

# Public Document Pack



To: Councillor Boulton, Chairperson; and Councillors Copland and Donnelly.

Town House,  
ABERDEEN 27 February 2019

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

The Members of the **LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL** are requested to meet for a site visit on **THURSDAY, 7 MARCH 2019 at 9.30 am, leaving the Town House reception and then returning to the Town House for deliberation.**

FRASER BELL  
CHIEF OFFICER - GOVERNANCE

### **BUSINESS**

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 Erection of single storey extension and garage to side and rear - 1 Argyll Crescent Aberdeen - 181557

2.2 Delegated Report, Original Application Form, Decision Notice and Letters of Representation (Pages 5 - 26)

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:-

181557

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

2.3 Planning Policies Referred to in Documents Submitted (Pages 27 - 28)

2.4 Notice of Review with Supporting Information Submitted by Applicant / Agent (Pages 29 - 36)

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:-

181557

<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 Lynsey McBain on [lymcbain@aberdeencity.gov.uk](mailto:lymcbain@aberdeencity.gov.uk) / tel 01224 522123

## 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 in recognition that these will require to be intimated and publicised in full accordance with the regulations.



## Strategic Place Planning

Report of Handling

<b>Site Address:</b>	1 Argyll Crescent, Aberdeen, AB25 2HW,
<b>Application Description:</b>	Erection of single storey extension and garage to side and rear
<b>Application Ref:</b>	181557/DPP
<b>Application Type:</b>	Detailed Planning Permission
<b>Application Date:</b>	10 September 2018
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr And Mrs Alan Caldow
<b>Ward:</b>	Mid Stocket/Rosemount
<b>Community Council:</b>	Rosemount And Mile End
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Sheila Robertson

### **RECOMMENDATION**

---

Refuse

### **APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

---

#### **Site Description**

The application property, which comprises a late 19<sup>th</sup> Century, 2 storeys, end terraced dwelling, designed by JB Pirie and A Clyne, and is built of pink and grey granite. The property forms part of a Category “B” listed convex terrace of 13 nearly symmetrical dwellings sharing a private drive and gardens to the front elevations, set back from and located at the junction of Westburn Drive and Westburn Road. The curve of the terrace creates rear gardens which are arranged in a radial plan, with segmental private gardens and a communal green to the apex. To the rear of the dwelling, there is a single storey annexe which wraps around part of the western gable, to provide an entrance door to the side, and kitchen to the rear. The annexe is single storey with a hipped pitched roof; advanced to the right of the ground floor; projects approximately 5.3m from the rear building line; and is 6.3m in width including a 1.6m projection to the gable. The site is bound to the east by a neighbouring terraced dwelling, to the south by Westburn Road, to the north by a shared private garden ground area and to the west by a private lane. An access has been formed in the western boundary wall to permit car parking within the rear garden. The site is located within the Rosemount and Westburn Conservation Area.

#### **Relevant Planning History**

Two applications for planning permission and listed building consent (982034) and (990486) for replacement windows, internal alterations and a double garage were refused in 1999. An application for Listed Building Consent/Planning Permission (000418) was refused in 2000 for a single garage, extension to dwelling house, alteration to boundary wall, formation of driveway and erection of gates. An application for Listed Building Consent/Planning permission (001148) for a driveway, alterations to boundary wall and erection of gates was approved in 2000. An application for Listed Building Consent/Planning Permission (021614) to erect a garage was refused in 2002. Listed Building Consent (070434) was granted in 2007 for a replacement door. Planning

permission (140817) was granted in 2014 to remove an existing attached shed and replace with 2 free standing sheds to the east and west of the rear extension.

