

# Public Document Pack



To: Councillor Boulton, Chairperson; and Councillors Allan and Duncan.

Town House,  
ABERDEEN 25 September 2019

## **LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL**

The Members of the **LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL** are requested to meet in **Committee Room 2 - Town House** on **WEDNESDAY, 2 OCTOBER 2019 at 2.00 pm.**

FRASER BELL  
CHIEF OFFICER - GOVERNANCE

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

1.1 Procedure Notice (Pages 3 - 4)

**COPIES OF THE RELEVANT PLANS / DRAWINGS ARE AVAILABLE FOR INSPECTION IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING AND WILL BE DISPLAYED AT THE MEETING**

**MEMBERS PLEASE NOTE THAT THE FOLLOWING LINK WILL TAKE YOU TO THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.**

[Local Development Plan](#)

**TO REVIEW THE DECISION OF THE APPOINTED OFFICER TO REFUSE THE FOLLOWING APPLICATIONS**

**PLANNING ADVISER - GAVIN EVANS**

2.1 60 Cranford Road - Erection of 1.5 Storey Gable Extension and Single Storey Extensions to Rear - 190802/DPP

2.2 Delegated Report, Original Application Form, Decision Notice and Letters of Representation (if there are any) (Pages 5 - 20)

Members, please note that all plans and supporting documents relevant to the review can be viewed online at the following link by entering the application reference number:-

(Ref Number - 190802)

<https://publicaccess.aberdeencity.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=simple&searchType=Application>

2.3 Planning Policies Referred to in Documents Submitted (Pages 21 - 22)

2.4 Notice of Review with Supporting Information Submitted by Applicant / Agent (Pages 23 - 38)

Members, please note that all plans and supporting documents relevant to the review can be viewed online at the following link by entering the application reference number:-

(Ref Number - 190802)

<https://publicaccess.aberdeencity.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=simple&searchType=Application>

2.5 Determination - Reasons for Decision

Members, please note that reasons should be based against Development Plan policies and any other material considerations.

2.6 Consideration of Conditions to be Attached to the Application - if Members are Minded to Over-Turn the Decision of the Case Officer

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

Should you require any further information about this agenda, please contact Mark Masson on [mmasson@aberdeencity.gov.uk](mailto:mmasson@aberdeencity.gov.uk) / tel 01224 522989

## LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

### PROCEDURE NOTE

#### GENERAL


1. The Local Review Body of Aberdeen City Council (the LRB) must at all times comply with (one) the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Schemes of Delegation and Local Review Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2008 (the regulations), and (two) Aberdeen City Council's Standing Orders.
2. In dealing with a request for the review of a decision made by an appointed officer under the Scheme of Delegation adopted by the Council for the determination of "local" planning applications, the LRB acknowledge that the review process as set out in the regulations shall be carried out in stages.
3. As the first stage and having considered the applicant's stated preference (if any) for the procedure to be followed, the LRB must decide how the case under review is to be determined.
4. Once a notice of review has been submitted interested parties (defined as statutory consultees or other parties who have made, and have not withdrawn, representations in connection with the application) will be consulted on the Notice and will have the right to make further representations within 14 days.  
Any representations:
  - made by any party other than the interested parties as defined above (including those objectors or Community Councils that did not make timeous representation on the application before its delegated determination by the appointed officer) or
  - made outwith the 14 day period representation period referred to abovecannot and will not be considered by the Local Review Body in determining the Review.
5. Where the LRB consider that the review documents (as defined within the regulations) provide sufficient information to enable them to determine the review, they may (as the next stage in the process) proceed to do so without further procedure.
6. Should the LRB, however, consider that they are not in a position to determine the review without further procedure, they must then decide which one of (or combination of) the further procedures available to them in terms of the regulations should be pursued. The further procedures available are:-
  - (a) written submissions;
  - (b) the holding of one or more hearing sessions;
  - (c) an inspection of the site.

7. If the LRB do decide to seek further information or representations prior to the determination of the review, they will require, in addition to deciding the manner in which that further information/representations should be provided, to be specific about the nature of the information/representations sought and by whom it should be provided.
8. In adjourning a meeting to such date and time as it may then or later decide, the LRB shall take into account the procedures outlined within Part 4 of the regulations, which will require to be fully observed.

#### DETERMINATION OF REVIEW

9. Once in possession of all information and/or representations considered necessary to the case before them, the LRB will proceed to determine the review.
10. The starting point for the determination of the review by the LRB will be Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, which provides that:-
 

“where, in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the Development Plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”
11. In coming to a decision on the review before them, the LRB will require:-
  - (a) to consider the Development Plan position relating to the application proposal and reach a view as to whether the proposal accords with the Development Plan;
  - (b) to identify all other material considerations arising (if any) which may be relevant to the proposal;
  - (c) to weigh the Development Plan position against the other material considerations arising before deciding whether the Development Plan should or should not prevail in the circumstances.
12. In determining the review, the LRB will:-
  - (a) uphold the appointed officers determination, with or without amendments or additions to the reason for refusal; or
  - (b) overturn the appointed officer’s decision and approve the application **with or without appropriate conditions.**
13. The LRB will give clear reasons for its decision. The Committee clerk will confirm these reasons with the LRB, at the end of each case, in recognition that these will require to be intimated and publicised in full accordance with the regulations.

 <p><b>ABERDEEN</b> CITY COUNCIL</p>	<h2 style="margin: 0;">Strategic Place Planning</h2> <hr/> <p style="margin: 0;">Report of Handling</p>
---	---

<b>Site Address:</b>	60 Cranford Road, Aberdeen, AB10 7NP,
<b>Application Description:</b>	Erection of 1.5 storey gable extension and single storey extensions to rear
<b>Application Ref:</b>	190802/DPP
<b>Application Type:</b>	Detailed Planning Permission
<b>Application Date:</b>	16 May 2019
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr W Russell
<b>Ward:</b>	Airyhall/Broomhill/Garthdee
<b>Community Council:</b>	Braeside and Mannofield
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Nicholas Lawrence

## **RECOMMENDATION**

---

**Refuse**

## **APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

---

### **Site Description**

Number 60 Cranford Road, together with the adjoining number 62, forms a semi-detached 1½ storey bungalow, dating from the inter-war period and adopts a simple villa form. The building in its entirety displays a distinctive hipped roof arrangement (incorporating a pair of matching pitched dormers to the front and rear roof slopes), that is emphasised by large chimneys on the gable elevations. However, since the application as submitted the originating garage to number 60 Cranford Road has been demolished.

Whilst there have been alterations to dwellings in the area, principally to the rear, the dominant character of the area is of bungalows having a simple, unapologetic, and understated urban presence within the street scene.

