

Development Management Sub Committee

Wednesday 25 June 2014

Application for Planning Permission 14/00070/FUL At 50 Newbattle Terrace, Edinburgh, Demolition of existing 18 unit apartment block and erection of 11 new apartment block.

Item number	4.14
Report number	
Wards	A10 - Meadows/Morningside

Summary

The proposed erection of a new flat roofed, four-storey, 11 unit flatted building and associated works complies with the development plan and represents a minor and acceptable variation from the non-statutory guidelines. The character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area will be suitably maintained and matters of road safety and neighbouring amenity will not be detrimentally affected.

Links

Policies and guidance for this application	LPC, CITD1, CITD3, CITD6, CITH1, CITH3, CITH4, CITH6, CITT4, CITT5, CITT6, NSG, NSGD02, NSP,
--	--

Report

Recommendations

1.1 It is recommended that this application be Granted subject to the details below.

Background

2.1 Site description

The application site comprises a 1970s, three-storey, flatted block comprising 18 dwelling units and set centrally within its feu. The site measures 30.2 metres along its road frontage with a depth of 41.4 metres; an overall area of 1,273 square metres. It is located on the southern side of Newbattle Terrace, midway between its junction with Falcon Gardens to the east and its western junction with Morningside Road, within a predominantly residential area.

The site slopes downhill from Newbattle Terrace to its southern boundary. The garden ground is predominantly laid out to lawn with some planting to the boundaries and individual trees to the south eastern and south western corners and a single conifer to the front of the building. The rear and side boundaries are formed of stone walls. To the front is a rendered wall with metal railing above.

The existing property is presently empty but was last used as residential flats, owned by Viewpoint Housing Association. The building is faced in a white coloured cement render, over a brick built plinth, to the first two-storeys; the upper floor comprises windows set within a mansard, tile faced roof, with a flat central section. The building is 'L' shaped with an additional leg to the rear. All elevations contain principal windows with modern fixed and side casement, double glazed windows.

There is an existing vehicular access located to the eastern end of the road frontage. The drive slopes downhill to a relatively flat rear section in line with the side elevation of the building. There is a separate pedestrian access, via a stair, leading down to the main entrance located to the western end of the road frontage.

To the east of the site, there is a two-storey dwelling and a single-storey dwelling, beyond that a stone built two-storey terrace terminating at the Falcon Gardens junction. To the west, there is a modern, double fronted, four-storey flatted block with a traditional, stone built, two-storey terrace beyond that. At the end of the terrace is cinema building. To the south there is a stone-built, four-storey tenement block set below the site level. The layout and character of the area to the south side of Newbattle Terrace and beyond is one of terraces.

To the north side of Newbattle Terrace, the properties are large, stone-built villas set within large feus. These properties form the southern boundary of the Merchiston and Greenhill Conservation Area. To the east of Falcon Gardens is the western boundary of the Grange Conservation Area. The site itself is not in a conservation area.

2.2 Site History

There is no relevant planning history on file for this site.

Main report

3.1 Description Of The Proposal

The application is for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of new flat roofed, four-storey, 11 unit flatted building. Using the existing vehicular access, it is proposed to provide an under-croft car parking area for 13 vehicles, including one space for disabled access, and a secure cycle storage area for 22 cycles. Above this there are four floors of residential accommodation with three, dual-aspect flats on each of the first three levels and two, dual aspect flats on the top floor.

The flats comprise six 2-bed and five 3-bed properties and range in size from a 2-bed flat at 108.5 square metres floor space to a 3-bed flat at 153 square metres.

The footprint of the proposed building measures 530 square metres, equivalent to 42% of the overall site area. This compares with the existing building at 325 square metres, equivalent to 26% of the overall site area. The proposal would result in a limited area of external hard standing, given the use of the under-croft area. The rear garden area will be 511 square metres, equivalent to 40% of the overall site area.

The building has maximum overall dimensions of 27.5 metres in width and 23.6 metres in depth. It measures 12.8 metres in height at the front elevation and 13.5 metres at the rear.

