

# Public Document Pack



To: Councillor Boulton, Convener; Councillor Jennifer Stewart, Vice Convener; and Councillors Allan, Cooke, Copland, Cormie, Greig, Avril MacKenzie and Malik.

Town House,  
ABERDEEN 24 May 2018

## **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (VISITS)**

The Members of the **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (VISITS)** are requested to meet at the Town House reception **on THURSDAY, 31 MAY 2018 at 9.30 am**. The meeting will reconvene at the Town House for deliberation following the visit, in the Council Chamber.

FRASER BELL  
CHIEF OFFICER - GOVERNANCE

### **B U S I N E S S**

#### **WHERE THE RECOMMENDATION IS ONE OF APPROVAL**

- 1 76 Morningside Avenue - Erection of 1.5 Storey Extension to Rear - 180409  
(Pages 3 - 8)


Website Address: [www.aberdeencity.gov.uk](http://www.aberdeencity.gov.uk)

Should you require any further information about this agenda, please contact Lynsey McBain on 01224 522123 or email [lymcbain@aberdeencity.gov.uk](mailto:lymcbain@aberdeencity.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

	<h2>Planning Development Management Committee</h2>
	Report by Development Management Manager
	<b>Committee Date: 24 May 2018</b>

<b>Site Address:</b>	76 Morningside Avenue, Aberdeen, AB10 7LX,
<b>Application Description:</b>	Erection of 1.5 storey extension to rear
<b>Application Reference:</b>	180409/DPP
<b>Application Type</b>	Detailed Planning Permission
<b>Application Date:</b>	20 March 2018
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Liam Christie
<b>Ward:</b>	Airyhall/Broomhill/Garthdee
<b>Community Council</b>	Braeside And Mannofield
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Sheila Robertson



## RECOMMENDATION

Approve Unconditionally

## APPLICATION BACKGROUND

---

### Site Description

The application relates to a 1½ storey semi-detached dwelling house, of semi-modern design, facing north east across Morningside Avenue. The property has dormer windows to both front and rear elevations and a single garage has been added to the gable elevation. The immediate area is characterised by semi-detached dwelling houses of similar design. Ground levels drop by 1m between the front and rear elevations of the dwelling.

### Relevant Planning History

An application for planning permission (180077/DPP) for a 1½ storey rear extension was withdrawn in March 2018. This application proposed a similar extension; however, its roof ridge was higher than now submitted, tying in with the existing roof ridge; its projection was 6.6m, 2.6m longer than now proposed although set 1m off the mutual NW boundary; an area of raised decking was included to the rear; and a dormer was located to the NW roof elevation and low-level roof light to the SE.

## APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

---

### Description of Proposal

The application proposes the erection of a 1½ storey extension, extending across the full width of the rear elevation, to provide a family room at ground floor level and a bedroom/en-suite at upper level. The extension would have a 4m projection with an overall built footprint of 25.2sqm. The roof would be pitched at right angles to the main roof, its eaves sitting just below existing with a ridge height 1.5m below existing and 650mm above the flat roof of the rear dormer. Except for a small roof light with etched glazing to the north west roof elevation serving the en-suite, all glazing would be confined to the rear facing elevation and would consist of double width sliding doors to both ground and upper floor levels, the upper window protected by a glazed balustrade. Due to changes in ground levels, there would be a 900mm depth of underbuilding towards the rear of the extension to ensure the internal ground floor level would match existing. Finishing materials would include roof slates, white render and vertical timber cladding at first floor level. This proposal has been amended since original submission following advice from the Planning Service, to remove a dormer from the NW elevation and substitution by a roof light.

### Supporting Documents

All drawings and supporting documents listed below can be viewed on the Council's website at:

<https://publicaccess.aberdeencity.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=P5UKLNBZJYF00>.

### Reason for Referral to Committee

The application has been referred to the Planning Development Management Committee because it has been the subject of six or more timeous letters of representation (following advertisement and/or notification) that express objection or concern about the proposal and thus falls out with the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

## CONSULTATIONS

---

**ACC - Roads Development Management Team** – No observations.

**Braeside and Mannofield Community Council** - Comments received, neither supporting nor objecting to the proposal, which state *"The Community Council objected to the previous application prior to the application being withdrawn. We understand there is still neighbour*

*objections and the Community Council requests that the Supplementary Planning Advice and the Local Development Plan are fully taken into account when considering the application”.*

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

---

8 letters of representation (objection) have been received. The objections were received prior to the submission of amended plans and can be summarised as follows: -

- All extensions to properties within the immediate area are single storey – therefore the proposal would be inappropriate and out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area and encourage similar proposals.
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- The extension is 2 storeys and should not project by more than 3m.
- Impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of day light, overshadowing and privacy.

## **MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

---

### **Legislative Requirements**

Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that where, in making any determination under the planning acts, regard is to be had to the provisions of the Development Plan and that determination shall be made in accordance with the plan, so far as material to the application unless material considerations indicate otherwise

### **Aberdeen Local Development Plan (2017)**

- Policy H1 (Residential Areas)
- Policy D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design)

### **Supplementary Guidance and Technical Advice Notes**

- The Householder Development Guide

### **Other Material Considerations**

- BRE Information Paper on ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight’

## **EVALUATION**

---

### **Principle of Development**

The application site is located in a residential area, under Policy H1 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan and the proposal relates to householder development. Proposals for such development will accord with this policy in principle if it: does not constitute over development; does not have an unacceptable impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area; does not result in the loss of valuable and valued areas of open space; and complies with associated Supplementary Guidance. As this proposal would be located within an existing residential curtilage, the proposal would not result in the loss of valuable and valued areas of open space. The other guidelines mentioned above are assessed in the below evaluation.

