

Stockbridge and Inverleith Community Council

Colin Bryans, Planning Officer
Waverley Court
4 East Market St
Edinburgh EH8 8BG

15th Nov 2013

Dear Mr Bryans

Planning Application 13/04325/FUL, 1 Malta Terrace Edinburgh

Stockbridge and Inverleith Community Council is a statutory consultee and objects to planning application no.13/04325/FUL. The new proposals remove the 2 proposed garages at the side of Malta House and turn them into a flat roofed extension of the house. There is no objection to turning the garages into an extension but there are knock-on consequences. This means that more parking spaces will be required in the front garden space. The Community Council has been copied into emails to the local residents in which you say that: *'The issue of parking will be considered in the context of the whole development and not in isolation...'* Our understanding is that planners these days are encouraged to liaise with the developer for a better development. This further application is an opportunity for you to do that.



We objected last time to the removal of the beautiful trees along St Bernard's Row (shown in the attached photo) for garages which neither, enhance the Conservation Area, or the setting of the listed buildings around and also limit the flexibility of the parking situation - all contrary to the Local Plan policies. This application means that at least 2 more parking spaces are now required in the front garden space. The Community Council suggests that in considering the parking as a whole it would be in everyone's interest to remove the garages along St Bernard's Row which would give more flexibility and room for car-parking and keep the trees. This would give a better outlook for the people who eventually live in the new housing as well as for the public walking along the road. It would also fit with planning policy. We suggest that the developer is approached about such a change. When the first application was submitted the Councillors asked the developers to go away and reconsider and there was some improvement. This should be done again.

The new application shows timber cladding with a door in it filling the gap between 2 old stone pillars in the boundary wall along Malta Terrace. We object to timber cladding as inappropriate for a conservation area and suggest the wall here could be re-instated in stone. If the present extension is demolished there will be plenty of stone around and most appropriate that it be used to fill the gap in the wall. Tiling and a gentle sloping roof would also be more appropriate for an extension in a Conservation Area. The developer should be asked to modify these aspects of his plans further.

The Community Council is aware that local residents have found these plans to be badly presented and that they complained some time ago about them and we would support that view. But even now on the portal in the plan marked: *'Indicative 3d views of proposed Malta House extension (08)'* no windows are shown along the boundary wall. However in plan marked *'Proposed elevations'* there are 3 windows shown in the same boundary wall in a drawing marked: *'North West Elevation as Proposed'*. What are we to make of errors like this? What faith can there be in the accuracy of the rest?

It should not be so difficult and time-consuming to understand plans. We ask the planning department to insist that developers and their architects give clear, accurate, unambiguous plans that are easy for the local residents to grasp. Given the errors and difficulties with these plans it is appropriate for the developers to be asked to re-submit their plans and it would be an opportunity for further modification. Local people would be delighted if a way could be found of retaining the trees along St Bernard's Row.

Yours sincerely

Pam Barnes
Stockbridge and Inverleith Community Council