The front elevation of the building is to be predominantly faced in natural buff coloured sandstone, over an under-build comprised of random stone filled gabion baskets. The flat roof is to be formed of a grey coloured, single ply membrane. To the sides and rear this will be a smooth cement render. There is stained timber cladding details to the front windows with dark grey coloured metal cladding at the top floor level. The window are to be dark grey, aluminium framed double glazed units.

Additional supporting information has been provided by the applicant in the form of 'Sun-path Analysis Diagrams' detailing both the existing and proposed sun paths and the associated impact on the neighbouring properties.

3.2 Determining Issues

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, the Committee needs to consider whether:

- (a) the principle of the proposal is acceptable in this location;
- (b) the proposals preserve the setting of a listed building and conservation area;
- (c) the proposed scale, form, design and materials are acceptable;
- (d) the proposals affect road safety;
- (e) the proposals would result in any drainage issues;
- (f) the proposals will result in an unreasonable loss of neighbouring amenity;
- (g) the proposals provided sufficient amenity for the future occupiers of the development;
- (h) the proposals have any equalities or human rights impacts;
- (i) the proposals comply with sustainability criteria; and
- (j) comments raised have been addressed.

a) The Acceptability of the Proposal in this Location

The application site lies within the defined urban area of the city where policy Hou 1 permits residential development on other suitable sites provided the proposals are compatible with other policies in the development plan.

The application falls below the minimum threshold set for any requirement for affordable housing or contributions towards the alleviation of any accommodation pressures on any nearby schools.

Policy Hou 6 seeks to resist the loss of housing without suitable justification. In this instance whilst the proposal would represent a loss of the existing housing on the site this would be replaced by new housing.

Overall, in principle the proposal is acceptable subject to compliance with other provisions of the development plan.

b) Setting of a Listed Building and Conservation Area

There are two listed buildings, at No 5 and 7 Newbattle Terrace, immediately opposite the application site. They are detached villas set back within their respective feus, behind substantial stone boundary walls and supplemented by mature trees and garden planting. Accordingly, the public road represents a substantial break in the character, density and townscape between the northern and southern sides of Newbattle Terrace. Consequently, the setting of those listed buildings would be suitably separated from the proposal and as such there would be no detrimental impact on their setting as a result of the proposals.

The proposal is appropriate in terms of its general form and appearance with the urban form to the southern side of Newbattle Terrace and would not impact on the

conservation area which includes the properties on the northern side. This assessment is detailed in section 3.3(c) below.

c) Scale, Form and Design (Materials)

The proposal takes its location, height and form from the existing street layout on the south side of the road and the existing modern townhouse development at Nos 40 and 42 Newbattle Terrace (Ref 01/04659/FUL) dated 6 March 2002.

Policy Hou 4 seeks to ensure an appropriate level of density on any application site.

The proposed density of residential units within the site would be lower than at present but in a form that is in keeping with the tenemental and terraced block character of its immediate surroundings. In this regard the two detached dwellings to the east of the site represent an anomaly to the otherwise terraced character of this part of Newbattle Terrace.

Overall the proposed density for the site would be appropriate in this instance.

The density, scale and character of the residential properties on the northern side of Newbattle Terrace are significantly different. They stand within the Merchiston and Greenhill Conservation Area and Newbattle Terrace forms the boundary and represents a distinct break in the respective character and appearance of the development on either side.

The height, form and mass of the proposals seek to replicate the prevailing form in the wider streetscape. The building would be slightly lower than the adjacent townhouse development to the west and, as identified in the 'street elevation' plan is proportionate to the overall appearance of the streetscape.

In terms of the design, the building continues the strong terraced form on this side of the street. It represents an acceptable, contemporary form which together with a 'solid to void' relationship and use of stone to the front elevation allows the development to relate well to the remainder of the terraces on either side. The contrasting dark grey coloured metal cladding to the upper floor helps to reduce the overall appearance whilst ensuring a suitable termination to the building. The architectural appearance and horizontal form are appropriate to the site and its immediate surroundings.

The proposal fills the width of the site. There is a small element of separation with the neighbouring sites but otherwise this is appropriate to the prevailing terraced form. The under-croft area accommodates the necessary level of parking provision in a suitably unobtrusive manner.

The terraced form represents a significant townscape benefit for the site compared to the existing building.