## **APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

---

### **Description of Proposal**

Erection of a single storey extension projecting 7m from the rear of the existing annexe, extending across its full width and 1.4m beyond its western gable, giving a total width of 7.5m. It would sit 1.4m off the western boundary wall which is 1.6m in height. The extension would result in a rear annexe with a total projection of 12.3m from the main body of the house. The roof ridge height, eaves and roof profile would replicate those of the existing annexe although the extra width of the extension would require the roof to sit at right angles to the original roof. The extension would incorporate a single garage, to the immediate rear of the existing annexe, utilising the existing access from the lane, thereafter a sun room and utility room linked to the kitchen by a corridor, running along the eastern side of the extension behind the proposed garage, the opening formed from an existing window to the rear of the annexe. The rear wall of the existing annexe would be retained to form the inner wall of the proposed garage. The proposed extension would be constructed of coursed granite and natural slate; to the western elevation is proposed a single timber garage door with timber clad panels above and an external door to the utility room; the proposed north elevation have extensive timber framed glazed doors; and the proposed eastern elevation would have a single window, high level windows with timber cladding below and full height glazing towards the extremity, wrapping around to meet the rear glazed doors.

The original submission proposed replacement of all windows to the main dwelling however this element has been removed from the proposal.

### **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=PEH7Z0BZ00D00>

## **CONSULTATIONS**

---

**ACC - Roads Development Management Team** – Comments received - Object to the proposal on the grounds that the internal length of the garage (5550mm) would not meet the minimum acceptable length of 5700mm, as required by the guidance contained in the Transport and Accessibility Guide. Current off-street parking is provided within the rear garden with the potential to accommodate 2 parked cars. The existing dwelling has 3 bedrooms which require the provision of 2 off-street parking spaces. The development would result in the removal of the existing parking facilities and replacement by a garage of substandard length, which would not count towards the parking provision therefore resulting in the property providing no off-street parking spaces.

**Rosemount and Mile End Community Council** – No comments received.

## **REPRESENTATIONS**

---

2 representations have been received (1 objection and 1 neutral). The matters raised can be summarised as follows –

- Seeks confirmation that the existing access from the lane will not be enlarged and that no new entry is to be made in the boundary wall.
- Objects on the basis that the application incorrectly states that there are no trees on or adjacent to the site and that the SG: Trees and Woodlands states that all trees within a development site and within 15m of the site must be shown on the plans.

## **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.

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

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) and Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement (HESPS)

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

Policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design), D4 (Historic Environment) and H1 (Residential Areas)

### **Other Material Considerations**

Supplementary Guidance (SG) - Householder Development Guide and Transport and Accessibility and Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement Managing Change – Extensions

## **EVALUATION**

---

### **Principle of Development**

While the principle of extending an existing dwelling is normally acceptable within a residentially zoned area such as this, the proposal must also be assessed in terms of factors such as scale, materials, design, location, setting of the Listed Building and impact on the character and amenity of the area and effect on residential amenity. Development within a Conservation Area should have a neutral or positive effect on its character. These issues are assessed in the evaluation below.

### **Design and Scale**

General principles contained in the HDG expects all development to be architecturally compatible in design and scale with the original house and its surrounding area, and any extension should not serve to overwhelm or dominate the original form or appearance of the dwelling. No extension or alteration should result in a situation where the amenity of any neighbouring properties would be adversely affected. Certain elements of the proposed extension are considered to be acceptable in terms of the HDG as both the resultant increase on the overall footprint and level of site coverage would be within acceptable levels. However, the proposal fails to comply with several of the criteria which promote good design, and retention of the characteristics of the surrounding built environment which contribute towards the character and identity of an area, for the reasons discussed below.

The Statement of Special Interest in the list description asserts '*one of the most unusual features of Argyll Crescent is the planning. The smooth convex curve of the terrace, with private drive and gardens in front encloses the gardens which are arranged in a radial plan, with a segmental drying green at the apex, forming a unique and complete design*'. The rear elevations of the dwellings within the terrace are relatively unaltered since originally built and the majority retain their original rear wash-house annexes. At the rear of Nos 3, 9 and 11 Argyll Crescent modest contemporary extensions, replacing their original off shoots, have been permitted with the maximum projection of 4.5m from the main house. Their projections were specifically designed to minimise the impact on the character of their parent buildings and the wider crescent. Their design is generally of a contemporary style, with flat roofs and granite salvaged from the demolition of the annexes giving a sympathetic complementary addition which contrast clearly as a modern addition to the existing

building. This design approach accords with section 3.5 of the Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions.

