

20 Mansionshouse Road 14/02371/FUL

I write on behalf of the Grange association which is the amenity association for the Grange Conservation Area.

We wish to object to this application because of the large area of hard standing that would be created and the loss of more of the original boundary wall. We believe the application is not compatible with the Householders' Guidance, the Grange Conservation Area Character Appraisal, or with policies Env6(a) and Env6(b).

The application would appear to be contrary to the non-statutory Householders' Guidance which applies to houses whether or not they are in a conservation area. It states "Maximum site coverage of all buildings, garages, parking and access driveways should not exceed 40% of the site area". It looks as if this figure would be at least 50% if this application were granted. This would not be acceptable, particularly in a conservation area.

The Grange Conservation Area Character Appraisal describes the spacious garden settings, stone boundary walls and green open spaces as characteristics of the area. Policy Env6(a) states that a development in a conservation will be permitted if it "preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the conservation area and is consistent with the relevant conservation area character appraisal". This application would contravene this policy.

The application also includes enlarging the break in the garden wall to give an entrance of 3.42 meters. The boundary walls are a characteristic of the area so that removing part of the wall works against policy Env6(b) which states that a development will be permitted which "preserves trees, hedges, boundary walls, railings, paving and other features which contribute positively to the character of the area". Because the boundary walls are also highlighted in the Grange CACA, loss of part of the wall would also conflict with policy Env6(a).

The Householders' Guidance suggests that new breaks in a boundary wall to make an entrance should be no more than 3 meters wide. This, of course, is not even in a conservation area. It suggests that this proposed 3.42 meter opening within our conservation area would be excessive.

We request that application 14/02371/FUL be refused.