The tree, to the front of the site, makes a contribution to the wider overall appearance and amenity of the area. However, as a single tree, its loss would not detract from the existing level of tree cover and therefore the wider amenity of this part of the road.

Other trees to the rear of the site will be retained and the use of the existing vehicular access will retain the existing trees located within the carriageway.

Accordingly, the proposed scale, form, design and materials are acceptable in this instance.

d) Road Safety Issues

The proposal identifies a sufficient number of off-street car and cycle parking spaces within the proposed under-croft area to comply with the provisions of both the relevant policies and guidance.

At present, there are 18 residential dwellings on the site and space only for three, off-street car parking spaces with no on-site turning facilities.

The applicant has provided additional information regarding the layout of the vehicular access, facilities to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear and the proposed cycle parking facilities on the site. These meet with the necessary requirements for a scheme of this scale.

Transport has raised no objections to the proposal on road safety grounds.

e) Drainage

Concerns have been identified regarding drainage issues and likely run-off into gardens of Falcon Avenue. However, the site is presently used for flatted residential use and, subject to adequate drainage connection and surface water run-off, would be matters between the developer and Scottish Water as the infrastructure provider and controlled at the Building Warrant stage of any development.

f) Neighbouring Amenity

In terms of overshadowing, the building is west of the neighbouring dwelling house and extends to a maximum depth of 11 metres beyond the rear elevation of that property. Consequently there would be some impact on the rear garden space.

Whilst the rear garden of the neighbouring dwelling house faces south, with the benefit of direct sunlight for a good proportion of daylight hours, the proposal will result in some impact in the afternoon.

The applicant has submitted supporting information in the form of a sun-path assessment showing the impact of the existing and the proposed built forms on the site. This identifies an element of impact in the late afternoon but it is within acceptable parameters. Accordingly, the proposal would not result in a detrimental overshadowing impact on the neighbouring properties.

Otherwise, the development is located to the north of the Falcon Avenue tenement. Therefore, all overshadowing in that direction would be wholly retained within the application site. To the west, the proposal would stand in a gable-to-gable position with the neighbouring flatted development. Accordingly, any resultant overshadowing would fall within an area that would not be protected by the guidance and would not result in any detrimental impact on the occupiers of that property.

As a residential development in an urban area of predominantly residential properties the proposed use of the proposal represents an appropriate and acceptable form of development. As such it would have no detrimental impact on the existing levels of residential amenity presently enjoyed by the occupants of those neighbouring residential properties.

With regard to the potential sky light impact of the proposal, the 25 degree rule, taken from ground floor windows of the tenement properties at Falcon Avenue, would not be obstructed by the overall height and position of the proposal within the application site. As such there would be no additional, detrimental impact on the existing levels of daylight presently available to those properties.

The proposal presents a blank elevation to both side elevations and the proposed windows in the rear elevation are located a minimum of 11.2 metres from the rear boundary wall and 25.8 metres from the rear elevation of the neighbouring tenement building at Falcon Avenue.

As such there would be no detrimental levels of overlooking resulting from the proposed development to any of the neighbouring properties.

Revised plans have been submitted identifying acceptable details of both the existing and proposed site levels within the application site. Accordingly, there would be no detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupants of the neighbouring properties.

g) Amenity of Future Occupants

The level of useable open space provided on the site is in excess of 40% of the overall site area. There is 511 square metres of rear space identified together with other space to the sides and front of the building.

The sizes of the proposed units exceed the minimums identified in the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

The area of open space, its form and layout and depth to the rear boundary would provide an adequate provision that would meet the needs of the future residents of the proposed development.

h) Equalities and Human Rights Impacts

This application has no impact in terms of equalities or human rights.

i) Sustainability Criteria

The application includes a sustainability statement form concerning the proposed building approach as a mean of ensuring the necessary carbon reduction requirement.

