

Gina Bellhouse
City of Edinburgh Council
Planning Department Local Review Body
Waverley Court
Business Unit G2
4 East Market Street
Edinburgh
EH8 8BG

26/06/23

Dear Ms Bellhouse

**PROPOSED EXTENSION, 4/2 SAUGHTONHALL AVENUE WEST, EDINBURGH EH12 5TJ
PLANNING APPEAL REF NO 23/00651/FUL**

We are writing in response to your letter dated 21.06.23 and would make the following comments:

- We understand from the applicant, Mr Sandy Hyslop, that the individual who responded to the Planning appeal, Sarah Unwin, while being the owner of the property, has not lived in it since at least the start of 2022. We understand that she is resident overseas. She will not be personally affected by the proposed development
- As per the examples provided in our Planning Appeal document dated 30.05.23, there are many examples nearby where original '4 in a block' properties have been extended in a similar fashion, particularly Nos 15 & 19 Glendevon Park
- The proposed extension has been deliberately designed to have a lower ridge height and setbacks in plan so that it is subservient to the original property, in accordance with the Guidance for Householders document
- There is an adequate path which maintains access for the neighbours to the communal back garden
- A route for a chimney flue for the ground floor property can be maintained as part of the proposed extension. This would be addressed as part of the Building Warrant application and is not, strictly speaking, a Planning issue
- It is assumed the applicant will have sole responsibility for maintaining the roof over the extension. The maintenance of the communal roof of the 4 in a block property is a legal issue to be agreed between the owners. It is not a Planning issue
- The location of the proposed boiler flue is a Building Standards issue, it is not covered by Planning legislation or guidance
- The proposed area designated as a workshop on the Planning drawings will be used by Mr Hyslop as storage for household items. It will not create any form of disturbance for the neighbours

- Whatever the use of the workshop space, it will need to fully comply with all relevant Building Regulations including noise and fire safety. The comment from the neighbour that the workshop presents a fire risk is unfounded as the extension will meet all the Regulations regarding fire spread on the boundary and surface spread of flame etc.
- The proposed pend is adequately high and wide to allow domestic gardening items to be carried into the back garden
- The Report of Handling for the original Planning application Ref No 23/00651/FUL noted that the proposals will not result in any unreasonable loss to the amenity of the neighbouring properties in accordance with NPF 4 Policy 16g)ii) and LDP Policy Des 12b) & c). The assessment considered the proposals in terms of daylight, sunlight & overshadowing and privacy & overlooking and confirmed that all of them are acceptable and the neighbours' rights are not infringed by the proposed extension

Please do not hesitate to contact us to discuss further details of the appeal.

Yours sincerely

Simon Brims RIAS RIBA
Director

GRAPHITE STUDIO
CHARTERED ARCHITECTS



External email >

First time sender >

Planning review 23/00651/FUL

08.06.2023

I would like to comment on the planning review submitted by the tenant of 4/2 Saughtonhall Ave West. I am surprised that the application is submitted by the tenant rather than the owner of the flat but would oppose the proposal whomever it was submitted by.

I live in 2 Saughtonhall Ave West, the flat which is beneath 4/2 but would be completely subsumed by my neighbour should approval be granted.

The whole area has a pleasingly symmetrical design scheme of small blocks of four flats the same as ours, some of which are a little wider than our block. However these slightly wider properties are all of regular construction, with the ground floor and first floor flats having the same dimensions. There is total symmetry in all the blocks which look as ours do. The width from the middle stairwell is the same on either side, the ground floor flats only occupy the ground floor and the first floor flats only occupy the first floor. There is no symmetry in the proposal. The roof height does not even appear to be the same and there is a need for access to the rear which will again ruin the symmetry of the building and be totally out of keeping with all the other similar buildings throughout the area. The proposal will look how it feels to me; it will look like one of those old fashioned 'spite houses'.

I also worry about the precedent approving such a proposal would set. In future, why would anybody buy a ground floor flat when it could become engulfed within the upstairs property?

The plans show that the chimney to my property is being removed, can this be done without my consent because I do not consent to this. The other ground floor neighbour has had a wood burner installed and was recommending that I do the same. I would like to do this but will be unable to if my chimney has been removed without my consent.

I am also unclear where I stand in terms of the new roof space according to the terms of the deeds as I do not see why I should have any shared responsibility for a roof that in no way covers my property.

The plans also detail a move of the existing boiler flue, it looks like this is being moved to exit right next to my kitchen window. I do not want my neighbour's boiler flue emitting

carbon monoxide into my kitchen. Under your guidelines I am able to comment about cooking odours but what about carbon monoxide fumes affecting my cooking and my health?

I am also concerned about having a workshop added to a residential block in a purely residential area. This workshop will be effectively attached to my flat via an echo chamber created by the covered access walkthrough. This will create awful noise pollution, in the surrounding area but particularly for my flat. What activities will be undertaken in this workshop in the middle of a residential area, will it be a fire hazard? Covering the access path as detailed in the plans will create a chimney effect, spreading fire at speed from the workshop to my flat. Having a workshop in a residential area will not only cause noise pollution it will also be out of keeping in this entirely residential area, there is a workshop area near Murrayfield stadium, workshops are not required here.

I strongly oppose the access path to the rear drying green and communal garden being restricted in this way, no other flats of our type have restricted access to the rear. It will be extremely cumbersome for anybody from the ground floor flat to get any of their gardening equipment from the shed in the back to the garden in the front. Plus this will look totally out of keeping with the symmetry of all the other flats in the locality.

Additionally the reduced sunlight to the drying green and communal gardens will impact all the residents of the block. The sun rises to the left of the proposed two storey extension and sets the other side of the block. The sunlight to the communal gardens in the rear will be reduced significantly, I am not sure we will even get any sunlight over our half of the rear garden and drying clothes will take forever. There will be reduced sunlight to my garden during the mornings too if this two storey extension is permitted. This two storey building will overshadow the communal gardens as well as my own garden.

I believe my flat would be unsaleable should it become engulfed by its upstairs neighbour but understand that you do not take this into account in your processes, although it is obviously a factor for myself and my future.

I trust you will consider my points carefully

Can you please confirm receipt of my response as this planning application is causing me considerable stress and I want to be assured that my points will be put to the panel, thank you.

Sarah Unwin