

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

ABERDEEN, 24 February 2016. Minute of Meeting of the LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL. Present:- Councillor Milne, Chairperson; and Councillors Jean Morrison MBE and Sandy Stuart.

The agenda and reports associated with this minute can be found at:-
<http://committees.aberdeencity.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=284&MIId=4148&Ver=4>

KNOWSIE, 10 CORDYCE VIEW, DYCE - 141127

1. The Local Review Body of Aberdeen City Council met this day to review the decision taken by an appointed officer under the Council's Scheme of Delegation to refuse three requests for planning permission.

Councillor Milne, as Chairperson, gave a brief outline of the business to be undertaken. He indicated that the Local Review Body would be addressed by the Assistant Clerk, Mr Mark Masson, as regards the procedure to be followed and also, thereafter, by Mr Robert Forbes, who would be acting as the Planning Adviser to the Body in the case under consideration this day.

The Chairperson advised that a letter of representation dated 19th February 2016, had been received by Dyce and Stoneywood Community Council (a statutory consultee) after the decision to refuse the application had been taken by the appointed officer. It was acknowledged that late submissions would not normally be considered by the Local Review Body unless there were exceptional circumstances, however it was agreed that on this occasion it would be considered as part of today's proceedings as they were a statutory consultee, although he indicated that officers would write to all Community Council's advising them that they must submit representations timeously or they would not be considered in future.

The Chairperson advised that Mr Robert Forbes had not been involved in any way with the consideration or determination of the application under review and was present to provide factual information and guidance to the Body only. Mr Forbes would not be asked to express any view on the proposed application.

Mr Forbes explained that the application which was the subject of the review was for the construction of a 1.5 storey extension to replace an existing extension and outbuilding at Knowsie, 10 Cordyce View, Dyce. Mr Forbes explained that he had checked the submitted Notice of Review and found it to be valid and submitted within the relevant timeframes.

The report advised that the application site was located on the north side of Cordyce View, a small cul de sac to the immediate north of Aberdeen Airport's East Terminal, and was occupied by a detached, hipped roofed, single storey dwelling house finished

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL
24 February 2016

with render and a slate roof. The original dwelling house, which was 'L' shaped and positioned towards the east of the plot, had been substantially extended to the rear and western elevation by several single storey extensions, eventually linking with a lean to outbuilding located 1.4m off the western boundary. There was a small outhouse to the extreme north west of the rear garden which abutted an area of amenity space to the north planted with semi mature trees. The front garden currently provided parking for several cars and was screened by a low wall to the street elevation backed by 1.8m high hedging. The principal elevation of the dwelling house had open views towards the airport grounds. Mr Forbes intimated that the footprint of the existing dwelling house, including the previous extensions, resulted in a built site coverage of approximately 28% of the 860 sq m plot. Cordyce View was characterised by a variety of detached and semi detached dwelling houses, both single and 1.5 storey, of varying design, materials and age, all located to the north side.

The report indicated that planning permission was sought to erect a 1.5 storey extension to the west of the original dwelling house and involving the removal of an existing hipped roof extension, a lean to entrance porch/utility room and an adjoining outhouse. The new extension would be 8.8m wide x 9.6m deep, its rear elevation would sit flush with the existing building line while its front building line would sit 1m forward of the front building line of the original dwelling house, 200mm forward of the projection of the original outbuilding. The roof would be pitched, with straight gables to both front and rear elevations. The roof ridge height would be 6.8m, 2.6m higher than the roof ridge of the original dwelling house and some 3.7m higher than the extension to which it would abut. The eaves height would be 800mm above the adjoining extension, but match that of the original dwelling house. To ground floor level, the extension would provide a new lounge/dining room, storage room, W.C., rear vestibule and a staircase to the upper floor which would function as a games room/storage area with a W.C. Finishing materials would include grey wet dash render and slates. To the front (south) elevation, there would be a glazed door and triple windows to the ground floor and 2 triangular windows at upper level, while to the rear there would be a single glazed door, a set of triple glazed doors and a single window to the ground floor and 2 triangular windows at upper level.