The simple unassuming and distinctive built form of the bungalows makes a further contribution to the character and appearance to the area at road junctions, where the retention of original hipped roofs creates vistas along the streets that results in a sense of openness.

The site is located within a residential area as shown on the Proposals Map to the Aberdeen City Local Development Plan 2017 (ALDP), to which policy H1 attaches.

### **Relevant Planning History**

Application Number	Proposal	Decision and Date
190572/DPP	Erection of 1.5 storey gable extension; single storey extensions to rear and formation of porch to front	Withdrawn 25.04.2019

## **BACKGROUND AND BASIS OF APPLICATION**

---

### **Background**

Application Reference 190572/DPP sought planning permission for all the elements set out in the current application, save for the incorporation of a porch to the front of the property. As part of the assessment process the Agent was notified by letter of the 15<sup>th</sup> of April 2019 that the proposal could not be supported, albeit, not limited to; firstly, the design of the development (e.g. scale, form, massing and composition); and secondly, impact upon the adjoining dwelling together and the character and appearance of the area. It was considered that the proposal was contrary to the adopted Householder Development Guide Supplementary Guidance (the Guidance), policies D1 and H1 of the Aberdeen Local Development plan (ALDP), together with national guidance.

### **Basis of Application**

As noted above, the development as presented only differs from application reference 190572/DPP by the omission of the porch. The local Planning Authority in correspondence dated the 24<sup>th</sup> of May 2019 welcomed the removal of the porch; however, the reservations previously expressed were re-affirmed. The Application Acknowledgement Letter allows a revision to the proposals in agreement with the Local Planning Authority, without prejudice to the decision-taking process. To this end a sketch with an indicative roof profile, following the form and silhouette of the existing roof, was appended to the letter. A date seeking revisions was set for the 7<sup>th</sup> of June 2019.

The Applicant has not furnished the Local Planning Authority with revised drawings and therefore maintains a divergent view to the guidance offered on the following basis as set out in the originating supporting statement:

- The design is compatible with the existing design and does not overwhelm the original dwelling; and
- Does not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties – will create a feature; and
- Precedent – there are many examples that could be used as a justification - cites Cranford Road; and
- Footprint does not exceed twice the original dwelling and not developed more that 50% of front or rear garden.

It should be noted that the supporting statement only referenced the Guidance and did not seek to address policies D1 and H1 of the ALDP, or national guidance.

## **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

### **Description of the Proposed Development**

In brief, planning permission is sought for the following elements:

- 2 storey lateral half-hipped roof/gable extension including creation of front and rear pitched dormer windows to matching design of existing windows and a single storey rear extension to provide garage, store, and workshop at ground floor level and master bedroom at first

floor level. To facilitate this aspect of the proposed development both the gable chimney and garage is to be demolished.

- Single storey lean-to rear extension to create utility room – some 2.80 metres square with the roof profile rising from 2.80 metres to 3.40 metres where it joins the ‘host’ dwelling. The workshop single storey extension to the garage follows the roof profile and depth of the utility room extension, however, the width is 4.50 metres.

The disposition and appearance of the proposed developmental elements is shown on submitted drawings all prefixed by 1913: 07 Rev A; 08 Rev A; 09 Rev A; and 10 Rev A.

## **Supporting Documents**

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

- Supporting Statement

<https://publicaccess.aberdeencity.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=PRLTTCBZG2H00>

## **CONSULTATIONS**

---

**Braeside and Mannofield Community Council** – No response

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

---

None

## **PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK AND 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, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **National Planning Policy and Guidance**

- 3<sup>rd</sup> National Planning Framework
- Scottish Planning Policy
- Planning Advice Note 67 Housing Quality

### **Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan (2014) (SDP)**

The purpose of the SDP is to set a spatial strategy for the future development of the Aberdeen City and Shire. The general objectives of the plan are promoting economic growth and sustainable economic development which will reduce carbon dioxide production, adapting to the effects of climate change, limiting the use of non-renewable resources, encouraging population growth, maintaining and improving the region’s built, natural and cultural assets, promoting sustainable communities and improving accessibility.

From the 29<sup>th</sup> of March 2019, the Strategic Development Plan 2014 will be beyond its five-year review period. In the light of this, for proposals which are regionally or strategically significant or give rise to cross boundary issues between Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire, the presumption in favour of development that contributes to sustainable development will be a significant material consideration in line with Scottish Planning Policy 2014.

The Aberdeen City Local Development Plan 2017 will continue to be the primary document against which applications are considered. The Proposed Aberdeen City & Shire SDP 2020 may also be a material consideration.

### **Aberdeen City Local Development Plan 2017**

- H1 Residential Areas
- D1 Quality Placemaking by Design

#### *Supplementary Guidance*

- Householder Development Guide

## **EVALUATION**

---

### **ABERDEEN CITY AND SHIRE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN (2014) (SDP)**

In terms of assessment against the SDP, due to the small scale of this proposal it is not considered to be strategic or regionally significant, or require consideration of cross-boundary issues and, therefore, does not require consideration against the SDP.

### **MAIN ISSUES**

Firstly; whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle; secondly, whether the proposal in its detailed form harms host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area; and thirdly, the question of precedent. All issues have regard to the provisions of the ALDP, supporting Guidance and other material considerations.

#### **Principle of the Proposed Development**

ALDP policy H1 supports householder development subject to, in part, that the development does not constitute overdevelopment, does not have an unacceptable impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area, and complies with Supplementary Guidance.

Therefore, the principle of the proposed development is deemed acceptable subject to the provisions of ALDP policy H1, other policies within the ALDP, Supplementary Guidance: Householder Development Guide (the Guidance), together with national guidance and policy.

The proposed development as outlined above has 2 main elements (i.e. lateral roof/gable extension; and single storey rear extensions). The Local Planning Authority is of the view that the only aspect of the proposal at issue relates to the lateral roof/gable extension.

#### **Impact upon the host building and the character and appearance of the area**

The character of an area is more than the visual flow of the type of buildings and their associated materials; it also embraces the juxtapositions between buildings, their setting and the spaces they create.



Both ALDP policies D1 and H1, together with the Guidance seeks to ensure that due regard is had to the impact of a development upon the character and appearance of its environs (i.e. context), which includes impact upon the building in its entirety (i.e. 60 and 62 Cranford Road).

The Guidance notes that modifying only one half of a hipped roof is likely to result in the roof having an unbalanced appearance will not be supported, unless it will not result in any harm the character and appearance of the area, which includes visual amenity.

