

Graphite Studio Chartered Architects.
FAO: Simon Brims
7/3 East Trinity Road
Edinburgh
EH5 3DZ

Mr Callis
22 Coillesdene Crescent
Edinburgh
EH15 2JH

Decision date: 21 December 2022

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

Replace existing roof to form mansard, form storey-and-a-half extension to rear, build garden studio.

At 22 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JH

Application No: 22/05269/FUL

DECISION NOTICE

With reference to your application for Planning Permission registered on 18 October 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;

Reason for Refusal:-

1. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Des 12 in respect of Alterations and Extensions, as the proposed bungalow roof development would not be compatible with the bungalow property and would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding bungalow neighbourhood character.
2. The proposals are contrary to the non-statutory Guidance for Householders as the proposed bungalow roof development does not respect the original character of the bungalow or its original roof design.

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

Drawings 01 - 05, 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 proposed works to the dwelling are not in accordance with the Development Plan. The works are not compatible with the existing building and would be detrimental to the neighbourhood character. Although the works do not result in an unreasonable loss of neighbouring amenity the proposals do not comply with the non-statutory Guidance For Householders, or the LDP policy Des 12, and the overall objectives of the Development Plan. There are no further material considerations to be considered. Therefore, the proposal 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 Blair Burnett directly at blair.burnett@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
22 Coillesdene Crescent, Edinburgh, EH15 2JH

Proposal: Replace existing roof to form mansard, form storey-and-a-half extension to rear, build garden studio.

Item – Local Delegated Decision
Application Number – 22/05269/FUL
Ward – B17 - Portobello/Craigmillar

Recommendation

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

Summary

The proposed works to the dwelling are not in accordance with the Development Plan. The works are not compatible with the existing building and would be detrimental to the neighbourhood character. Although the works do not result in an unreasonable loss of neighbouring amenity the proposals do not comply with the non-statutory Guidance For Householders, or the LDP policy Des 12, and the overall objectives of the Development Plan. There are no further material considerations to be considered. Therefore, the proposal is not acceptable.

SECTION A – Application Background

Site Description

The application refers to a single storey bungalow with a low pitch, hipped roof. The property features a single storey, flat roof side garage, and flat roof rear extension. In the rear garden the property features two ancillary buildings.

The established character of this area is defined by the bungalow building type and within this neighbourhood character, there are two defined roof forms for the bungalows these are - hipped, 30 degree pitch angle, measuring 5.6m from ground to ridge; and hipped, (approximately) 35 degree pitch angle, measuring 6m from ground to ridge.

Several properties have been developed with many featuring flat roof side and rear extensions. In terms of roofscape development, several feature dormers, with some altering the roof - however, this is primarily extending the roof to the rear utilising an intersecting hipped roof and maintaining the existing roof pitch.

Beyond this, there are some examples of whole roof alterations to extend the width and roof pitch. On Coillesdene Avenue (approximately 100m from the site boundary) there are three examples of roofscape development which altered the roof pitch. The first for a mansard roof with no online record of development, second in 2004 for a pitch of 45 degrees, and lastly in 2013 for a 42.5 degree pitch. These very limited examples were granted permission in the past and do not comply with current guidelines, therefore, these should not be taken as setting any form of precedent and should not be used as examples to follow as they do not represent the character of the area.

Description Of The Proposal

The application refers to the:

Removal of the existing hipped roof;
Removal of existing chimneys;
Removal of the flat roof side garage;
Removal of the flat roof rear extension;

Replacement of the side and rear extension on a similar footprint;
Replacement of the roof at a 50 degree pitch over the whole new footprint;

Addition of a small glass roof rear extension;
Addition of an ancillary building with flue; and
Addition of hardstanding for ancillary building.

Supporting Information

- Supporting design statement

Permitted Development

The addition of hardstanding for the ancillary building would be permitted development under Class 3C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Order 1992 (as amended). No assessment of its merits are therefore required as part of this planning application.

Relevant Site History

98/01310/FUL
22 Coillesdene Crescent
Edinburgh
EH15 2JH
House extension
Granted
1 July 1998

Other Relevant Site History

Coillesdene Crescent applications which extend or alter the roof to the rear of the property, but maintain the roof width and hipped roof angle:

94/00642/FUL
24 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JH
Alter & extend dwelling house (as amended)
Granted
29 June 1994

98/02114/FUL
32 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JJ
Alter & extend dwelling house
Granted
11 November 1998

02/01200/FUL
8 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JH
Extend dwelling house
Refused
10 May 2002

02/03757/FUL
8 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JH
Alter + Extend dwelling house
Refused
5 February 2003

03/02120/FUL
8 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JH
Alter and extend dwelling house
Granted
31 July 2003