j) Public Comments

Material Representations in Objection

- private or social housing development - assessed in section 3.3(a) and found that there is no requirement for affordable housing provision on the site.
- height comparison - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that the proposal represents a suitable and appropriate height within the streetscape.
- density/cramming affect - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that the proposal represents a lesser density on the site than the present building.
- out of character with the opposite side of Newbattle Terrace - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that there is a distinct break between the north and south side of Newbattle Terrace and that both are significantly different.
- larger than the existing building - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that although larger the proposal is proportionate to the prevailing street character.
- appearance of the proposal - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that the proposal is acceptable and appropriate to the application site.
- outwith a conservation area so ignored by the Planning Authority - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that the design and form of the proposal is appropriate to the prevailing street character.
- not in keeping with the special character and historic environment - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that the proposal is detached from and does not have a detrimental impact on either the character or appearance of the neighbouring historic environment.
- unnecessary loss of a fine tree - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that its loss would not detract from the wider amenity of the surroundings.
- relationship of height with adjoining properties - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that the neighbouring dwellings are out of character with the wider appearance of the south side of the street.
- no site levels on the plans - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that a condition is required to ensure suitable land levels within the site are agreed prior to development on the site.

- the proposal would add to the present parking pressures in the area - assessed in section 3.3(d) and found that the proposal complies with the parking standards.
- drainage issues - assessed in section 3.3(e) and found that there is no known flood risk and surface run-off would be a matter for Building Standards.
- proximity and terrain will intrude on privacy - assessed in section 3.3(f) and found that all of the proposed windows comply with the minimum separation standards.
- noise from the rear balcony area - assessed in section 3.3(f) and found that as a residential development there would be no detrimental impact on the existing levels of neighbouring amenity.
- full height glazing results in a lack of privacy - assessed in section 3.3(f) and found that all of the proposed windows comply with the minimum separation standards.
- too close to the Falcon Avenue properties - assessed in section 3.3(f) and found that the proposals would have no detrimental overshadowing impact on the occupants of those properties.
- increased overshadowing and loss of views - assessed in section 3.3(f) and found that the only impact would fall on a property within the applicants' control otherwise there would be no detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.
- it would block out sky views from neighbours - assessed in section 3.3(f) and found that there would be no detrimental impact on sky views from any neighbouring properties.
- insufficient level of green-space - assessed in section 3.3(g) and found that there would be adequate levels of external amenity provision within the application site.

Non-material Representations

- this is a missed opportunity for a sympathetic development of the site;
- this cramming will reduce airflow worsening air quality;
- plans available on the Council website are deceiving and do not provide sufficient detail; and
- impact on boundary walls and responsibility for same.

Community Council Comments

Morningside Community Council was consulted on 13 January 2014 and objected to the proposal. Those comments are reproduced in full in Appendix 1.

- adversely affect the setting of neighbouring listed buildings - assessed in section 3.3(b) and found that the proposal is detached from and does not have a detrimental impact on the setting of either of the two nearby listed buildings.
- lack of the necessary details - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that a condition is required to ensure suitable land levels within the site are agreed prior to development on the site. Otherwise there are adequate details provided to enable a full assessment of the proposed development.
- position forward of the building line - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that
- the position of the development within the site is in keeping with the prevailing terraced appearance and character of the south side of Newbattle Terrace.
- scale and height of the building - assessed in section 3.3(c) and found that the scale and height of the proposed development is in character with the wider appearance of the south side of the street.
- contrary to policies on housing - assessed in section 3.3(c) - and found that the proposal accord with the relevant housing policies regarding location, density and impact.
- amenity of neighbours - assessed in section 3.3(f) and found that the only impact would fall on a property within the applicants' control otherwise there would be no detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the proposals comply with the development plan and represent a minor and acceptable variation from the relevant non-statutory guidance, maintain the character and appearance of the building and its immediate surroundings and would not prejudice road safety or residential amenity. There are no material considerations which outweigh this conclusion.

It is recommended that this application be Granted subject to the details below

3.4 Conditions/reasons/informatives

1. Prior to the commencement of work on the site a detailed specification, including samples, of the proposed external stone material shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Head of Planning and Building Standards. Thereafter only the approved materials shall be used in the construction of the development hereby approved.

Reasons:-

1. In order to enable the Head of Planning and Building Standards to consider these matters in detail.

Informatives

It should be noted that:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.
2. No development shall take place on the site until a 'Notice of Initiation of Development' has been submitted to the Council stating the intended date on which the development is to commence. Failure to do so constitutes a breach of planning control, under Section 123(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.
3. As soon as practicable upon the completion of the development of the site, as authorised in the associated grant of permission, a 'Notice of Completion of Development' must be given, in writing to the Council.