In relation to the documents which the Members of the Body should consider, Mr Forbes outlined that all the following documents were accessible via web links, and available as set out in the papers:-

In relation to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan the report advised:-

Policy D1 – Architecture and Placemaking - To ensure high standards of design, new development must be designed with due consideration for its context and make a positive contribution to its setting. Factors such as siting, scale, massing, colour, materials, orientation, details, the proportions of building elements, together with the spaces around buildings, including streets, squares, open space, landscaping and boundary treatments, will be considered in assessing that contribution;

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

24 February 2016

Policy H1 – Residential Areas - Within existing residential areas (H1 on the Proposals Map) and within new residential developments, proposals for new residential development and householder development will be approved in principle if it:

1. Does not constitute overdevelopment;
2. Does not have an unacceptable impact on the character or amenity of the surrounding area; and complies with Supplementary Guidance contained in the Householder Development Guide.

In relation to Supplementary Guidance - Householder Development Guide:-

Rear/side extensions - There is no specific guidance relating to extensions to detached dwelling houses. Such development is assessed on their own merits on a site specific basis however all alterations should be architecturally compatible in design and scale with the original house and its surrounding area. Materials used should be complementary to the original building. Any extension or alteration proposed should not serve to overwhelm or dominate the original form or appearance of the dwelling.

In relation to the proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan, the following policies substantively reiterate policies in the adopted local development plan:- D1 – Quality Placemaking by Design (*D1 – Architecture and Placemaking in adopted LDP*)

All development must ensure high standards of design and have a strong and distinctive sense of place which is a result of context appraisal, detailed planning, quality architecture, craftsmanship and materials; H1 – Residential Areas (*H1 – Residential Areas in adopted LDP*). Within existing residential areas (H1 on the Proposals Map) and within new residential developments, proposals for new development and householder development will be approved in principle if it:

1. Does not constitute over development;
2. Does not have an unacceptable impact on the character or amenity of the surrounding area;
3. Does not result in the loss of valuable and valued areas of open space. Open space is defined in the Aberdeen Open Space Audit 2010; and
4. Complies with Supplementary Guidance.

National Policy and Guidance – Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) required that where, in making any determination under the planning acts, regard was to be had to the provisions of the development plan and that determination should be made in accordance with the plan, so far as material to the application, unless material considerations indicated otherwise. In relation to consultations, Mr Forbes explained that no objections were received from Environmental Health or Roads Development Management Service.

In relation to representations, it was noted that one letter of objection had been received.

In relation to consultations, Mr Forbes advised that no objections had been received from Environmental Health or the Roads Development Management Service.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

24 February 2016

Mr Forbes advised that the street was characterised by a range of dwelling types, forms and heights.

Mr Forbes advised that the stated reason for refusal of planning permission was as follows:

The proposed extension would breach both Policy D1 (Architecture and Placemaking) and the relevant Supplementary Guidance contained in Policy H1 (Residential Areas) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012, as its design would overwhelm and dominate the original form and appearance of the dwelling house which would have a significant detrimental impact on the existing visual and residential amenities of the area by virtue of its overall height and massing. No material considerations have been identified that would warrant determination other than in accordance with the Development Plan. The proposal, if implemented, could establish an undesirable precedent for similar applications, potentially leading to a cumulative erosion of residential character, to the detriment of the visual and residential amenity of the area.

Mr Forbes referred Members to large scale plans of the proposed development.

The Local Review Body then asked a number of questions of Mr Forbes and the Chairperson confirmed that Members had taken into consideration all of the documents which were before them today in respect of this review.

At this point, the Local Review Body considered whether it had sufficient information before them to proceed to determine the review. The Local Review Body thereupon agreed that the review under consideration should be determined without further procedure.

Members unanimously agreed that the proposal was contrary to Policy (1) D1 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, which advised that high standards of design, new development must be designed with due consideration for its context and make a positive contribution to its setting. Factors such as siting, scale, massing, colour, materials, orientation, details, the proportions of building elements, together with the spaces around buildings, including streets, squares, open space, landscaping and boundary treatments, would be considered in assessing that contribution; and (2) D5 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, which advised that that proposals affecting Conservation Areas or Listed Buildings will only be permitted if they complied with Scottish Planning Policy.