The policy requirements of the ALDP is founded upon national advice within Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and Planning Advice Note 67 (Housing Quality) which adopt the approach that good design is indivisible from good planning. The latter document comments that local authorities should not abandon any expectation of achieving design quality and notes that *It is in suburban settings that opportunities for good design are most likely to be missed.*

As noted above, the character of the area is suburban in terms of form and setting (i.e. a sense of place) and in any such area there has been a range of architectural responses to the changing needs of the dwellings occupiers. This is most notably expressed by the number of rear extensions to properties immediately to, and in the wider area of the site. Accordingly, the streetscape maintains the character of small villa type bungalows, with symmetrical roof profiles, set back from the road.

The proposed lateral extension will alter the balance of the unaltered pair of dwellings, and this imbalance coupled to the form, mass and detail (dormers / garage) will in turn erode the character and appearance of the area. This aspect of the proposed development would represent an abandonment of seeking to achieve good design (i.e. SPP policy principle – planning should direct the right development to the right place - page 13) The proposal fails to meet the expectations of the 'General Principles' in the Guidance, in that it would overwhelm and dominate the original dwelling – the volume of the extension would be significantly greater than that of the original house, which is more apparent because of its corner location. Consequently, the proposed development would harm not only the host building but also the character and appearance of the area.

The net result of the lateral / gable extension would be producing a residential unit of a distinctly different character to the abutting dwelling and in turn would appear at odds and out of context with its neighbouring dwelling and surroundings. As noted above the dwellings that occupy corner locations at the junctions of roads by their very design (e.g. hipped roofs set back from the road) provide the area with a distinctive aspect of openness. The proposed development by reason of its width and associate roof form, appears cramped within the site (i.e. towards the Cranford Terrace) and has the effect of closing off and removing the characteristic sense of openness attributed to this part of the area. road).

Therefore, the proposed lateral gable/roof extension is contrary to advice set within policies D1 and H1 of the ALDP, the Guidance, as well as advice at the national level within SPP and PAN 67.

## **Precedent**

The Applicant within the supporting statement has drawn the writers' attention to other developments in the locality that have been undertaken. However, each application proposal must be dealt with on its individual merits. Notwithstanding this fact, those extensions were undertaken prior to the adoption of the current ALDP and the Guidance; in addition, the number of such extensions has not eroded the overall character of the area of simple villa styled bungalows of a symmetrical form fronting the street.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

### **Residential Amenity**

The Local Planning Authority has never propounded the position that the scheme will adversely affect residential amenity.

### **Overdevelopment**

The Applicant in the supporting documentation has equated over development to footprint coverage of the proposed development. Whilst the footprint is a consideration in respect of overdevelopment it is not the only one and not the determinative consideration. Overdevelopment in simple terms can be considered as an amount of development (for example the quantity of buildings or intensity of use) that is excessive in terms of demands on infrastructure and services, or impact on local amenity and character.

It is considered that the scale and the proportions of the proposed lateral / gable extension in relation to the existing (i.e. host) dwelling and the building in its entirety would appear as an overdevelopment of the site, would be an incongruous addition to the street scene, and appear as a cramped form of development which would detract from the more spacious character of this part of the area.

It is therefore considered that this aspect of the proposed development is contrary to policies D1, H1, and the Guidance to the ALDP, together with national guidance.

## **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION OF REFUSAL**

---

1. The proposed lateral roof/gable extension by reason of its design, form, mass and composition would harm both the conformation of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, together with the character and appearance of the area contrary to policies D1 and H1, and the Householder Development Guide Supplementary Guidance to the Aberdeen City Local Development Plan 2017, together with national guidance in Scottish Planning Policy and Planning Advice Note 67 on Housing Quality.



Marischal College Planning & Sustainable Development Business Hub 4, Ground Floor North Broad Street Aberdeen AB10 1AB Tel: 01224 523 470 Fax: 01224 636 181 Email: pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk

Applications cannot be validated until all the necessary documentation has been submitted and the required fee has been paid.

Thank you for completing this application form:

ONLINE REFERENCE 100159828-002

The online reference is the unique reference for your online form only. The Planning Authority will allocate an Application Number when your form is validated. Please quote this reference if you need to contact the planning Authority about this application.

## Description of Proposal

Please describe accurately the work proposed: \* (Max 500 characters)

Erection of a 1.5 storey gable extension and single storey extensions to the rear.

Has the work already been started and/ or completed? \*

No  Yes - Started  Yes – Completed

## Applicant or Agent Details

Are you an applicant or an agent? \* (An agent is an architect, consultant or someone else acting on behalf of the applicant in connection with this application)

Applicant  Agent

## Agent Details

Please enter Agent details

Company/Organisation:	Raymond Simpson Associates Ltd		
Ref. Number:	<input type="text"/>	You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
First Name: *	Mark	Building Name:	<input type="text"/>
Last Name: *	Urquhart	Building Number:	7
Telephone Number: *	01224 636707	Address 1 (Street): *	Mid Stocket Road
Extension Number:	<input type="text"/>	Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Mobile Number:	<input type="text"/>	Town/City: *	Aberdeen
Fax Number:	<input type="text"/>	Country: *	United Kingdom
		Postcode: *	AB15 5JL
Email Address: *	mark@raymondsimpson.com		

Is the applicant an individual or an organisation/corporate entity? \*

Individual  Organisation/Corporate entity

## Applicant Details

Please enter Applicant details

Title:	Mr	You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
Other Title:	<input type="text"/>	Building Name:	<input type="text"/>
First Name: *	W	Building Number:	60
Last Name: *	Russell	Address 1 (Street): *	Cranford Road
Company/Organisation	<input type="text"/>	Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number: *	<input type="text"/>	Town/City: *	Aberdeen
Extension Number:	<input type="text"/>	Country: *	Scotland
Mobile Number:	<input type="text"/>	Postcode: *	AB10 7NP
Fax Number:	<input type="text"/>		
Email Address: *	<input type="text"/>		

## Site Address Details

Planning Authority:

Aberdeen City Council

Full postal address of the site (including postcode where available):

Address 1:

60 CRANFORD ROAD

Address 2:

Address 3:

Address 4:

Address 5:

Town/City/Settlement:

ABERDEEN

Post Code:

AB10 7NP

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

Northing

804224

Easting

391998

## Pre-Application Discussion

Have you discussed your proposal with the planning authority? \*

Yes  No

## Pre-Application Discussion Details Cont.

In what format was the feedback given? \*

Meeting  Telephone  Letter  Email

Please provide a description of the feedback you were given and the name of the officer who provided this feedback. If a processing agreement [note 1] is currently in place or if you are currently discussing a processing agreement with the planning authority, please provide details of this. (This will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently.) \* (max 500 characters)

The porch should be removed, the extension is too big and would impact on the adjoining dwelling, the original Planning Application should be withdrawn and revised proposals sent as a Planning Enquiry in the first instance.