Financial impact

4.1 The financial impact has been assessed as follows:

There are no financial implications to the Council.

Risk, Policy, compliance and governance impact

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

Equalities impact

6.1 The equalities impact has been assessed as follows:

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

Sustainability impact

7.1 The sustainability impact has been assessed as follows:

This application meets the sustainability requirements of the Edinburgh Design Guidance.

Consultation and engagement

8.1 Pre-Application Process

Pre-application discussions took place on this application.

8.2 Publicity summary of representations and Community Council comments

The application was neighbour notified on 13 January 2014 and attracted 13 letters of representation, all of which are objections to the proposal. These included comments from Morningside Community Council.

Material Representations in Objection

- unclear if this is a private or social housing development;
- height compared with Nos 52 and 54 Newbattle Terrace;
- density/cramming affecting the scenic quality of the area;
- out of character as the density on the opposite side of Newbattle Terrace is much lower;
- proposal is much larger than the existing building;
- the proposal looks like an ugly office block;
- being outwith a conservation area we feel we can be ignored by the Planning Authority;
- unnecessary loss of a fine tree;
- plans do not show a relationship of height with adjoining properties;
- not in keeping with the special character and historic environment of Morningside and the Grange;
- no site levels on the plans;
- impact of excavations on the integrity of neighbouring boundaries and buildings;
- the proposal will add to the present parking pressures in the area;
- drainage issues and likely run-off into gardens of Falcon Avenue properties;
- proximity to, plus fall in terrain, equals an intrusion to privacy;
- noise from the use of the rear balcony area;

- full height glazing increases the sense of a lack of privacy;
- it is too close to the boundary with the Falcon Avenue properties;
- increased overshadowing and loss of views;
- the building would block out any views of the sky from neighbours; and
- level of green-space around the building is insufficient.

Non-material Representations

- this is a missed opportunity for a sympathetic development of the site;
- this cramming will reduce airflow worsening air quality;
- plans available on the Council website are deceiving and do not provide sufficient detail; and
- impact on boundary walls and responsibility for such.

Community Council Comments

Morningside Community Council were consulted on 13 January 2014 and objected to the proposal. Those comments are reproduced in full in Appendix 1.

- lack of the necessary details;
- position forward of the building line;
- scale and height of the building;
- adversely affect the setting of neighbouring listed buildings;
- contrary to policies on housing; and
- amenity of 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

Edinburgh City Local Plan - Urban Area.

Date registered

8 January 2014

Drawing numbers/Scheme

01, 02 + 06-16,

Scheme 2

David R Leslie.

Acting Head of Planning and Building Standards

Contact: John Maciver, Planning Officer

E-mail: john.maciver@edinburgh.gov.uk Tel: 0131 529 3918

Links - Policies

Relevant Policies:

Relevant policies of the Edinburgh City Local Plan.

Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context) sets general criteria for assessing design quality and requires an overall design concept to be demonstrated.

Policy Des 3 (Development Design) sets criteria for assessing development design.

Policy Des 6 (Sustainable Design & Construction) sets criteria for assessing the sustainable design and construction elements of development.

Policy Hou 1 (Housing Development) supports housing on appropriate sites in the urban area, and on specific sites identified in the Plan.

Policy Hou 3 (Private Open Space) sets out the requirements for the provision of private open space in housing development.

Policy Hou 4 (Density) sets out the factors to be taken into account in assessing density levels in new development.

Policy Hou 6 (Loss of Housing) identifies the circumstances in which the change of use of an existing dwelling to another use will be permitted.

Policy Tra 4 (Private Car Parking) requires private car parking provision to comply with the parking levels set out in supplementary planning guidance, and sets criteria for assessing lower provision.

Policy Tra 5 (Private Cycle Parking) requires cycle parking provision in accordance with levels set out in supplementary guidance.

Policy Tra 6 (Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking) sets criteria for assessing design of off-street car and cycle parking.

Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines

Non-Statutory guidelines Edinburgh Design Guidance supports development of the highest design quality and that integrates well with the existing city. It sets out the Council's expectations for the design of new development, including buildings and landscape, in Edinburgh.