04/00061/FUL
41 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JL
Extension of a domestic dwelling house (as amended)
Granted
15 March 2004

10/00908/FUL
10 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JH
Single storey rear extension with hipped and flat roof
Granted
28 May 2010

18/10058/FUL
11 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JH
Ground floor rear extension and rear elevation dormer (as amended).
Granted
22 March 2019

Coillesdene Avenue applications which extend the roof to the rear and side, but maintain the hipped roof angle:

14/00055/FUL

36 Coillesdene Avenue Edinburgh EH15 2JW
Single storey extension to side and rear of property, increase in the height of the roof and formation of dormers to front and rear elevations (as amended).
Granted
7 March 2014

Coillesdene Avenue applications which alter the whole roof and hipped roof angle:

43 Coillesdene Avenue Edinburgh EH15 2JW
Mansard roof, no online record available

04/02671/FUL
34 Coillesdene Avenue Edinburgh EH15 2JW
Alter and extend house
Refused
8 October 2004

04/03968/FUL
34 Coillesdene Avenue Edinburgh EH15 2JW
Alter and extend house
Granted
23 December 2004

12/02659/FUL
46 Coillesdene Avenue Edinburgh EH15 2JR
Extension of bungalow. Conversion of attic.
Refused and Upheld
27 September 2012

13/01204/FUL
46 Coillesdene Avenue Edinburgh EH15 2JR
New hipped roof with dormer and side extension.
Granted
14 June 2013

Consultation Engagement
No consultations.

Publicity and Public Engagement

Date of Neighbour Notification: 31 October 2022
Date of Advertisement: Not Applicable
Date of Site Notice: Not Applicable
Number of Contributors: 1

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 Design policies Des 12.

The non-statutory Householder Guidance is a material consideration that is relevant when considering policy Des 12.

Scale, form, design and neighbourhood character

Within a bungalow area, the form of a hipped roof is an important feature which contributes significantly to the character of a neighbourhood, and this is particularly true when viewing the bungalow from the public streetscape. The Guidance For Householders outlines that any extension to the original bungalow should retain the original character, not imbalance the principle elevation, and respect the hipped roof character of the original dwelling. This non-statutory guidance assists development to comply with the Edinburgh Local Development Plan in which Policy Des 12 requires development to be compatible with the existing building and not have a detrimental impact on the neighbourhood character.

When looking specifically at the proposed roof design, it is proposed to replace the entire bungalow roof with a 50 degree pitch hipped roof over the original and extended footprint. This roof design would incorporate two primary elevation dormers, a rear elevation dormer with Juliet balcony, ten skylights on the roofscape, a solar thermal panel, a rooflight and eleven angled solar panels on the flat roof section.

In principle, the surrounding development has suggested that extending the roof may be acceptable in some circumstances, however, these are primarily extending to the rear and maintaining the existing roof pitch. Under these circumstances, development would respect the character of the bungalow and its hipped roof. However, the proposal

at 22 Coillesdene Crescent would extend the roof to the side and increase the existing roof pitch by 20 degrees which would not be compatible with the established character of development in the area. While limited examples are present, these do not represent the holistic character of the neighbourhood, therefore, the principle of increasing the roof width and pitch would be unacceptable.

Extending the width of the roof over the side extension would imbalance the original appearance of the bungalow property as the side extension would not appear to be subservient to the original dwelling. While the replacement of the side and rear extension structure would be acceptable, the proposed roof design extending over this replacement structure would be unacceptable. This imbalance of the primary elevation would not respect the original character of the bungalow property and in turn would be detrimental to the character of the surrounding bungalow neighbourhood.

The existing hipped roof is a lower pitch at a 30 degree angle. There are two primary roof types in the area - 30 degrees and approximately 35 degrees - these form the part of the defined character of the area as originally intended. Altering the roof by increasing the pitch angle from 30 degrees to 50 degrees would not respect or match the original roof of the bungalow and would not match the established character of the surrounding area. Therefore, this alteration would not be compatible with the existing building and would be detrimental to the surrounding area.

While the proposed roof height would be 6 metres from ground to ridge - similar to higher roof types in the area - the proposal would include several angled solar panels on the flat roof section of the new roof. While these would be a minimal addition to the roof, as these are angled, they would be readily visible to the streetscape and would increase the overall massing of the development to 7 metres.

On the primary elevation two dormers are proposed, due to the increased roof width these would comply with the Guidance For Householders, however, the established character of the area includes a single primary elevation dormer. Therefore, the addition of two dormers would not be compatible with the wider neighbourhood and is only achievable through increasing the roof width which has been assessed above as unacceptable.