The Local Review Body therefore unanimously agreed to **uphold** the decision of the appointed officer and **refuse** the application.

In coming to their decision, the Local Review Body had regard to the provisions of the Development Plan as required by Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) which required that where, in making any determination under the planning acts, regard was to be had to the provisions of the

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

24 February 2016

development plan and that determination should be made in accordance with the plan, so far as material to the application, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

More specifically, the reasons on which the Local Review Body based this decision were as follows:-

The proposed extension would breach both Policy D1 (Architecture and Placemaking) and the relevant Supplementary Guidance contained in Policy H1 (Residential Areas) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012, as its design would overwhelm and dominate the original form and appearance of the dwelling house which would have a significant detrimental impact on the existing visual and residential amenities of the area by virtue of its overall height and massing. No material considerations have been identified that would warrant determination other than in accordance with the Development Plan. The proposal, if implemented, could establish an undesirable precedent for similar applications, potentially leading to a cumulative erosion of residential character, to the detriment of the visual and residential amenity of the area.

1 CLAREMONT STREET ABERDEEN - 150900

2. The Local Review Body then considered the second request for a review. The Chairperson advised that the LRB would again be addressed by Mr Robert Forbes and reminded members that Mr Forbes had not been involved in any way with the consideration or determination of the application under review and was present to provide factual information and guidance to the Body only. Mr Forbes would not be asked to express any view on the proposed application.

Mr Forbes indicated that the application which was the subject of the review was for the alteration and change of use from an office to 4 no. flats at 1 Claremont Street, Aberdeen. Mr Forbes explained that he had checked the submitted Notice of Review and found it to be valid and submitted within the relevant timeframes.

Mr Forbes explained that the application site comprised a two storey office block and area of car parking set back from Claremont Street. It dates from around the 1980s and has a vehicular access from Claremont Street. The building itself had windows and a door in its principal elevation (and three skylights to the rear). A two storey block of flats with mansard roof was located to the front, adjacent to the vehicular access. The surrounding area was formed largely of residential uses, reflected by its residential designation within the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012 (ALDP).

The report advised that detailed planning permission was sought for the alteration and change of use of the office block to four residential flats. Two flats would be located on each floor, with the principal elevation of the building altered to accommodate a revised arrangement of windows and front door resulting in all flats being single aspect, apart from the upper floors where new skylights would be provided to the rear of the building.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

24 February 2016

Externally, the front of the building would contain 5 parking spaces, with a landscaped area and storage space for bins and cycle parking.

It was noted that although the report referred to 5 parking spaces, the actual figure was in fact 4.

In relation to documents which the Members of the Body should consider, Mr Forbes outlined that all the following documents were accessible via web links, and available as set out in the papers:-

In relation to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan:-

H1 – Residential Areas

Within existing residential areas (designated H1), proposals for new residential development and householder development will be approved in principle if it:

1. does not constitute over development;
2. does not have an unacceptable impact on the character or amenity of the surrounding area;
3. does not result in the loss of valuable and valued areas of open space. Open space is defined in the Aberdeen Open Space Audit 2010;
4. complies with Supplementary Guidance on Curtilage Splits; and
5. complies with Supplementary Guidance on House Extensions.

D1 – Architecture and Placemaking

New development must be designed with due consideration for its context and make a positive contribution to its setting. Factors such as siting, scale, massing, colour, materials, orientation, details, proportions, coupled with the physical characteristics of the surrounding area, will be considered in assessing that contribution.

D2 – Residential Amenity

In order to ensure the provision of appropriate levels of amenity the following principles will be applied:

1. Privacy shall be designed into higher density housing.
2. Residential development shall have a public face to a street and a private face to an enclosed garden or court.
3. All residents shall have access to sitting-out areas. This can be provided by balconies, private gardens, terraces, communal gardens or other means acceptable to the Council.
4. When it is necessary to accommodate car parking within a private court, the parking must not dominate the space: as a guideline no more than 50% of any court should be taken up by parking spaces and access roads. Underground or decked parking will be expected in high density schemes.
5. Individual flats or houses within a development shall be designed to make the most of opportunities offered by the site for views and sunlight. Repeated standard units laid out with no regard for location or orientation is not acceptable.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

24 February 2016

6. Development proposals shall include measures to design out crime and design in safety.
7. External lighting shall take into account residential amenity and minimise light spillage into adjoining areas and the sky.