Title:

Mr

Other title:

First Name:

Nicholas

Last Name:

Lawrence

Correspondence Reference Number:

190572

Date (dd/mm/yyyy):

22/04/2019

Note 1. A Processing agreement involves setting out the key stages involved in determining a planning application, identifying what information is required and from whom and setting timescales for the delivery of various stages of the process.

## Trees

Are there any trees on or adjacent to the application site? \*

Yes  No

If yes, please mark on your drawings any trees, known protected trees and their canopy spread close to the proposal site and indicate if any are to be cut back or felled.

## Access and Parking

Are you proposing a new or altered vehicle access to or from a public road? \*

Yes  No

If yes, please describe and show on your drawings the position of any existing, altered or new access points, highlighting the changes you proposed to make. You should also show existing footpaths and note if there will be any impact on these.

## Planning Service Employee/Elected Member Interest

Is the applicant, or the applicant's spouse/partner, either a member of staff within the planning service or an elected member of the planning authority? \*

Yes  No

## Certificates and Notices

CERTIFICATE AND NOTICE UNDER REGULATION 15 – TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) (SCOTLAND) REGULATION 2013

One Certificate must be completed and submitted along with the application form. This is most usually Certificate A, Form 1, Certificate B, Certificate C or Certificate E.

Are you/the applicant the sole owner of ALL the land? \*

Yes  No

Is any of the land part of an agricultural holding? \*

Yes  No

## Certificate Required

The following Land Ownership Certificate is required to complete this section of the proposal:

Certificate A

## Land Ownership Certificate

Certificate and Notice under Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013

Certificate A

I hereby certify that –

(1) - No person other than myself/the applicant was an owner (Any person who, in respect of any part of the land, is the owner or is the lessee under a lease thereof of which not less than 7 years remain unexpired.) of any part of the land to which the application relates at the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the accompanying application.

(2) - None of the land to which the application relates constitutes or forms part of an agricultural holding

Signed: Mark Urquhart

On behalf of: Mr W Russell

Date: 16/05/2019

Please tick here to certify this Certificate. \*

## Checklist – Application for Householder Application

Please take a few moments to complete the following checklist in order to ensure that you have provided all the necessary information in support of your application. Failure to submit sufficient information with your application may result in your application being deemed invalid. The planning authority will not start processing your application until it is valid.

- a) Have you provided a written description of the development to which it relates? \*  Yes  No
- b) Have you provided the postal address of the land to which the development relates, or if the land in question has no postal address, a description of the location of the land? \*  Yes  No
- c) Have you provided the name and address of the applicant and, where an agent is acting on behalf of the applicant, the name and address of that agent? \*  Yes  No
- d) Have you provided a location plan sufficient to identify the land to which it relates showing the situation of the land in relation to the locality and in particular in relation to neighbouring land? \*. This should have a north point and be drawn to an identified scale.  Yes  No
- e) Have you provided a certificate of ownership? \*  Yes  No
- f) Have you provided the fee payable under the Fees Regulations? \*  Yes  No
- g) Have you provided any other plans as necessary? \*  Yes  No

Continued on the next page

A copy of the other plans and drawings or information necessary to describe the proposals (two must be selected). \*

You can attach these electronic documents later in the process.

- Existing and Proposed elevations.
- Existing and proposed floor plans.
- Cross sections.
- Site layout plan/Block plans (including access).
- Roof plan.
- Photographs and/or photomontages.

Additional Surveys – for example a tree survey or habitat survey may be needed. In some instances you may need to submit a survey about the structural condition of the existing house or outbuilding.  Yes  No

A Supporting Statement – you may wish to provide additional background information or justification for your Proposal. This can be helpful and you should provide this in a single statement. This can be combined with a Design Statement if required. \*  Yes  No

You must submit a fee with your application. Your application will not be able to be validated until the appropriate fee has been Received by the planning authority.

## Declare – For Householder Application

I, the applicant/agent certify that this is an application for planning permission as described in this form and the accompanying Plans/drawings and additional information.

Declaration Name: Mr Mark Urquhart

Declaration Date: 16/05/2019

This page is intentionally left blank



## **DECISION NOTICE**

### **The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997**

### **Detailed Planning Permission**

Mark Urquhart  
Raymond Simpson Associates Ltd  
7 Mid Stocket Road  
Aberdeen  
AB15 5JL

on behalf of **Mr W Russell**

With reference to your application validly received on 16 May 2019 for the following development:-

**Erection of 1.5 storey gable extension and single storey extensions to rear at 60 Cranford Road, Aberdeen**

Aberdeen City Council in exercise of their powers under the above mentioned Act hereby **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION** for the said development in accordance with the particulars given in the application form and the following plans and documents:

<b>Drawing Number</b>	<b>Drawing Type</b>
1913 - 05	Location Plan
1913 - 07 Rev A	Ground Floor Plan (Proposed)
1913 - 08 Rev A	First Floor Plan (Proposed)
1913 - 09 Rev A	Multiple Elevations (Proposed)
1913 - 10 Rev A	North Elevation (Proposed)
	Planning Statement

#### **REASON FOR DECISION**

The reason on which the Council has based this decision is as follows:-

1.

The proposed lateral roof/gable extension by reason of its design, form, mass and composition would harm both the conformation of the pair of semi-detached

dwellings, together with the character and appearance of the area contrary to policies D1 and H1, and the Householder Development Guide Supplementary Guidance to the Aberdeen City Local Development Plan 2017, together with national guidance in Scottish Planning Policy and Planning Advice Note 67 on Housing Quality.

**Date of Signing** 15 July 2019



**Daniel Lewis**  
Development Management Manager

## **IMPORTANT INFORMATION RELATED TO THIS DECISION**

### **DETAILS OF ANY VARIATION MADE TO ORIGINAL PROPOSAL, AS AGREED WITH APPLICANT (S32A of 1997 Act)**

None.

### **RIGHT OF APPEAL THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997**

If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the planning authority –

- a) to refuse planning permission;
- b) to refuse approval, consent or agreement required by a condition imposed on a grant of planning permission;
- c) to grant planning permission or any approval, consent or agreement subject to conditions,

the applicant may require the planning authority to review the case under section 43A(8) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 within three months from the date of this notice. Any requests for a review must be made on a 'Notice of Review' form available from the planning authority or at [www.eplanning.scot](http://www.eplanning.scot).

Notices of review submitted by post should be sent to Strategic Place Planning (address at the top of this decision notice).

