

## Appeal Statement

**Alteration, formation of dormers and extension to roof of flat at  
11 Stoneybank Grove  
Musselburgh  
East Lothian  
EH21 6HF**

Our application for the above proposals, ref 13/00207/P, was refused by East Lothian on the 7th May 2013 for the following reasons;

- 1) *By its architectural form, proportion, scale and positioning the proposed extension to the roof of the house and thus the dormers to be formed in part of the front and rear elevation roof slopes of them would be disproportionate, dominant and incongruous features harmful to the character and appearance of the flatted building, of the streetscape of Stoneybank Grove and of the area. Therefore, the extension to the roof of the building and the dormers are contrary to Policy ENV1G of the approved Edinburgh and the Lothians Structure Plan 2015 and Policy DP6 of the adopted East Lothian Local Plan 2008.*
  
- 2) *If approved, the roof extension and dormers would set a harmful precedent for allowing similar extensions to the hipped end roof slopes of the other flatted buildings in the locality. Such cumulative change would collectively out of keeping with the character of the built form of the flatted buildings, to the greater detriment of the streetscape of Stoneybank Grove and the character and appearance of the area.*

Our proposals are not to alter the height of the roof line but to continue the roof line at same height outwards, to form a gable. There are 13 blocks in our cul de sac , 31 of which are semi detached/terraced houses with gabled roofs. There are only 2 blocks of 4 flats with a hip end roof.

The report states the roof extension would '*radically alter the distinctive architectural form, balance and integrity of the buildings*'. The new roofing slates will nestle in with the existing and with the exception of the dormers, it would be very difficult to determine whether or not the roof extension was part of the original building. This change of form would not '*radically*' alter the overall architectural form of the building, so to suggest this is a vast exaggeration to say the least.

Yes the building becomes asymmetrical, but the building is long in form and is only 2 storeys high, so I doubt this would radically alter the overall balance to a harmful manner. If it was the opinion of East Lothian Council that our proposed gable extension to form a gable would radically alter the balance of the building, then why would they approve the following alterations?



1. Prestonpans



2. Prestonpans – before (hip) and after (gable)



3. main road in Tranent

The above properties have altered the hipped roof to form a gable, and for what reason? Likely because the family required more space within the attic and the gable extension provided the headroom, the same reason we require such. It is subjective as to whether these examples integrate well, but they certainly don't radically alter the original buildings architectural form and balance to the degree that they are harmful to the original house or

surrounding area , nor do they appear overly dominant and disproportionate. I would suggest that our proposals would integrate more harmoniously and be more in keeping with the original building than example properties 1 and 2, and be more in line with example 3.

The report repeatedly focuses on the fact that the building is a flat of 4 in a block. Why should this be of such importance? Our buildings architectural form is similar of that of the above example 1, and also to that of other semi-detached houses in our surrounding area. The minor difference being is that one of the ground floor windows is replaced with a front door. The form, balance and features of the houses are all similar in appearance to ours. The fact that our proposals are to alter a flat should not be an issue, what is behind the buildings fabric is irrelevant. The focus should lie on its external appearance to which our proposals do not differ greatly from the example properties.

The second reason for refusal states that the proposals would '*set a harmful precedent*'. Why would a gable end set a '*harmful*' precedent? It sets a precedent that integrates well with the original building, and also to the neighbouring gabled houses opposite and sits comfortably along the streetscape. As previously mentioned, it would be very difficult to determine whether or not the roof extension was part of the original building. So for this reason it must surely integrate well and would certainly not be a dominant and incongruous feature harmful to the building or character of the streetscape. A visual analysis incorporating our proposals into the existing streetscape is indicated at the end of the statement to support our views.

The dormer to the front has been deliberately designed to be small in scale to ensure it is in proportion and does not dominate the roof. Less can be said of the example shown below. So why is it suggested that our proposals are '*incongruous*' and contrary to Policies ENV1G and DP6, given our proposals are most certainly less intrusive than any of the examples?



4.

In summary, I would state that our proposals are not dominant or disproportionate, nor would they be an incongruous feature which would harm the building or character of the area, as the suggested justification for refusal. There were no concerns or objections made during the application process and the general consensus when speaking with local residents have been overwhelmingly supportive.

I therefore respectfully request that the Local Review Body overturns the decision as it cannot be considered reasonable to suggest that our proposals would be **harmful to the character and appearance of the building and streetscape or would set a harmful precedent.**

I understand that the following commentary may be immaterial, but as a young couple expecting our first baby, our single bedroom home will soon be too small to meet our growing needs. We are in desperate need of more space and in this current economic climate we are not in a position to afford larger accommodation, nor is there any availability of social housing. There is an aging population in this area which is in need of young families and if we gain permission, this allows us to remain living within our means and provide a much needed flexible family home for years to come, with its private drive and large private rear garden. Its close proximity to the Doctors and excellent schools are also of huge benefit to us, and we are hopeful that we will not be forced to lose this. We understand this may be considered irrelevant, nonetheless it is becoming a regular occurrence where young couples starting their own family, outgrow their homes and unfortunately are unable to afford to move.