The proposed extension, sited at a prominent location at the edge of the conservation area adjoining Westburn Road, is not considered to be subordinate in scale to the footprint and volume of the existing listed building. It would result in a rear annexe that would dominate the rear elevation of the building and substantially impact on views along the rear of the crescent, which is a key feature defining the 'special character' of the listed building and its setting. The proposal would cumulatively result in a rear annexe with a total projection of 12.3m from the rear building line of the dwelling, compared to the 9.8m depth of the dwelling and substantially greater in projection to all other rear annexes within the crescent. The extension would add 55sq.m to the existing footprint, which would cumulatively increase the footprint of the annexe to 88sq.m. compared to the 95sq.m footprint of the main dwelling. The proposed extension therefore does not represent a subservient rear extension and would therefore be contrary to the guidance contained in both the HDG and Managing Change document, which require that any extension should play a subordinate role and should neither dominate the original building as a result of its scale, materials or location.

Whilst located to the side and rear elevations, the proposed extension would be highly visible from the side lane and its form and volume would impact on the special character of the sweep of the terrace visible from this viewpoint. One of the key elements of the crescent is the long segmental rear gardens, the scale of the proposal would fill a large part of the rear garden space, reducing the sense of openness and cut across views of the rear elevation of the terrace, thereby undermining and detracting from the overall unique form of the crescent to the rear. The scale and projection of the proposed extension would dominate the rear elevation of the listed building, and substantially impact on views along the rear of the crescent which would not preserve the pattern of the wider historic environment as required by HESPS (Sections 1.09 b 1.20 d) and Policy D4.

HESPS also requires that new developments are sensitive to historic character and attain high standards in design and construction, while recognising the portfolio of original building materials (Section 1.20 d). The proposal largely follows a traditional construction approach to the extension with limited architectural refinement to a category B listed building, however notwithstanding the consideration on the form and volume of the proposal, the materials specification does not clarify the type of granite to be used (e.g. reclaimed to match the rear elevation of the existing building); the ridge covering (e.g. lead or yellow clay ridge tiles); type of timber cladding and finish and materials for rainwater goods (e.g. cast iron especially on the lane facing elevation).

The proposal would result in poor and inappropriate relationship between the resultant rear extension and the rear elevation of the dwelling due to the extensions' excessive projection and width which would result in a rear annexe that would be out of proportion relative to the dwellings original form and layout and would therefore not protect the character and appearance of the building. The design of the extension, in terms of volume and detail, therefore does not make a positive contribution to the special character of the place and the existing building's rear elevation, fails to take clear design cues from the original architectural design or act as an assertively contrasting addition to the original building. As a result, the proposed extension would negatively impact on the original character and setting of the listed building and the wider conservation area. Policies D1 and D4 of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan require high quality design that respects the character, appearance and setting of the historic environment and protects the special architectural or historic interest of its listed buildings, conservation areas and historic gardens and designed landscapes and it is therefore considered that the proposals do not accord with the Council's policy

### **Impact on residential character and amenity**



Although the proposed extension would not result in any detrimental impact to the nearest neighbouring property, to the immediate east, in terms of loss of day light or overshadowing, nor impact on their current privacy levels, the proposal would result in an elongated structure extending 12.9m beyond that property's rear building line. This neighbouring property sits on a slightly lower elevation, and the boundary line is splayed. The existing annexe is positioned 3.1m from the mutual boundary however at its furthest extremity; the new extension would sit only 1.7m from the mutual boundary. Given that the neighbour has a projecting annexe running along their eastern boundary, the proposed extension would result in a situation whereby the neighbouring property would become 'hemmed in' as a result of the extension's excessive projection in close proximity to the mutual boundary and which would not protect that neighbour's outlook and amenity. Its scale, massing and projection would also introduce an intrusive element into the streetscape leading to an adverse impact and erosion to the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area, thereby negatively affecting residential amenity, contrary to Policy H1.