### **SERVICE OF PURCHASE NOTICE WHERE INTERESTS ARE AFFECTED BY A PLANNING DECISION**

If permission to develop land is refused and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any

development that would be permitted, the owners of the land may serve on the planning authority a purchase notice requiring the purchase of the owner of the land's interest in the land in accordance with Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **National Planning Policy**

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)

<https://www.gov.scot/Resource/0045/00453827.pdf>

## **Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan (SDP)**

<http://www.aberdeencityandshire-sdpa.gov.uk/nmsruntime/saveasdialog.aspx?IID=1111&SID=90>

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

D1: Quality Placemaking by Design;

H1: Residential Areas

## **Supplementary Guidance**

Householder Development Guide

<https://www.aberdeencity.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2.1.PolicySG.HouseHoldDesignGuide.pdf>

This page is intentionally left blank



Marischal College Planning & Sustainable Development Business Hub 4, Ground Floor North Broad Street Aberdeen AB10 1AB Tel: 01224 523 470 Fax: 01224 636 181 Email: pi@aberdeencity.gov.uk

Applications cannot be validated until all the necessary documentation has been submitted and the required fee has been paid.

Thank you for completing this application form:

ONLINE REFERENCE            100159828-003

The online reference is the unique reference for your online form only. The Planning Authority will allocate an Application Number when your form is validated. Please quote this reference if you need to contact the planning Authority about this application.

## Applicant or Agent Details

Are you an applicant or an agent? \* (An agent is an architect, consultant or someone else acting on behalf of the applicant in connection with this application)

Applicant  Agent

## Agent Details

Please enter Agent details

Company/Organisation:	Raymond Simpson Associates Ltd		
Ref. Number:		You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
First Name: *	Mark	Building Name:	
Last Name: *	Urquhart	Building Number:	7
Telephone Number: *	01224 636707	Address 1 (Street): *	Mid Stocket Road
Extension Number:		Address 2:	
Mobile Number:		Town/City: *	Aberdeen
Fax Number:		Country: *	United Kingdom
		Postcode: *	AB15 5JL
Email Address: *	mark@raymondsimpson.com		

Is the applicant an individual or an organisation/corporate entity? \*

Individual     Organisation/Corporate entity

## Applicant Details

Please enter Applicant details

Title:	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>	You must enter a Building Name or Number, or both: *	
Other Title:	<input type="text"/>	Building Name:	<input type="text"/>
First Name: *	<input type="text" value="William"/>	Building Number:	<input type="text" value="60"/>
Last Name: *	<input type="text" value="Russell"/>	Address 1 (Street): *	<input type="text" value="Cranford Road"/>
Company/Organisation	<input type="text"/>	Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number: *	<input type="text"/>	Town/City: *	<input type="text" value="Aberdeen"/>
Extension Number:	<input type="text"/>	Country: *	<input type="text" value="Scotland"/>
Mobile Number:	<input type="text"/>	Postcode: *	<input type="text" value="AB10 7NP"/>
Fax Number:	<input type="text"/>		
Email Address: *	<input type="text"/>		

## Site Address Details

Planning Authority:	<input type="text" value="Aberdeen City Council"/>
Full postal address of the site (including postcode where available):	
Address 1:	<input type="text" value="60 CRANFORD ROAD"/>
Address 2:	<input type="text"/>
Address 3:	<input type="text"/>
Address 4:	<input type="text"/>
Address 5:	<input type="text"/>
Town/City/Settlement:	<input type="text" value="ABERDEEN"/>
Post Code:	<input type="text" value="AB10 7NP"/>

Please identify/describe the location of the site or sites

Northing	<input type="text" value="804224"/>	Easting	<input type="text" value="391998"/>
----------	-------------------------------------	---------	-------------------------------------



## Description of Proposal

Please provide a description of your proposal to which your review relates. The description should be the same as given in the application form, or as amended with the agreement of the planning authority: \*  
(Max 500 characters)

Erection of 1.5 storey gable extension and single storey extensions to rear.

## Type of Application

What type of application did you submit to the planning authority? \*

- Application for planning permission (including householder application but excluding application to work minerals).
- Application for planning permission in principle.
- Further application.
- Application for approval of matters specified in conditions.

What does your review relate to? \*

- Refusal Notice.
- Grant of permission with Conditions imposed.
- No decision reached within the prescribed period (two months after validation date or any agreed extension) – deemed refusal.

## Statement of reasons for seeking review

You must state in full, why you are seeking a review of the planning authority's decision (or failure to make a decision). Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. If necessary this can be provided as a separate document in the 'Supporting Documents' section: \* (Max 500 characters)

Note: you are unlikely to have a further opportunity to add to your statement of appeal at a later date, so it is essential that you produce all of the information you want the decision-maker to take into account.

You should not however raise any new matter which was not before the planning authority at the time it decided your application (or at the time expiry of the period of determination), unless you can demonstrate that the new matter could not have been raised before that time or that it not being raised before that time is a consequence of exceptional circumstances.

Please see the statement attached in the supporting documents which sets out our request for a review.

Have you raised any matters which were not before the appointed officer at the time the Determination on your application was made? \*

Yes  No

If yes, you should explain in the box below, why you are raising the new matter, why it was not raised with the appointed officer before your application was determined and why you consider it should be considered in your review: \* (Max 500 characters)

Please provide a list of all supporting documents, materials and evidence which you wish to submit with your notice of review and intend to rely on in support of your review. You can attach these documents electronically later in the process: \* (Max 500 characters)

1.Statement 2. Appendix 1 - Report of Handling 3. Appendix 2 - Decision Notice 4. Appendix 3 - Planning Support Statement 5. Appendix 4 - Letter 1 from Case Officer 6. Appendix 5 - Letter 2 from Case Officer 7. Appendix 6 - Sketch from Case Officer 8. Appendix 7 - Emails to Case Officer 9. Appendix 8 - Letters of Support

## Application Details

Please provide details of the application and decision.

What is the application reference number? \*

190802/DPP

What date was the application submitted to the planning authority? \*

16/05/2019

What date was the decision issued by the planning authority? \*

15/07/2019

## Review Procedure

The Local Review Body will decide on the procedure to be used to determine your review and may at any time during the review process require that further information or representations be made to enable them to determine the review. Further information may be required by one or a combination of procedures, such as: written submissions; the holding of one or more hearing sessions and/or inspecting the land which is the subject of the review case.

Can this review continue to a conclusion, in your opinion, based on a review of the relevant information provided by yourself and other parties only, without any further procedures? For example, written submission, hearing session, site inspection. \*

Yes  No

In the event that the Local Review Body appointed to consider your application decides to inspect the site, in your opinion:

Can the site be clearly seen from a road or public land? \*

Yes  No

Is it possible for the site to be accessed safely and without barriers to entry? \*

Yes  No

## Checklist – Application for Notice of Review

Please complete the following checklist to make sure you have provided all the necessary information in support of your appeal. Failure to submit all this information may result in your appeal being deemed invalid.