### **Design, Scale and Layout**

The proposed extension is considered to be of acceptable scale and compliant with the Supplementary Guidance for the following reasons: the extension would add an additional 25.2sqm to the existing footprint of 71sq.m, well under the maximum 100% increase on the existing footprint permitted, and which would increase the built site coverage from 22% to 29.9%, retaining a low density of development that would compare favourably with neighbouring densities and therefore be acceptable within the context of the surrounding area. Well in excess of 50% of

the usable rear garden space would remain undeveloped as required by the guidance. Overdevelopment of the site therefore would not be an issue.

The Householder Development Guide limits the projection of single storey rear extensions to a maximum of 4m along a mutual boundary separating a pair of semis. On such properties of 2 or more storeys, two storey extensions may be possible subject to a maximum 3m projection along a mutual boundary. The application property is a 1½ storey dwelling house, defined as a single storey dwelling house that includes habitable rooms within the roof/attic space, with sloped internal ceilings and dormers/roof lights. Although containing two floors of accommodation, it is not classed as having 2 storeys, which would have full height ceilings to the upper floor and regular windows to an external wall. Therefore, as the rear extension is also considered to be a 1½ storey addition, the limitation on projection applicable to single storey dwelling houses will apply in which case, the proposed 4m projection would be fully compliant with the above guidance. The area of underbuilding required to construct the extension does not change the definition of type of extension.

In terms of design, the extension would make an acceptable contribution to its setting and respect the architecture of the existing dwelling; its roof ridge would be positioned below that of the main dwelling, as would its eaves resulting in it appearing secondary and therefore subservient to the original dwelling, and, in addition to its footprint, would neither overwhelm nor dominate the rear elevation; and proposed materials would either match or add a contrast to the existing finishes. Although such extensions are not common within the immediate area, they are an acceptable form of development city wide, and since the site is land locked to the rear, the proposed extension would not be readily visible from either the principal elevation or from any public viewpoint therefore its visual impact to the streetscape and surrounding area would be negligible. Due consideration has therefore been paid to its siting, scale, design and finishing materials and the proposal is therefore fully compliant with the aims of Policy D1 and with the guidance contained in the Householder Development, having been designed with sufficient regard for the character of the existing building and its context within the surrounding area.

### **Impact on Residential Amenity**

Calculations regarding impact to neighbours' internal daylight receipt, based on methodology contained in the BRE Information Paper on 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight', demonstrate no impact to any neighbouring windows. When the calculations are applied to additional overshadowing, they indicate that while there would be no impact to No 78 Morningside Avenue due to its orientation, an area of garden ground to the rear of No 74 Morningside Avenue would be affected by overshadowing during early morning however given the extent and mainly south/south westerly aspect of their available areas of garden ground, the short duration and magnitude of the resultant overshadowing are such that any impact to their current amenity and enjoyment of their garden ground would be negligible and not sufficient to warrant refusal of the application. Their windows to the south western elevation would continue to receive sunshine for the greater part of the day, and any reduction in the internal receipt of sunshine would also be within an acceptable level.

In terms of privacy, sufficient rear garden boundary screening is in-situ to ensure no additional overlooking from the windows at ground floor level. At upper level, the full height window would face towards the rear elevation of properties facing Deeside Park and given that no new windows would either directly face or be on the same plane as any neighbouring windows to the rear, and there would be a minimum of 23m separation distance from the proposed extension, which is well out with the minimum 18m window - to - window distance required to maintain internal privacy, there would be no impact to their internal privacy. There is an existing dormer to the rear of the application property which already offers views over neighbours rear gardens; the proposed window at upper level, although closer to the rear boundary than existing, would not result in any

additional opportunity for further overlooking than exists at present. Existing residential amenity would therefore be retained in compliance with Policy H1.

### **Equalities Impact Assessment**

An Equalities Impact Assessment is not required because the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any differential impacts on those with protected characteristics.

### **Matters Raised in Representation.**

Matters relating to design, height, projection, sunlight, daylight, and privacy have been assessed in the above evaluation. No precedent would be set by this application as every planning application is assessed on its own merits, on a site specific basis, against the relevant current national and local planning policies and guidance.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

---

Approve Unconditionally

## **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION**

---

The proposed extension is considered to be secondary to the existing property by way of its size, scale and position, and acceptable in terms of design and materials, having been designed to respect the form and architecture of the existing dwelling. Its dimensions and location are such that the site would not be over developed and there would be no significant adverse impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of daylight receipt and privacy, and although there would be a slight increase in overshadowing, it would be within an acceptable level. There would be a neutral impact on the visual character of the streetscape, the extension not being visible from outwith the site. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design) and H1 (Residential Areas) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017 and with the associated Supplementary Guidance - Householder Development Guide. On the basis of the above, and following on from the evaluation under policy and guidance, including the matters raised in representation, it is considered that there are no material planning considerations that would warrant refusal of the application.

This page is intentionally left blank