

Furthermore, it is easier for the applying party to make the size of the land to the rear of 99 Drum Brae south look far larger than it is. However, as all of my neighbours have agreed, it is far too small for a residential property. The proposed housing plan takes up over a third of the proposed building site, unnecessarily forcing an accommodation into a space that is far too small.

It is clear that the applying party are looking to force themselves into the area, without real care for the impact on the local community. Anyone that has had the pleasure of visiting the immediate area surrounding the planning permission will be immediately aware of just how negative the building of this property would be, and would be astounded that anyone would attempt to build a property on land of that size. I urge the local council planning board to reject this application again, hopefully for the final time to ease the concern of the local area and allow residents to rest with confidence, knowing their immediate living situations are not going to be affected unnecessarily.

Thank you.

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Ian Deal

Address: 101 Drum Brae South Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: PLANNING APPLICATION 22/01177/FUL

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are disappointed that there has been a third attempt by the developer to build another two-storey property on what was, previously the garden of 99 Drum Brae South. Once again the developer is showing a complete disregard of the negative impact this would have on the area, and the upset that it would cause local homeowners. It would appear that previous feedback from Edinburgh City Council Planning Department has once again been chiefly ignored, and clearly the hope is that they will succeed with their plans by continually pushing through 'new' designs - yet essentially still remaining the same concept of a two-storey house.

Windows facing the north and south will have a huge impact on the privacy of the properties surrounding it, and will also reduce the enjoyment of home owners' garden space.

Once again we are frustrated that our property (101 Drum brae South) is not identified on any plans, or acknowledged as likely to be impacted by the proposal.

The upstairs window of the proposed property (facing north) will enable the occupants to look straight down our drive and through our windows., and will have a great impact on our privacy. There is no acknowledgement of this by the planning consultant in the plans. (photo illustration emailed to Planning Officer).

Essentially the plans still propose an over development of the plot and will also mean unacceptable levels of traffic in the small lane. Parking is already proving to be a problem with

visitors for existing properties parking in the lane, and on occasions causing problems with vehicular access to driveways of 101 and 103A.

An additional hazard would be the pavement that spans the entire lane would be interrupted by any traffic entering and leaving the proposed property.

We once again strongly object to this planning proposal.

Ian Deal
Andrew Griggs
101 Drum Brae South,
Edinburgh
EH12 8TN

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Shazana Hussain

Address: 101A Drum Brae South Drum Brae South Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We wish to object to the planning proposal, on the land to the rear of 99 Drum Brae South.

Once again we are faced with the prospect of a large house, over 2 floors, which will overlook gardens and into people's properties, including through our bedroom and lounge windows on the side of our bungalow.

It is an over development for a 2 floored house to be built on this garden, which should have remained attached to 99 Drum Brae South. It is also very much an over development of the quiet lane.

The property developer does not even live in the area and has no interest in how it will impact our lives and invade our privacy.

I have two sons with learning difficulties, and I need to park near my house. It is likely that additional cars and traffic from the new house will make this impossible and will cause upset for my sons.

Please do not allow this application to proceed.

S. Hussain

101A Drum Brae South

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Graham Milligan

Address: 66 Craigmount Avenue North Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Not in line with rest neighborhood.

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Gillian Denholm

Address: 97 Drum Brae South Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: There has been no significant changes to the structure of the building, therefore no grounds for this to be submitted again. Our previous objections stand in that the building does not fit into the surrounding area, and it poses a risk to health and safety with it being built in such a small area in an extremely busy lane which accesses a local primary school and doctors surgery.

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Thomas Bathe

Address: 58 Craigmount Ave North Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: As with Application Number 19/00798/FUL and 20/01301/FUL we continue to not only comment but to strongly object to Application Number 22/01177/FUL

Once again this property developer, with absolutely no interest or care for this area and the people living around here, has submitted yet another application to build a property on a SMALL area of land.

This application has next to NO significant changes from the previous applications in respect of our boundary at 58 Craigmount Ave North.

Once again the relevance of the supporting statement must be questioned:-

The 4 storey flats are 200 yards away across a main thoroughfare in another estate.