Have you provided the name and address of the applicant?. \*

Yes  No

Have you provided the date and reference number of the application which is the subject of this review? \*

Yes  No

If you are the agent, acting on behalf of the applicant, have you provided details of your name and address and indicated whether any notice or correspondence required in connection with the review should be sent to you or the applicant? \*

Yes  No  N/A

Have you provided a statement setting out your reasons for requiring a review and by what procedure (or combination of procedures) you wish the review to be conducted? \*

Yes  No

Note: You must state, in full, why you are seeking a review on your application. Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. You may not have a further opportunity to add to your statement of review at a later date. It is therefore essential that you submit with your notice of review, all necessary information and evidence that you rely on and wish the Local Review Body to consider as part of your review.

Please attach a copy of all documents, material and evidence which you intend to rely on (e.g. plans and Drawings) which are now the subject of this review \*

Yes  No

Note: Where the review relates to a further application e.g. renewal of planning permission or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition or where it relates to an application for approval of matters specified in conditions, it is advisable to provide the application reference number, approved plans and decision notice (if any) from the earlier consent.

## **Declare – Notice of Review**

I/We the applicant/agent certify that this is an application for review on the grounds stated.

Declaration Name: Mr Mark Urquhart

Declaration Date: 23/08/2019

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING APPLICATION (ref190802/DPP) - Erection of 1.5 storey gable extension and single storey extensions to rear of dwellinghouse at 60 Cranford Road, Aberdeen, AB10 7NP**

**Applicant – Mr W Russell**

Request for review of refusal of planning application for the erection of extensions to the gable and rear of the dwellinghouse at 60 Cranford Road, Aberdeen.

Statement to accompany the Notice of Review.

**Introduction**

This Notice of Review has been prepared by Raymond Simpson Associates Ltd on behalf of Mr W Russell to support the request for review under the terms of Section 43A (8) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 and Regulation 9 of the Town and Country Planning (Schemes of Delegation and Local Review Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013, against the refusal by Aberdeen City Council to grant full planning permission for the construction of extensions to the side and rear of the dwellinghouse at 60 Cranford Road, Aberdeen.

**Site**

The application property is located on an end plot at the junction of Cranford Road, running North West to South East, and Cranford Terrace running North East to South West. The streetscape comprises predominantly semi-detached dwellings built in granite with slate roofs and dormer windows. There are many examples of extension work done over the years. The Cranford Care Centre, which is a purpose built care home, 2 storeys in height and finished with blockwork/harled walls and slate roofs set behind a wall and screened to a large extent by trees and shrubs is situated directly across Cranford Road.

The site does not lie within a conservation area.

The application site which extends to 405 square metres comprises a dwelling and until recently a lean-to garage attached to the gable facing Cranford Terrace, with its frontage, facing Cranford Road. The building measured 10 metres in length with the garage in place and 8.1 metres in height to the ridge of the dwelling. The site is screened to the rear by blockwork walls to Cranford Terrace, timber fences and hedges between neighbours and is enclosed at the Cranford Road frontage by a low level granite wall. The garden areas are laid to lawn with various planting beds, a slabbed drive way and concrete patio area to the rear.

The existing dwelling is semi-detached, one and a half storeys in height with a slated, hipped roof and dormer windows front and back. The walls are finished in granite block with timber windows and doors. Unfortunately the house was engulfed by fire in November 2017 leaving the interior and exterior in a poor and unsightly condition. To the side of the dwelling there was a lean-to garage which has recently been demolished. This garage was built using synthetic stone to the front, blockwork/ harling to rest of the elevations and a corrugated asbestos roof over. The garage had been

damaged in the fire and was in poor structural condition with several cracks visible on the walls. Photographs below show the house with the garage in place and the current position with the garage having been removed.



## Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission to extend the existing dwelling out to the side and to the rear. The extension to the side will be 1.3 metres wider than the garage which previously occupied the site and project 2.8 metres beyond the rear wall of the house to accommodate a more usable garage and a small workshop and store for domestic purposes behind the garage.

There will be a master bedroom with an ensuite bathroom formed at first floor level above the new garage. This will be contained solely within the width of the existing house. The workshop will be contained within a single storey element with a very low pitched roof.

The gable extension will be built on the same building line as the existing house to the front and project 4.5 metres to the side of the existing house, giving a total frontage of 11.3 metres. This means that the width of the house facing Cranford Road will be increased by 1.3 metres. There will still be 1.5 metres between the enlarged house and the boundary with Cranford Terrace.

The ridge and eaves level of the existing dwelling will project through to maintain identical heights, with an additional dormer window constructed at both the front and back to replicate the existing dormers. The roof will be finished in slate, over the main extension, with the rear extension roof finished using Sarnafil. The front wall to Cranford Road and gable to Cranford Terrace will be built using granite to continue the traditional finish, whilst the rear which will have a rendered finish.

A second, very modest single storey extension, projecting 2.8 metres out from the rear wall of the house will be built on the opposite side of the rear elevation. This is on the boundary with no. 62 Cranford Road, the adjoining semi-detached dwellinghouse. This part of the proposal contains a utility room. A small patio will be formed between the two rear projections. The Report of Handling states that no objection has been raised by the Appointed Officer to this aspect of the proposals.

The existing vehicular access and parking area will remain the same, as will the majority of the garden space.

No objections were received to the application from neighbours nor were there any adverse comments from consultees including Braeside and Mannofield Community Council.

The applicant has received 4 letters of support from neighbours since planning permission was refused. These are referred to in more detail later in this statement.



## **RESPONSE TO REPORT OF HANDLING AND REASONS FOR REFUSAL**

The decision notice gives one reason for refusal:

*'The proposed lateral roof/gable extension by reason of its design, form, mass and composition would harm both the conformation of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, together with the character and appearance of the area contrary to policies D1 and H1, and the Householder Development Guide Supplementary Guidance to the Aberdeen City Local Development Plan 2017, together with national guidance in Scottish Planning Policy and Planning Advice Note 67 on Housing Quality'.*

In addressing the grounds for refusal it is necessary to respond to the Report of Handling.

A copy of the Report of Handling is produced as appendix 1 and of the Refusal Notice as appendix 2. A copy of the Supporting Statement submitted with the planning application is attached as appendix 3. The Supporting Statement includes photographs of the site as it existed before the garage was demolished, photographs of the wider area as well as drawings of the proposed extension and an explanation of the rationale for the form of the extension. This is discussed later in this statement.

It is interesting to note that the Appointed Officer has used the word conformation in the refusal notice. We have not experienced the word used in this way before. Conformation generally relates to the shape or structure of an object and as such it is believed that the Appointed Officer does not have concerns about the proposed external finishes of natural granite on the street elevations, roughcast on the rear and slated roof.