In relation to Supplementary Guidance the report advised:-

The Council's Supplementary Guidance on the Subdivision and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages is a material consideration in this instance. Although it is targeted at residential development on sites currently in residential use, some elements of the guidance are applicable to other types of development. This includes sections on amenity, daylight and sunlight.

In relation to the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan:-

H1 – Residential Areas

Within existing residential areas (designated H1), proposals for new residential development and householder development will be approved in principle if it:

1. does not constitute over development;
2. does not have an unacceptable impact on the character or amenity of the surrounding area;
3. does not result in the loss of valuable and valued areas of open space. Open space is defined in the Aberdeen Open Space Audit 2010; and
4. complies with Supplementary Guidance.

D1 – Quality Placemaking by Design

All development must ensure high standards of design and have a strong and distinctive sense of place which is a result of context appraisal, detailed planning, quality architecture, craftsmanship and materials.

In relation to the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan Supplementary Guidance:-

The Council's Supplementary Guidance on the Subdivision and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages is a material consideration in this instance. Although it is targeted at residential development on sites currently in residential use, some elements of the guidance are applicable to other types of development. This includes sections on amenity, daylight and sunlight.

In relation to consultations, Mr Forbes advised that no objections had been received from Environmental Health or the Roads Development Management Service.

In relation to representations, Mr Forbes explained that four letters of objection had been received.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

24 February 2016

Mr Forbes advised that the stated reasons for the application being refused were as follows:-

The change of use of the office building to four residential flats would result in backland residential development. The largely single aspect outlook of the units with a resultant lack of solar gain and relatively poor level of daylight, coupled with the lack of external amenity space would result in an oppressive and poor living environment, contrary to the requirements of policies H1 – Residential Areas, D2 – Design and Amenity and the Council's Supplementary Guidance on the Sub-division and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages.

In relation to the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2015, and for similar reasons, the proposals fail to accord with the requirements of policies H1 – Residential Areas and D1 – Quality Placemaking by Design.

The Local Review Body then asked a number of questions of Mr Forbes and referred Members to large scale plans of the proposed development.

It was acknowledged that the site was not located in the city centre or city centre masterplan area.

The Chairperson confirmed that Members had taken into consideration all of the documents which were before them today in respect of this review.

At this point, the Local Review Body considered whether it had sufficient information before them to proceed to determine the review. The Local Review Body thereupon agreed that the review under consideration should be determined without further procedure.

The Local Review Body therefore unanimously agreed to **uphold** the decision of the appointed officer and **refuse** the application.

In coming to their decision, the Local Review Body had regard to the provisions of the Development Plan as required by Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) which required that where, in making any determination under the planning acts, regard was to be had to the provisions of the development plan and that determination should be made in accordance with the plan, so far as material to the application, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

More specifically, the reasons on which the Local Review Body based this decision were as follows:-

The change of use of the office building to four residential flats would result in backland residential development. The largely single aspect outlook of the units with a resultant lack of solar gain and relatively poor level of daylight, coupled with the lack of external amenity space would result in an oppressive and poor living environment, contrary to the requirements of policies H1 – Residential Areas, D2 – Design and Amenity and the Council's Supplementary Guidance on the Sub-division and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

24 February 2016

In relation to the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2015, and for similar reasons, the proposals fail to accord with the requirements of policies H1 – Residential Areas and D1 – Quality Placemaking by Design.

10 KING'S CROSS ROAD, ABERDEEN - 151708

3. The Local Review Body then considered the third request for a review. The Chairperson advised that the LRB would now be addressed by Ms Lucy Greene and reminded members that Ms Greene had not been involved in any way with the consideration or determination of the application under review and was present to provide factual information and guidance to the Body only. Ms Greene would not be asked to express any view on the proposed application.

