

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

2 October 2019

ABERDEEN, 2 October 2019. Minute of Meeting of the LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL. Present:- Councillor Boulton, Chairperson; and Councillors Allan and Malik.

The agenda and reports associated with this meeting can be viewed [here](#).

60 CRANFORD ROAD - ERECTION OF 1.5 STOREY GABLE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO REAR - 190802/DPP

1. The Local Review Body (LRB) of Aberdeen City Council met on this day to review the decision taken by an appointed officer under the Council's Scheme of Delegation to refuse the request for planning permission for the erection of a 1.5 storey gable extension and single storey extension to rear of 60 Cranford Road, Aberdeen, Planning Reference 190802/DPP.

Councillor Boulton as Chair, gave a brief outline of the business to be undertaken, advising that the LRB would be addressed by the Assistant Clerk, Mr Mark Masson with regards to the procedure to be followed and also, thereafter, by Mr Gavin Evans who would be acting as the Planning Adviser to the Body in the cases under consideration this day.

The Chairperson stated that although the Planning Adviser was employed by the planning authority, he 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. She emphasised that the officer would not be asked to express any view on the proposed application.

The Local Review Body was then addressed by Mr Masson, Assistant Clerk in regard to the procedure to be followed, at which time reference was made to the procedure note circulated with the papers calling the meeting and to more general aspects relating to the procedure.

In relation to the application, the LRB had before it (1) a delegated report by Nicholas Lawrence, Senior Planning Officer; (2) the application dated 16 May 2019; (3) the decision notice dated 15 July 2019; (4) links to the plans showing the proposal and planning policies referred to in the delegated report; and (5) the Notice of Review submitted by the applicant's agent along with an accompanying statement with further information relating to the application.

The LRB was then addressed by Mr Evans who advised that the review had been submitted with all necessary information within the time limit of three months following the decision of the appointed officer.

Mr Evans then described the site advising that it was a residential plot, located on the South-western side of Cranford Road, on the eastern side of its junction with Cranford Terrace. The plot contained a 1½ storey semi-detached dwelling, which faced onto Cranford Road, along with associated front and rear garden.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

2 October 2019

He indicated that the dwelling and its adjoining neighbour at no. 62 were of a hipped-roof design, and each had a hipped-roof dormer to front and rear elevations, along with a chimney constructed off the gable wall. There was formerly a flat-roofed garage to the side of the dwelling, but this had been demolished in the recent past.

He intimated that the property did not appear to be in good condition, and the applicant's supporting statement noted that the house was unfortunately subjected to fire damage in November 2017, which left the interior and exterior in a "poor and unsightly condition".

Mr Evans explained that the site was located in an area the Aberdeen Local Development Plan (ALDP) identified as an H1 Residential Area.

Mr Evans made reference to the history of the site and outlined the appointed Officer's reasons for refusal as follows:-

- the proposal, by reason of its design, form, mass and composition, would harm the '*conformation of the pair of semi-detached dwellings*', together with the character and appearance of the area; and
- identified conflict with policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design) and H1 (residential Areas) of the ALDP, as well as Householder Development Guide Supplementary Guidance, together with national guidance contained in Scottish Planning Policy and Planning Advice Note 67 on Housing Quality.

In relation to the appellants case, Mr Evans highlighted the following:-

- noted that the officer's report expressed no concern over materials proposed;
- took issue with sketch suggestion for alternative roof profile – would not meet client's needs/brief;
- were not allowed meaningful dialogue on alternatives before refusal;
- contended that PAN 67: Housing Quality was not relevant, as it was intended as guidance for new housing developments, not alterations to existing properties;
- referred to the Supporting Statement provided alongside the application for analysis against the Householder Development Guide Supplementary Guidance (HDGSG);
- highlighted that the HDGSG did not completely preclude hip-to-gable extension, but provided for them based on context;
- Pointed to other examples of similar extensions in surrounding streets including the closest properties at 79-81 Cranford Road and 4-6 Cranford Terrace; and
- Contended that one further extension of this type would not adversely affect the appearance or amenity of the area.

Mr Evans pointed out that the intention of the Supplementary Guidance was to avoid unbalanced pairs such as these examples being repeated. The Policy test was really whether these were common that they now represent the character of the area and would not be out place.

Mr Evans intimated that there was no response from Braeside and Mannofield Community Council and no representations submitted, however four letters of support were provided along with review submissions.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

2 October 2019

Mr Evans advised that the applicant had expressed the view that expressed the view that no further procedure was required.

The Chairperson and Councillors Allan and Malik advised in turn that they each had enough information before them and agreed that a site visit was not required and that the review under consideration should be determined without further procedure.

Mr Evans outlined the relevant policy considerations, making reference to the following in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017:-

H1 - proposals for new development will be acceptable in principle if they:-

- did not constitute over development;
- did not have an unacceptable impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area;
- did not result in the loss of valuable and valued areas of open space. Open space is defined in the Aberdeen Open Space Audit 2010;
- complied with Supplementary Guidance;

D1 – Quality Placemaking by Design: Required development to be of a high standard of design, which demonstrates an understanding of its context. (distinctive, welcoming, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, adaptable and resource efficient); and Supplementary Guidance - Householder Development Guide, specific content on hipped roofs and guidance on extensions to semi-detached dwellings.

Mr Evans explained that in determining the appeal, members should have regard to the Local Development Plan and any other material considerations they feel were relevant to the application that would point to either overturning the original decision or dismissing the review. The following key points were highlighted as being of relevance:-

- Zoning: Did the proposal satisfy the tests set out by policy H1:-
 1. Would it have an unacceptable impact on the character and amenity of the area?;
 2. Did it comply with the relevant Supplementary Guidance (Householder Development Guide)?;
- Design: was the proposal of sufficient design quality (D1) - having regard for factors such as scale, siting, footprint, proportions relative to original, materials, colour etc?

He indicated that should members wish to overturn the decision of the appointed officer, consideration should be given to any conditions which would be appropriate in order to make the proposal acceptable, however all conditions must meet the six tests set out by Scottish Government policy.

He suggested that an appropriate condition could be added regarding materials to be used in the roof and walls of the development.

The Local Review Body then asked questions of Mr Evans, specifically regarding alterations to neighbouring properties and surface materials

Following discussion, Members agreed unanimously to reverse the appointed officer's earlier decision and therefore grant planning permission.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

2 October 2019

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 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) and other material considerations in so far as these were pertinent to the determination of the application.

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

The Local Review Body (LRB) noted the prominence of this corner site and considered that the proposal, though not fully compliant with the Council's Householder Development Guide Supplementary Guidance, would be architecturally compatible with its surroundings and would make use of appropriate materials. It was considered that the proposal would not represent overdevelopment of the site nor double its existing footprint or result in any significant adverse impact on the character or amenity of the area, consistent with policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design) and H1 (Residential Areas). It was noted that there are several examples of similar extensions in the surrounding streets and letters of support from neighbouring residents were highlighted. The LRB considered that preserving traditional granite buildings is important but must be balanced against a need to accommodate modern family living.

CONDITIONS

- (1) No development pursuant to this grant of planning permission shall be carried out unless a scheme detailing materials to be used in the roof and walls of the development hereby granted planning permission (including physical samples and details of the block size and coursing pattern for granite walls) has submitted and approved in writing by the planning authority. Thereafter, all works shall be carried out in full accordance with the scheme so agree.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring satisfactory design quality, as required by policy D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan (ALDP).

- **COUNCILLOR MARIE BOULTON, Chairperson.**