Overall, the cumulative impact of the roof alteration changes the style and structure of the roof entirely. These changes alter the interpretation of the bungalow property because the roof is such a key characteristic when defining a bungalow character and appearance. The proposal would be against the Guidance For Householders and would not be compatible with the existing character of the bungalow. Moreover, the changes to the character and appearance of the bungalow would be readily visible from the public streetscape and as a result the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character of the bungalow neighbourhood.

The creation of a small rear extension is of a suitable scale that it would be compatible with the existing dwelling and the addition of an ancillary building in the rear garden would be a suitable addition given the existing ancillary buildings.

Neighbouring Amenity

With respect to privacy, overshadowing and loss of daylight or sunlight, the proposals have been assessed against requirements set out in the non-statutory 'Guidance for

Householders'. The proposals will not result in any unreasonable loss to neighbouring amenity.

With respect to daylight and sunlight the replacement of the side and rear extension is situated on a similar footprint. Therefore, there would be no new daylight or sunlight impacts as a result of the proposal. Similarly, the new impact from the ancillary building would primarily fall on the neighbouring ancillary building.

With respect to privacy there would be no direct window to window conflicts as a result of the proposal.

With respect to overlooking, the direct outlook from the primary elevation dormers does not introduce any new overlooking concerns. Similarly, the rear dormer with Juliet balcony will directly overlook the applicants own garden.

Conclusion in relation to the Development Plan

The proposals are not compatible with the existing building and would be detrimental to the neighbourhood character. Although the proposals do not result in an unreasonable loss of neighbouring amenity, the proposals do not comply with the non-statutory Guidance For Householders or the LDP policy Des 12 and the overall objectives of the Development Plan.

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 complies with Paragraph 29 of SPP.

Emerging policy context

The Revised Draft National Planning Framework 4 was laid before the Scottish Parliament on 08 November 2022 for approval. As it has not completed its parliamentary process, only limited weight can be attached to it as a material consideration in the determination of this application.

On 30 November 2022 the Planning Committee approved the Schedule 4 summaries and responses to Representations made, to be submitted with the Proposed City Plan 2030 and its supporting documents for Examination in terms of Section 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997. At this time 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

One objection received, summarised as:

material considerations

Concern for the raising of the roof - Considered, further details in section a) above.

Concern for the massing impact on the wider area - Considered, further details in section a) above.

Conclusion in relation to identified material considerations

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

Overall conclusion

The proposed works to the dwelling are not in accordance with the Development Plan. The works are not compatible with the existing building and would be detrimental to the neighbourhood character. Although the works do not result in an unreasonable loss of neighbouring amenity the proposals do not comply with the non-statutory Guidance For Householders, or the LDP policy Des 12, and the overall objectives of the Development Plan. There are no further material considerations to be considered. Therefore, the proposal is not acceptable.

Section C - Conditions/Reasons/Informatives

The recommendation is subject to the following;

Reason for Refusal

1. The proposal is contrary to the Local Development Plan Policy Des 12 in respect of Alterations and Extensions, as the proposed bungalow roof development would not be compatible with the bungalow property and would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding bungalow neighbourhood character.
2. The proposals are contrary to the non-statutory Guidance for Householders as the proposed bungalow roof development does not respect the original character of the bungalow or its original roof design.

Background Reading/External References

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

Further Information - [Local Development Plan](#)

Date Registered: 18 October 2022

Drawing Numbers/Scheme

01 - 05

Scheme 1

David Givan
Chief Planning Officer
PLACE
The City of Edinburgh Council

Contact: Blair Burnett, Assistant Planning Officer
E-mail: blair.burnett@edinburgh.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Consultations

No consultations undertaken.

Comments for Planning Application 22/05269/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/05269/FUL

Address: 22 Coillesdene Crescent Edinburgh EH15 2JH

Proposal: Replace existing roof to form mansard, form storey-and-a-half extension to rear, build garden studio.

Case Officer: Householder Team

Customer Details

Name: Org Portobello Amenity Society

Address: 4a Elcho Terrace Edinburgh

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Amenity Body

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:Portobello Amenity Society objects to this major alteration and raising of the roof to this bungalow which will dominate the pleasing prospect from the street of the row of traditional bungalows. It is difficult to establish what the increased height of the roof will be as there is no dimensioned figure, as far as can be seen, on the drawings. An internal dimension of 2.4m is given however a floor to ceiling height of 2.3m for habitable rooms is acceptable and why the roof has to be raised above the current ridge height is unknown.

The visual mass of the extended roof is out of scale with the surrounding properties and this will be exacerbated by the array of photovoltaic panels, not that the Society objects to solar panels per se. It is considered that this extent of modification to the bungalow as being overdevelopment of the confined site.