Ms Greene explained that the application which was the subject of the review was for the proposed formation of a straight gable, extension to front dormer and erection of 1.5 storey extension to rear.

Ms Greene explained that she had checked the submitted Notice of Review and found it to be valid and submitted within the relevant timeframes.

Ms Greene explained that the site referred to was located to the south of King's Cross Road and extended to 511.7 sq.m and was occupied by a 1.5 storey semi-detached dwelling house and a detached single garage to the rear. The area was characterised by properties of similar design and materials. The site was identified by the Adopted Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012 as a residential area.

Ms Greene explained that planning permission was sought to straighten the existing hipped gable and erecting a 1.5 storey rear extension to the existing dwellinghouse. The proposed extensions would accommodate a new kitchen/ living area at the ground floor and three numbers of enlarged bedrooms with an en-suite, a bathroom and a storage space on the first floor. The proposed rear extension would have an overall projection of 4m and would have an eaves height of 3.4m and a ridge height of 7.3m.

The proposal also included dormer extensions to the front of the property (north elevation) and a new dormer on the eastern pitch of the proposed rear extension pitched roof. Finishing materials would include a slated roof and rendered cladding.

She also highlighted the site's previous planning history, wherein it was advised that detailed planning application for formation of a dormer window was approved unconditionally in May 2005.

In relation to documents which the Members of the Body should consider, Ms Greene outlined that all the following documents were accessible via web links, and available as set out in the papers:-

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL
24 February 2016

In relation to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan:-

Policy D1- Architecture and Placemaking

To ensure high standard of design, new development must be designed with due consideration for its context and make a positive contribution to its setting. Factors such as siting, scale, massing, colour, materials, orientation, details, the proportions of building elements, together with the spaces around buildings, including streets, squares, open space, landscaping and boundary treatments, would be considered in assessing that contribution.

Policy H1- Residential Areas

Within existing residential areas (H1 on the Proposals Map) and within new residential developments, proposals for new residential development and householder development will be approved in principle if it:

1. did not have an unacceptable impact on the character or amenity of the surrounding area; and
2. complied with Supplementary Guidance contained in the Householder Development Guide.

In relation to Supplementary Guidance:-

The Council's Supplementary Guidance on the Householder Development Guide was a material consideration in this instance.

In relation to the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan, Policies D1- Quality Placemaking by Design (D1- Architecture and Placemaking in adopted LDP) and H1- Residential Areas (H1- Residential Areas in adopted LDP) were material considerations.

National Policy and Guidance – Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) required that where, in making any determination under the planning acts, regard was to be had to the provisions of the development plan and that determination should be made in accordance with the plan, so far as material to the application, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

In relation to consultations, Ms Greene advised that no representations had been received in respect of the proposal.

Ms Greene highlighted that the application site was located within an area zoned for residential use in the Adopted Aberdeen Local Development Plan (2012), and related to an existing dwelling. Therefore, the proposal was acceptable in principle subject to an acceptable form and appearance. In determining what constituted an acceptable form of extension, the aforementioned national and local planning policies and associated supplementary guidance would be of relevance.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL
24 February 2016

Specifically regarding the design, scale and massing of the proposed hip to gable extension, Ms Greene referred to the Council's Supplementary Guidance: Householder Development Guide which was adopted in August 2012 and introduced specific guidance on straightening of the hipped roofs. This document highlighted that applications for such development prior to this date were determined under different circumstances in terms of the applicable policy context and therefore offer no precedent for applications submitted after the adoption of this guidance. The current Householder Development Guide stated that modifying only one half of a hipped roof was likely to result in the roof/ building having an unbalanced appearance.

The practice of extending a hipped roof on one half of a pair of semi-detached houses to terminate at a raised gable would not generally be acceptable unless the other half of the building had already been altered in this way or such proposal would not, as a result of the existing streetscape and the character of the buildings therein, result in any adverse impact on the character or visual amenity of the wider area. As the application property adjoined another with a hipped roof, the proposal did not meet the first criteria and the proposal therefore falls to be assessed against the second exception.

