

Application No: 19/00467/P

**3 Park Lane  
Haddington**

Applicant's  
Supporting Documents



## Review request statement

We request that you review the decision to refuse our planning application **19/00467/P** and ask that you consider changing this to grant of permission.

We feel that the new roof design would not be, in itself, overshadowing any neighbour properties nor the roof lights to the rear create any privacy issues.

We have had no adverse reaction from neighbour regarding this development nor did the planning application receive any objections.

The main reason behind refusal is based on the Council's DP5 policy, to quote the refusal:

*.....the proposed hipped pitched roof would significantly alter the architectural form of the house and in doing so interrupt the harmonious appearance of this homogenous group of houses the flat roofs and deep fascia's of which are a deliberate and distinctive design element. Consequently, by its size, form, proportions and scale the proposed hipped pitched roof would not be well integrated with its surroundings. Therefore the proposed pitched roof is contrary to policy DP5.....*

We would contend that the houses do not now met with the above for the following reasons:

- Our immediate neighbour (1 Park Lane), received planning permission (**13/00289/P**) May 2013 to alter and extend their property. This approval gave consent to the building having a lead fascia which is substantially shallower in depth than the original house.

Therefore the point within our planning refusal and part of the basis for the refusal "*.....deep fascia's of which are a deliberate and distinctive design element...*" has already been ignored by ELC Planning.

The continuity had already been lost for this design feature and in fact was present when our application was submitted so why was it used as a consideration? The material is also significantly different.

- Our immediate neighbour (5 Park Lane), has also had their fascia's renewed with pvc and again significantly shallower in depth and again was present when we submitted our application. So why was it used as a consideration?

Why therefore is it now being stated as a main reason?

- These properties weren't built to be part of a "group" and given the changes outlined above and the planning permissions issued, the current properties do differ and so again the point within our planning refusal and part of the basis for the refusal "*.....interrupt the harmonious appearance of this homogenous group of houses ...*" has already been ignored by ELC Planning.

Why is it now being stated as a main reason?

- The back garden of our property also backs on to the garden of a property accessed via the West Road. This property was similar in construction etc and constructed around the same period of time. This was then granted permission (**01/00128/FUL**) May 2001 to have a pitched roof with accommodation installed. The roof construction etc was substantially greater than our current proposals and which is quite clearly contradictory to the current position being adopted by ELC Planning.

We understand and acknowledge the need to preserve design aspects etc where merited however we also have to live in our property. We are predominantly surrounded by two storey housing in a residential area.

The roof has been a continuous problem in relation to maintenance and in its current form is not sustainable hence our move to a more sustainable type of roof construction. It is acknowledge that the life span of pitched roof far exceeds that of flat roofs. We are not looking to create accommodation within the roof and therefore can vary the roof height to one more agreeable (though pitch dependant in relation to the materials used).

Our grounds, as indicated above, are that the decision was based on ELC policy DP5 and the reasoning used was factually incorrect and contradicted by previous planning approvals.

We request that you review the decision to refuse our planning application **19/00467/P** and ask that you consider changing this to grant of permission.