

48A Lauder Road EH9 1UE

Planning Application 19/00459/FUL

LBC Application 19/00460/LBC

OBJECTION from Grange Association

22 February 2019

The Grange Association has reviewed applications 19/00459/FUL and 19/00460/LBC and lodges this objection, taking into account the setting within the Grange Conservation Area of 48 and 48A Lauder Road and their C-listed status. The proposals are (a) to build a single-storey extension to the rear with the loss of an original window and a significant part of the rear ground floor wall; and (b) to create a 6.5m x 4m tarmac hardstanding in the front garden.

Proposed hardstanding

Lauder Road is characterised by substantial detached and semi-detached villas, most of which retain well-kept green front gardens that add significantly to the amenity of the Grange Conservation Area. The [streetview](#) from 2008 shows the pleasing streetscape to which No 48A contributes.



48 and 48A Lauder Road - Streetview June 2008

This streetscape is wholly consistent with the Grange Conservation Area Character Appraisal. For example: *“Generous private gardens and mature trees create green character”* (page 17). Lauder Road is within Controlled Parking Zone S1 and has residents’ parking bays and shared use bays. These are very thinly used and there is rarely any shortage of parking spaces on the street for vehicles that can fit within these parking bays.

We object to the proposed loss of soft landscaping and the consequent loss of visual amenity that the front garden currently contributes to the Conservation Area. The proposal for a tarmac surface is contrary to the non-statutory Householder Guidance (page 19): *“Materials must be of high quality and appropriate for the house and the area. The paving must be porous or combined with a soakaway with the site”*. Moreover, the proposed dimensions for the parking area are excessive at 6.5m x 4m, sufficient for a large camper van. Any vehicle parked on this new hard standing would be parked

against the bay window of the house, disfiguring the frontage. The Householder Guidance specifies that the access should not be wider than 3 metres.

The **Local Development Plan** includes policies:

DES 12: *Planning permission will be granted for alterations and extensions to existing buildings which.....*

c) will not be detrimental to neighbourhood amenity and character.

ENV 6: *Development within a conservation area or affecting its setting will be permitted which.....:*

a) Preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the conservation area and is consistent with the relevant conservation area character appraisal.

The proposal for this hard standing:

- is detrimental to neighbourhood amenity and character; and
- would not preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of the conservation area as it is not consistent with the Grange Conservation Area Character Appraisal
 - *“Generous private gardens and mature trees create green character”* (page 17)
 - *“The green character of front and side gardens should remain dominant where additional on-site parking is proposed.”* (page 32)

We therefore request that this element of the application be refused.

Rear extension – land ownership and concurrent proposals on same plot

The drawings submitted with the application take no account of the earlier applications concerning the first floor flat (No. 48):

- 18/10374/FUL
- 19/00068/LBC

These applications are still pending consideration but, if approved, would create a separate single storey extension in the northern part of the rear garden. The current applications from No. 48A (ground floor flat: 19/00459/FUL and 19/00460/LBC) would provide for a second extension to the rear, on what is shown in the earlier applications as mutually owned land. We assume that the owners of the two properties have agreed a reallocation of the land on the site since the applications from No. 48 were submitted.

Neither the applications from No. 48 nor those from No. 48A show the proposals from the other. Therefore there is no opportunity for neighbours or other stakeholders to assess the appearance of the rear elevation if both sets of proposals are approved.

Given that the proposals from No. 48A were submitted after those from No. 48, we request that the later applicant be asked to resubmit elevation drawings showing both rear extensions, including the materials and finishes to be used for each, together with an indication that the two applicants have agreed the reallocation of the garden areas between them.

Grange Association
22 February 2019