### **Relevant Planning History and Background to Application**

The Report of Handling describes the background to the application. That section of the Report does not give a complete picture of the position. The Report states correctly that the application follows an earlier application ref 190572/DPP for the same development but which including also a front porch on the Cranford Road frontage of the property. The Council advised us by letter dated 15 April 2019 that the application could not be supported for the reasons set out in the letter (appendix 4). In order to try to make progress on the matter and following a telephone conversation with the case officer our client agreed to withdraw that application. This meant that he gave up any appeal rights in respect of the first application but this was done under the impression that there would be a meaningful dialogue with the case officer and that a suitable scheme which the Council would support could be prepared.

The current application which is the subject of this review removes the front porch from the proposals which had appeared to be a significant stumbling block on the first application. The application which is the subject of this Review was submitted on 16 May 2019. We received a response to the application by letter dated 24 May 2019 (appendix 5) in which we were pleased to see that the removal of the front porch was considered to be most welcome and that the proposal was considered by the Council to have no impact on residential amenity. We were extremely concerned, however, that the response from the Council included a freehand sketch (appendix 6) of the form of gable extension which the planning officer would be willing to support.



We were extremely surprised by the sketch for a number of reasons. Firstly the sketch would not have met the applicant's brief and requirements in any way whatsoever as it would only allow the formation of a small boxroom at the first floor level rather than a bedroom and ensuite bathroom. Essentially it suggested a fundamentally different development from that proposed. Secondly the form of extension suggested by the planning officer differs from that of all of the other extensions within the neighbourhood whereas the proposals which were submitted are of very similar design to many extensions within the area.

We sought to explain our concerns and to discuss the matter further with the case officer in order to try to reach a solution suitable to both parties. We contacted him by email on 2 separate occasions for an update (appendix 7) but received neither an acknowledgement nor response to either of these emails. In reality we were denied the opportunity to have a meaningful dialogue with the planning officer.

### **Planning Policy Framework and Evaluation of Application**

The Report of Handling describes the main issues which require to be considered in the determination of the application. It is agreed that the issues are solely related to those of design and appearance of the proposed extension. The Report of Handling assesses design in detail in terms of national and local planning policy.

### **National Policy and Strategic Development Plan**

The Report of Handling concludes that *'due to the small scale of this proposal it is not considered to be strategic or regionally significant, or require consideration of cross-boundary issues and, therefore, does not require consideration against the SDP'*

It is agreed that this is clearly the case.

The Report of Handling makes reference to National Planning Policy and Guidance namely the 3<sup>rd</sup> National Planning Framework, Scottish Planning Policy and Planning Advice Note 67: Housing Quality.

It is submitted that it is simply incorrect for the Appointed Officer to refer to Planning Advice Note 67 (PAN 67); Housing Quality in the manner which he has done and to include it in the reason for refusal. PAN 67 was issued in 2003 to support the Government's document 'Designing Places' which was issued in 2001 and set out the Government's aspirations for improving the quality and design of new housing. PAN 67 states that: *This Planning Advice Note (PAN) explains how Designing Places should be applied to new housing.* It does not give advice on how existing properties might be altered or adapted but rather advises on new developments in a much broader urban context. 'Designing Places' was superseded by Scottish Planning Policy in 2014 although PAN 67 remains as extant advice for new housing developments.

Scottish Planning Policy supports development that is distinctive, safe, pleasant, welcoming, adaptable, resource efficient and easy to move around and beyond. The 3<sup>rd</sup> National Planning Framework sets out a vision for the long term spatial development of the country and really provides little guidance for determining minor applications of the type under consideration for an extension to a dwellinghouse within an established residential area. The Report of Handling does not actually refer to the 3<sup>rd</sup> National

Planning Framework in the evaluation of the application despite listing it as a relevant policy. It is our belief that the proposal for a well-designed extension to an existing house, contained solely within the garden area attached to the house and of a scale and form similar to other extensions on identical properties at a number of locations in an established residential area does not raise any issues which suggests it conflicts with national policy.

### **Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017**

Development Plans are required to be consistent with national policy. It is the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017 (ALDP) which sets out detailed policy and provides the detailed guidance against which the application requires to be assessed.

It is agreed that the relevant policies are those set out in the Report of Handling namely Policies D1: Quality Placemaking and Design and H1: Residential Areas together with the Supplementary Guidance: Householder Development Guide which forms part of the Development Plan.

Policy D1 is a city wide policy requiring development to meet high standards of design and have a strong and distinctive sense of place. Proposals will be considered against the following six essential qualities - distinctive, welcoming, safe and pleasant, easy to move around, adaptable, resource efficient. I.e. it reaffirms the design principles in Scottish Planning Policy.

Policy H1 states that within existing residential areas (H1 on the Local Development Plan Proposals Map) and within new residential developments, proposals for new development and householder development will be approved in principle if they:

1. do not constitute over development;
2. do not have an unacceptable impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area
3. do 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. comply with Supplementary Guidance.

The Householder Development Guide contains further, more detailed requirements and lists the following general principles.

*1. Proposals for extensions, dormers and other 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 and should be visually subservient in terms of height, mass and scale.*

*2. No extension or alteration should result in a situation where the amenity of any neighbouring properties would be adversely affected. Significant adverse impact on privacy, daylight and general amenity will count against a development proposal.*

*3. No existing extensions, dormers or other alterations which were approved prior to the introduction of this supplementary guidance will be considered by the planning authority to provide justification for a development proposal which would otherwise fail to comply with the guidance set out in this document.*

4. *The built footprint of a dwelling house as extended should not exceed twice that of the original dwelling.*

5. *No more than 50% of the front or rear curtilage shall be covered by development.*

The Householder Development Guide also states in section 3.1.8 when referring to Roof Extensions

*The practice of extending a hipped roof on one half of a pair of semi-detached houses to terminate at a raised gable will not generally be accepted unless:*

- *The other half of the building has already been altered in this way;*

*Or*

- *Such a proposal would not, as a result of the existing streetscape and character of the buildings therein, result in any adverse impact on the character or visual amenity of the wider area.*

The detailed requirements contained within the Supplementary Guidance were discussed in the Supporting Statement submitted with the application and the proposal analysed in detail against all of these requirements.

### **Response to Evaluation of the Application in the Report of Handling**

The Report of Handling identifies the three main issues to be the following:

- (1) Whether or not the development is acceptable in principle.
- (2) Whether in its detailed form the development harms the host dwelling and character and appearance of the area.
- (3) The question of precedent.

It is a matter of law that these issues have to be considered with regard to the provisions of the Development Plan and other material considerations.

These issues will be addressed in turn.

(1) The Report of Handling considers that the erection of an extension to an existing dwellinghouse in an area allocated H1 in the ALDP is acceptable in principle. This is clearly the case.