In this case the existing streetscape, particularly on Kings Cross Road had a consistent design theme of hipped roofed properties. It was considered that there was a clear predominance of the original design character of hipped roof prevailing within this streetscape. The only two exceptions with a hip to gable extension in the immediate area are No. 2 Kings Cross Avenue (approved in 2004) and 2 Kings Cross Terrace (approved in February 2012) and Ms Greene explained that the decision did not set precedent for similar applications submitted after the introduction of the Supplementary Guidance in August 2012.

Ms Greene advised that the stated reason for refusal of planning permission was as follows:

The proposal did not comply with Policy D1 (Architecture and Placemaking) and H1 (Residential Areas) of Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012 and the associated 'Householder Development Guide' Supplementary Guidance in that the proposal did not demonstrate due regard for the design and context of the streetscape, and as a result the proposed development would appear out of context and would impose a negative design on the surrounding area. Also the proposed rear dormer would have a detrimental impact on privacy of No. 8 Kings Cross Road. On the basis of the aforementioned information, and following on from the evaluation under policy and guidance, it was considered that the proposal did not accord with the provisions of the Development Plan and that there were no material planning considerations – including the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan – that would warrant approval of the application.

Ms Greene referred Members to electronic plans of the proposed development. She also advised of the applicant's response to the decision, referring to the Notice of Review and accompanying statement.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

24 February 2016

The Local Review Body then asked a number of questions of Ms Greene and the Chairperson confirmed that Members had taken into consideration all of the documents which were before them today in respect of this review.

At this point, the Local Review Body considered whether it had sufficient information before them to proceed to determine the review. The Local Review Body thereupon agreed that the review under consideration should be determined without further procedure.

Members unanimously agreed that the proposal was contrary to Policy (1) D1 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, which advised that high standards of design, new development must be designed with due consideration for its context and make a positive contribution to its setting. Factors such as siting, scale, massing, colour, materials, orientation, details, the proportions of building elements, together with the spaces around buildings, including streets, squares, open space, landscaping and boundary treatments, would be considered in assessing that contribution; and (2) H1 (Residential Areas) of Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012 and the associated 'Householder Development Guide' Supplementary Guidance.

The Local Review Body therefore unanimously agreed to **uphold** the decision of the appointed officer and **refuse** the application.

In coming to their decision, the Local Review Body had regard to the provisions of the Development Plan as required by Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) which required that where, in making any determination under the planning acts, regard was to be had to the provisions of the development plan and that determination should be made in accordance with the plan, so far as material to the application, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

More specifically, the reasons on which the Local Review Body based this decision were as follows:-

The proposal failed to accord with Scottish Planning Policy, Policy D1 (Architecture and Placemaking); and Scottish Planning Policy, Policy H1 (Residential Areas), of Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2012 and the associated 'Householder Development Guide' Supplementary Guidance, in that whilst Members acknowledged that there were two properties on Kings Cross Crescent and Kings Cross Avenue with approved planning applications for a hip to gable extension, Supplementary Guidance: Householder Development Guide which was adopted in August 2012 had introduced specific guidance on straightening of the hipped roofs. This document highlighted that applications for such development prior to this date were determined under different circumstances in terms of the applicable policy context and therefore offer no precedent for applications submitted after the adoption of this guidance. The current Householder Development Guide stated that modifying only one half of a hipped roof was likely to result in the roof/ building having an unbalanced appearance. Members considered that the proposed straightening of the hipped roof on Kings Cross Road would create an unbalanced

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

24 February 2016

look for the semi-detached property and additionally that the proposed dormers combined with the hip to gable extension would overwhelm and dominate the original appearance of the dwelling roof in a manner that failed to demonstrate due regard for its context or make a positive contribution to its setting. Also, the proposed dormer to the rear of the application property would have a detrimental impact in terms of privacy on the neighbouring property to the east. Members also acknowledged that the principle of forming dormers to the front and rear elevations was acceptable, however any such dormers must be designed in a manner which was architecturally compatible with the scale and building proportions of the application property and should not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties.

- **RAMSAY MILNE, Chairperson**