The 2 storey terrace is 100 yards away across a main thoroughfare.

These factors have not changed since the original application was rejected

Again please note the front elevation picture has been enhanced to make the area look more expansive than it actually is.

The entrance / exit of the proposed build is directly onto a FOOTPATH which runs the whole length of the lane from Drum Brae to Craigmount Ave North. Whereas the property at 101 the entrance/ exit is direct to the road NOT the pathway.

The building WILL significantly darken my outlook and shadow my greenhouse. The sun on ground images provided infer that a '5.4metre on my east boundary will not cast a shadow' can I suggest this is due to the timeline and months that were supplied - March and December ! There is NO way a shadow will not be cast over the summer mornings as the sun rises in the East when the garden is more likely to be used and the greenhouse gets the sun. There is NO way the amenity of a bright outside space will be preserved on my property.

The introduction of a front door facing directly into my garden 1m from the boundary will also invade my privacy and cause excess noise and disruption. Once again the height of this building will be over 2.5m above the height of my boundary fence

We are at a loss to understand how building a two storey property only 1 Metre from our boundary would be in keeping with the surrounding area.

Our objections are as follows:-

The proposed building :-

- 1) is too close to our boundary fence
- 2) is too high and will overshadow our garden area
- 3) will compromise our security
- 4) will invade our privacy and induce excess noise and disruption to our private garden
- 4) entrance/exit would be dangerous as crosses a very busy pathway

We think the Council should take into consideration the neighbours comments and objections and refuse permission for the erection of the proposed new build rather than approve the application which would result in a developers profit to the detriment of the existing neighbours amenities.

We would like to point out that thankfully there is no existing pathway through our living room as shown in the street plan 04

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Beverley Petrie

Address: 56 Craigmount Avenue North Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Councillor's Reference

Comment: As with previous rejected applications 19/00798/FUL & 20/01301/FUL relating to the construction of a dwelling house at land to the rear of the property situated at 99 Drumbrae South, Edinburgh I continue to strongly object to this fresh proposal.

I remain of the opinion that this proposal is not acceptable in this location. Nothing significant has changed from the previous two applications in that this fresh proposal:

(1) continues to be not in keeping with the surrounding style of dwellinghouses nor with the spatial pattern of the surrounding area.

(2) This back-land development is not in keeping with the characteristics of the wider townscape and the proposal does not draw on the positive characteristics of the surrounding area.

(3) The proposals will be detrimental to privacy of neighbours and will create overshadowing to neighbouring gardens, resulting in a loss of sunlight.

Additionally, the supporting statement for this application contains information which is not factually accurate and should be questioned.

Finally, it also appears that the entrance to the property is adjacent to the rear garden of number 58 Craigmount Avenue North, Edinburgh which will entail opening direct access from the street. In my opinion this is both a security and privacy breach. The height of this new proposal will be significantly higher than the existing boundary fence and will therefore be an encroachment should it be permitted.

Comments for Planning Application 22/01177/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/01177/FUL

Address: Land To The Rear Of 99 Drum Brae South Craigmount Edinburgh

Proposal: Proposed new dwelling house at land to the rear.

Case Officer: Jackie McInnes

Customer Details

Name: Mrs A Fraser

Address: 54 Craigmount Avenue North Craigmount Avenue North Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour-Residential

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I wish to object to this planning application. It is a blatant attempt to disregard the previous decisions of City of Edinburgh Council and the Scottish ministers. 2 previous applications have been considered and refused and this application provides little amendment. My comments on the previous applications still remain valid. This is backyard development. The garden of 99 Drum Brae South was an average size and allowing a new house in it would set a dangerous precedent. The property is still too large and will cause a lack of privacy for all surrounding properties. Although I object to any development a single storey property would be far preferable. I hope the council maintain the consistent approach taken in rejecting previous applications.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED] [McInnes](#)
Date: 31 March 2022 17:00:47
Attachments: [PXL_20220331_152536550.MP~3.jpg](#)

Dear Madam,

I have submitted an objection to the above application. Please could you ensure that this photograph is attached to my objection for consideration as mentioned.

With thanks.

Ian Deal
101 Drum Brae South.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

