

Objection to Planning Application 19/00116/CON | Partial demolition of existing buildings. | 179A Canongate Edinburgh, Tommy Sheppard MP

I object to the proposed partial demolition of the attractive brick-built late Victorian industrial building at 179A Canongate – the last remaining part of the former city gas works complex. The building as it currently stands, while not listed, makes a clearly positive contribution to the Old Town Conservation Area and the wider Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site.

As one of a number of remaining historic former industrial buildings in the area between the Canongate and Calton Road, it typifies and adds to the very specific character of this particular part of the Old Town. The proposed partial demolition of this building threatens to diminish that distinctive character.

In my view, then, the proposed development is in breach of **Policy Env 1 (World Heritage Sites)** because partial demolition of this attractive historic building would not ‘respect and protect the outstanding universal values of the World Heritage Site’, particularly as this would impact on the setting of a number of key grade A listed buildings in immediate proximity to the site – namely the Canongate Tolbooth and the Canongate Kirk, both of which are of outstanding architectural and heritage value. For the same reason, the proposal is also in breach of **Policy Env 3 (Listed Buildings – Setting)**. The partial demolition and the proposed redevelopment would very clearly impact on the setting of adjacent listed buildings, a number of which are recognised as having national/international value.

Similarly, demolition of the historic building would be contrary to Local Development Plan **Policy Env 5 (Conservation Areas - Demolition of Buildings)** and the non-statutory guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas as the building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the design of the proposed replacement building does not outweigh the loss of the existing building. Additionally, the proposal is contrary to the **Historic Environment Policy Statement 2016** because the building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Furthermore, the design of the proposed replacement building, which is in my view poor and not in keeping with its historic location, clearly does not outweigh the loss of the existing building.