# Edinburgh council overturns planning refusal for Blenheim Place home amid heritage concerns



Last month, Edinburgh's planning appeals committee made a contentious decision, overturning an earlier refusal by planning officers regarding the construction of a contemporary five-bedroom home at 12 Blenheim Place, adjacent to Greenside Church. The plot, characterised by developers as "disused" and lacking any significant landscaping features, has come under scrutiny from local community stakeholders who dispute this characterization. They emphasise that the area was historically a wooded space, home to mature trees and a dense undergrowth, which was largely removed following the 2017 felling of several key trees.

Local councillor Tim Jones, chairing the Local Review Body (LRB) meeting on April 2, praised the design of the proposed building as "very discreet" and "very well thought out". He expressed that concerns over the potential obstruction of views of Calton Hill were being overstated. In a deadlock decision falling to a 2-2 split among councillors, Jones exercised his casting vote to grant approval.

However, this decision has drawn significant ire from the New Town and Broughton Community Council (NTBCC), which contends that the process was marred by "serious procedural failures" and apparent bias. They argue that the LRB's discussion failed to adequately consider the implications for both the New Town Conservation Area and the prestigious World Heritage Site status, which the area holds due to its historical significance. The council's handling of public input was also called into question, with NTBCC claiming that objections from four local organisations and 28 residents were disregarded during the decision-making process.

The NTBCC's chairman, Peter Williamson, made clear his discontent, stating that the conduct during the appeal meeting was shocking, particularly highlighted in their review of the council's webcast. There were assertions of a lack of preparedness and understanding from the convener during the meeting, which is expected in quasi-judicial settings of such significance. His remarks emphasised that decisions affecting local communities require meticulous and transparent processes.

Interestingly, this situation does not occur in isolation. Edinburgh has recently faced heightened scrutiny regarding development projects in culturally significant areas. For instance, in October 2020, Scottish ministers upheld previous refusals to transform the former Royal High School on Calton Hill into a luxury hotel, citing concerns about the visual integrity of the World Heritage Site. This decision was the culmination of multiple refusals dating back to 2015, during which conservationists raised alarms over potential damage to Edinburgh's architectural character and skyline.

Such projects highlight the ever-present tension between urban development and conservation in Edinburgh, echoing sentiments expressed by Williamson regarding the recent approval for the Blenheim Place plot. He expressed scepticism about whether due processes were correctly followed, pointing out that the unique historical context of the site should preclude such development in principle.

The plot at Blenheim Place is now listed for sale at £800,000, marketed as a "one-off opportunity" to construct a building in the New Town area. The head of planning, David Givan, responding to concerns raised, maintained that the councillors' decision is final and that any challenge to the ruling would need to come through legal channels. This reiteration of legal finality offers little comfort to community advocates, who are now considering their next steps, aware that the integrity of their local landscape hangs in the balance.

Moving forward, the NTBCC is advocating for a reconsideration of the appeal, urging that procedural safeguards be implemented to prevent similar issues in future planning decisions. The implications of this decision, both for the community and the historical fabric of Edinburgh, will undoubtedly ripple through future discussions about urban development and conservation in the city.
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