

**Planning Applications 25/05068/FUL and 25/05070/LBC - 57 Grange Road EH9 1TY**

**OBJECTION from Grange Association**

**14 October 2025**

We have reviewed planning applications [25/05068/FUL](#) and [25/05070/LBC](#) and submit this objection. We note that the earlier applications [25/02518/FUL](#) and [25/02516/LBC](#) were refused in August 2025 and we consider that the amendments in these newly submitted applications do not adequately address the matters that led to the refusals.

We maintain that the revised proposals are still unacceptable regarding:

- (A): The loss of privacy and outlook for the immediate neighbours;
- (B): The inappropriate form and materials proposed for the extension; and
- (C) The detrimental effect of the proposed extension on the setting of the listed buildings.

**A: Loss of privacy and outlook**

In this revised proposal, the eaves have been lowered by just 250mm, which will make little difference to the effect on neighbours' privacy and overlooking. The structure will still appear as a watchtower supervising the neighbouring properties at 59 Grange Road and 23 Mansionhouse Road. The side windows remain an obvious intrusion into neighbours' privacy, notwithstanding the revised orientations.

Moreover, the proposal still includes an open balcony to the East, overlooking Mansionhouse Road and providing an observation platform on the second storey from which to look into the gardens of neighbours. The floor of the proposed balcony is at the same level as the top of the garden wall as shown in the East elevation. While there is currently vegetation partially screening the views to the north and east of the property, there can be no guarantee that this will be retained and thus there would be the potential for gross intrusion on neighbour privacy. This is contrary to the Householder Guidance (page 11) relating to balconies.

*Permission for roof terraces and balconies will not be granted where there is significant overlooking into neighbouring property.....*

*Householder Guidance (page 11)*

In the Report of Handling explaining the refusal of [25/02518/FUL](#), the Case Officer wrote:

*"The proposed extension is located approximately 3.6 metres from the boundary of the adjacent property at 59 Grange Road. Given this proximity, orientation and massing of the extension, it is likely that a significant level of overlooking of the neighbouring property garden will arise from the development. .... It is therefore assumed that the proposed extension will have a negative impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of a reasonable provision of overlooking."*

We consider this assessment to remain relevant to the revised application.

## **B: Inappropriate form and materials**

The proposed extension, set on the second storey at the rear, will create an alien structure wholly unsympathetic to the form and materials of the pair of semi-detached listed villas at 57-59 Grange Road.

The [Householder Guidance](#) specifies (pages 12) that an extension should normally match the existing building. This applies to all development but is especially important in conservation areas such as the Grange. The proposed extension to 57 Grange Road demonstrates no sympathy to the existing building in its materials or its form. The aluminium and timber-clad building, would be an alien intrusion into the line of characterful villas in Grange Road. We acknowledge that new extensions can be designed in modern materials where the extension is plainly subservient to the main property and is sympathetic in other respects to the form of the property and its site. However, in this proposal, the extension would dominate the side elevations and would introduce a jarring asymmetric massing wholly unsympathetic to the design of the parent villa or the general streetscape of the area. The extension would be clearly visible from Mansionhouse Road and would become a dominant and incongruous feature of the streetscape.

*In most cases, the materials used should match the existing building and be in keeping with the character and appearance of the neighbourhood. [.....]*

*Householder Guidance (page 12)*

We object to the proposed aluminium and larch cladding because it would not sit harmoniously with the original building, which is a classic stone villa with a slate roof.

## **C: Detrimental effect on the setting of the listed buildings**

The pair of semi-detached villas are [C-Listed](#) and the listing cites: “4-bay symmetrical rectangular-plan double villa”. This proposal would destroy the symmetry of the rear elevation and harm the setting of these listed properties. The materials proposed for the extension would also be alien to the setting the properties.

In the Report of Handling explaining the refusal of [25/02516/LBC](#), the Case Officer wrote:

*“By virtue of its massing and position, the proposed extension would diminish rather than compliment the character and special interest of the villa. The design, siting and resulting two-storey scale would weaken the historic status of the villa and detract from its well-proportioned and largely unaltered rear elevation.*

*“The proposed extension would constitute an unsympathetic and incongruous addition that would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the listed building.”*

*“Due to the site's sloping topography, the extension would be positioned a full storey above the boundary treatment, creating a highly conspicuous addition within the streetscape. Its elevated position, combined with its projection above the boundary treatment, would heighten its visual prominence. This increased visibility would diminish the special qualities of the conservation area, reducing both the visual and physical sense of seclusion that characterises the villa.”*

We consider these assessments to remain relevant to the revised applications and request that these applications be refused.

**Grange Association**  
**14 October 2025**