Non-statutory guidelines on 'PARKING STANDARDS' set the requirements for parking provision in developments.

Appendix 1

Consultations

Environmental Assessment

The application proposes to demolish existing residential flats and replace them with new flatted properties. Residential properties surround the site to the south, west and east. Newbattle Terrace bounds the site to the north.

Environmental Assessment has no objections to this proposed development.

Transport

I have no objections to the proposed planning application subject to the following being included as conditions or informatives as considered appropriate:

- 1. The proposed vehicular access to be by means of a dropped kerb and not bellmouth opening.*
- 2. The applicant should provide a swept-path diagram to demonstrate that a vehicle can enter and exit the parking area in forward gear, in the interests of road safety.*
- 3. Cycle stand products should meet the criteria of ease of use and provides secure locking points for wheels/frame would be acceptable but would have to be approved.*
- 4. The following types of cycle racks are not acceptable:*
 - The Thames Bridge style cycle racks are not acceptable because they are not very user friendly as they require cyclists to physically lift bikes off the ground whilst being carried vertically.*
 - The Neath style cycle racks are not acceptable because it does not provide a locking point for the frame of the bike, only the wheels. The weight of the bike is held by the wheels with little support which could lead to damage to the bikes.*

Morningside Community Council

*50 Newbattle Terrace Edinburgh
Planning Application 14/00070/FUL*

Further to your email of 29 January confirming Morningside Community Council as statutory consultees, I can now confirm that members of the Community Council have now had the opportunity to consider the proposals for the above development.

The Community Council members oppose this development on the following grounds:

According to the Edinburgh City Council Planning Guidance - Building Heights and Roofscape document, Dec 2010, the submitted documents should include "site levels, heights and elevations of neighbouring buildings and photomontages". This information is has not been submitted and is necessary to make a full assessment of the potentially adverse impact of the development.

The position of the proposed development appears to be forward of the building line as set by the existing adjacent developments.

The height of the proposed building does not comply with Policy Des 10 as the roof-top lift housing is above the height of all the surrounding buildings.

The development is not considered to comply with Policy Des 3 since the scale and height of the building does not respect the small scale of adjoining buildings at 52 and 54 Newbattle Terrace. Consequently, the amenity of these neighbours, and those overlooked at 47-69 Falcon Avenue will be materially harmed.

This question of height is discussed extensively in the Building Heights and Roofscape, Dec 2010 Guidance, referred to above. The document promises that "Prevailing ridge heights and cornice levels will be used to guide the building envelope and frontage height of new proposals. Existing high and intrusive buildings (e.g. at 36 to 42 Newbattle Terrace) will not be accepted as precedents for the future". These statements do not appear to be reflected in the current proposals.

The development is designed at least one storey height higher than the majority of buildings in Newbattle Terrace and this creates a very dominant southern elevation due to the slope of the ground to the south. This is damaging to the character and appearance of the area around it, contrary to your adopted design principles for new development.

The development has extensive balcony or "terrace" provision to each flat, all of which will overlook the rear gardens of the tenement properties at 47-69 Falcon Avenue. Thus the proposals do not follow "Edinburgh Planning Guidance - Daylighting, Sunlight and Privacy - Approved 25 February 2010", since the "privacy requirements and amenity" of these Falcon Avenue neighbours will be adversely affected.

The development appears inconsistent with Policy Hou 4 since the scale and dimensions of the proposed building are considered to amount to "town cramming" and are clearly seen to fail to "retain the characteristic pattern of development".

The development does not comply with Policy Hou 6 since there is no case made that the existing 18 flats cannot "be readily improved" and that the resulting reduced number of flats (from 18 down to 11) "will benefit the local community without loss of amenity for neighbouring residents".

The development appears to be designed in complete opposition to the Policies Des 3, 4, 5 and 11 as set out in the Proposed Plan March 2013.

The development will adversely affect the setting of the listed buildings at 5 and 7 Newbattle Terrace.

Conclusion: Morningside Community Council considers it their duty to protect this site from over development and believe that the scale and design of the proposed building should not be permitted in this small site. Refusal of this planning application is thus requested.

Location Plan



© Crown Copyright and database right 2014. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey License number 100023420
END