(2) The Report of Handling confirms that the only aspect of the proposal which is at issue relates to the roof and side extension. The Report of Handling refers to the requirements in Policies D1 and H1 of the ALDP together with the Householder Development Guide for development to have regard to its impact upon on the character and appearance of its environs which includes the impact on the building i.e. 60 Cranford Road and the adjoining semi-detached house at number 62.

The Supplementary Guidance: Householder Development Guide does not preclude the altering of a hipped roof on one half of a pair of semi-detached houses as proposed so long as it does not result in an adverse impact on the character of the area. What is being proposed has been done at a number of properties in close proximity to the application property (on Cranford Road, Cranford Terrace, Morningside Gardens, Morningside Road). Indeed the pair of semi-detached houses at 79 and 81 Cranford Road and at 4 and 6 Cranford Terrace, directly opposite the side of the application

property each have had the gables of one of the pair of houses altered in a manner similar to that proposed.

Whilst the description of the general area in the Report of Handling as suburban in character with a range of architectural responses to the changing needs of residents is agreed it is felt that the contention that the number of rear extensions has ensured that the street scene maintains the character of the area with houses with 'symmetrical roof profiles set back from the road' does not reflect the position accurately. Rear extensions have tended to be single storey in nature whilst properties which have additional bedroom accommodation at first floor level have tended to be extended on their gable elevations. As mentioned above a number of houses in close proximity have had one of a pair of semi-detached houses altered thus meaning the blocks are no longer symmetrical. This is now part of the character of the area.

There is no suggestion in the Report of Handling that these existing examples of one of a pair of semi-detached houses being altered adversely affects the appearance of the wider area or the neighbouring, attached property.

In practical terms the question of symmetry is only really obvious for people viewing the houses from the opposite side of the street and generally directly opposite. In views along the street this feature is not readily noticeable.

In the particular case at number 60 and 62 Cranford Road the hipped end of number 62 is seen against the raised gable of number 64 which reduces any visual impact whilst on the opposite side of Cranford Road there are no houses directly facing the application property but rather the Cranford Care Centre set in secluded grounds behind a wall and boundary trees.

The erection of an extension in the form proposed makes a very efficient use of the site, minimizes the loss of usable garden space and has a much less impact on the neighbouring property at number 62 than a rear extension to provide extra bedroom space would involve.

The Appointed Officer raises particular concerns about the proposed extension being on a corner site. Cranford Terrace which runs along the side boundary of the application site only has houses fronting the street on its north side. On its south side, in addition to the application property, are the side elevations of 2 houses at the top of Morningside Gardens and then at the far end of Cranford Terrace one at its junction with Morningside Road. One of the houses at the top of Morningside Gardens and that at Morningside Road already have extensions of the type proposed. A further, similar extension will respect the established character of the area.

The Appointed Officer argues that the extension will produce a feeling of 'closing off' and loss of the open character of the area. The extension will, in fact, be set some 1.5 metres inside the boundary wall which will be retained and will be in a similar relationship to the boundary of Cranford Terrace as that of the gable extension on the house in Morningside Gardens immediately to the rear of the application site. It is clear that that property does not result in the closing off of views along the street and neither will the proposed extension at 60 Cranford Terrace.

The removal of the garage which had roughcast walls and an asbestos roof and the erection of an extension with a new granite gable with slated roof above will produce a much more attractive feature incorporating high quality, traditional materials which will turn the corner in a more pleasing manner as well as providing a feature at the end of the line of houses.

This demonstrates that, contrary to the Report of Handling, the extension of the roof is consistent with what has been done on other corner sites within the area and as it will improve the appearance of the wider area it is felt that the proposal complies with Policies D1, H1, Supplementary Guidance and Scottish Planning Policy. It is interesting to note that the resident of 2 Cranford Terrace who looks directly at the site considers that the extension will improve his outlook and amenity.

(3) In regard to the question of precedent the Report of Handling considers that the number of similar extensions has not eroded the overall character of the area of 'simple villa styled bungalows of a symmetrical form fronting the street'. In other words existing developments of the type proposed are considered by the Appointed Officer to retain the character of the area. There is no suggestion that one further similar extension will tilt the balance so that the appearance or amenity of the area will be harmed.

Whilst the general character of the area is one of one and a half storey granite and slate houses this is not entirely the case as directly across Cranford Road from the application site is the Cranford Care Centre. The existing extensions of the type proposed form part of the character of the area. It does not matter that they were approved before the adoption of the current Supplementary Guidance: Householder Development Guide in the sense that the planning system requires to consider the impact of a proposal in comparison to the existing situation. It is incorrect to suggest that the current Guidelines mean that the decisions taken before their adoption have no bearing on the application.

## **Other Issues**

### **Residential Amenity**

The conclusion by the Appointed Officer that the development will have no adverse impact on residential amenity is welcomed and agreed.

### **Overdevelopment**

It is agreed that overdevelopment does not relate solely to the footprint of the proposed development. Nevertheless site coverage is an important indicator of possible overdevelopment. Indeed it is used in two of the five general principles (numbers 4 and 5) of the Supplementary Guidance. The application meets both of these specific, detailed requirements. The built footprint of the enlarged house will exceed that of the original by 98% whilst the Guidance places a general limit of 100%. Only 9.5% of the rear garden will be covered by new development whilst there is a general limit of 50%.

In terms of the question of volume of the building being an indicator of overdevelopment the extension maintains the eaves lines of the original house on the front and rear elevations whilst the height and roof slope is the same as that of the

original house. The Appointed Officer has not considered other similar extensions to have resulted in overdevelopment of sites or to have harmed the character of the area.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

The applicant wishes to upgrade the house to form a 3 bedroom family house suitable for modern living requirements for his own use. As such he has no wish to detract from the appearance of either his property or of the wider area.

It is felt that the foregoing demonstrates that the proposal has been designed in a careful manner to respect its context. It is of a scale, form and design similar to several other existing nearby extensions from which it has taken its cue. A number of semi-detached houses have one half of the block with the gable altered in the manner proposed. In the case of blocks which have both gables altered this has frequently been done at different times. If the Council does not allow one half of a block to be altered this will generally mean that this form of extension, which maintains the character and appearance of the area, will not be able to be done by other property owners in the future thus significantly limiting the ability of householders to adapt houses to meet modern expectations.

The proposed extension upgrades a fire damaged house to provide an attractive 3 bedroom family home to meet modern living requirements. Not only were there no objections received to the application but 4 neighbours have now taken the trouble to discuss the proposals with the applicant and express their support for the proposal (appendix 8).

It is felt that this statement demonstrates that the proposal complies with Policies D1 and H1 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan as well as with Scottish Planning Policy. It is hoped, therefore, that the Local Review Body will overturn the decision taken by the Appointed Officer and grant planning permission thus allowing the refurbishment and sensitive alteration of a fire damaged dwellinghouse to form an attractive 3 bedroom family house.