### **Parking provision**

Although the proposed garage would fail to meet the standards contained in the SG: Transport and Accessibility in terms of internal length, the garage as proposed could still accommodate an average length car, and given the availability of on street parking space within the private lane, it is considered that this is sufficient justification to accept the level of parking to be provided, contrary to the above guidance and despite the comments received from officers in Roads Development Management. This matter itself would not constitute a reason for refusal, given the minimal nature of the shortfall does not raise any specific road safety issues.

### **Impact on the Conservation Area**

Policy D4 of the ALDP states that proposals affecting conservation areas will only be permitted if they comply with SPP which states proposals for development within conservation areas should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. For the reasons explained above, the proposed extension has not been designed with due consideration to its context, and would negatively affect the character of the conservation area contrary to the aims of SPP, HESPS and therefore with Policy D4 of the ALDP.

### **Matter raised in Representation**

It is the responsibility of the applicant, or the appointed agent, to ensure that accurate information is provided on the application form. In the case of a Householder application, if an applicant states that there are no trees on or adjacent to the application site and it is subsequently established that there are trees on or close to the site, it is then for the planning authority to consider whether it is necessary to request the applicant to provide further information on the trees. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Trees and Woodland SG states that "*all trees on a development site, and within 15 metres of a site must be shown on the plans...*", in this instance, this information was not requested as it is not considered likely that the construction of the extension would be significantly within the root protection area of any trees within the rear garden or that of neighbouring properties and there would be no material impact on their viability, which the SG seeks to protect.

It is acknowledged that the boundary wall is included in the listing of the property however the plans do not indicate any alterations to the existing western boundary wall. Any such alterations would always require submission of an application for Listed Building Consent and Planning Permission.

### **Conclusion**

The unsympathetic and inappropriate design, projection and width of the proposed extension and its poor relationship to the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and terrace would prevent the proposal from being compatible in terms of design, detail and scale with the original dwelling, contrary to the guidance contained in the HDG. The extension has not been designed with due consideration for its context and would introduce an intrusive element to current visual amenity,

contrary to Policy H1. The proposal therefore fails to preserve and enhance the character, appearance and setting of the listed building within this conservation area and therefore does not accord with the objectives of Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) with regard to preservation of the wider historic environment. No overriding public interest to justify approval of the development, contrary to the objectives of SPP, has been demonstrated or is evident. The proposal is not considered to accord with any of the relevant policies and guidance and the proposal is therefore recommended for refusal on the basis that the extension has not been designed with due consideration to its context, and would negatively affect the historic character of this Listed Building, and the wider Conservation Area, contrary to the aims of SPP, HESPS and therefore with Policies D1 and D4 of the ALDP.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

---

Refuse

## **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION**

---

The proposal fails to comply with the relevant policies of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, namely Policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design) and H1 (Residential Areas) in that by reason of its volume, detail, scale and projection, the extension has not been designed with due consideration for the context of its setting. The proposal would have a negative impact on the external appearance of this listed building, by introducing an extension of what is considered to be excessive projection, which would alter the form plan in a negative manner, thereby detracting from the character and integrity of the listed building and the setting of the terrace. Additionally, the proposal would disrupt the rhythm and pattern of development to the rear of this 'B' Listed terrace leading to erosion of the historic character and a negative impact on the wider character of the conservation area. The proposal would fail to protect neighbouring residential amenity contrary to Policy H1 (Residential Areas). The proposal is also contrary to the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy, Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement, Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions and thereby with Policy D4 (Historic Environment) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan. On the basis of the above and following on from the evaluation under policy and guidance, it is considered that there are no material planning considerations – including the matters raised in representation - that would warrant approval of planning permission in this instance.

# HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Town and Country Planning (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997  
The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2008

Please refer to the accompanying Guidance Notes when completing this application  
PLEASE NOTE IT IS FASTER AND SIMPLER TO SUBMIT PLANNING APPLICATIONS ELECTRONICALLY VIA <https://eplanning.scotland.gov.uk>

1. Applicant's Details		2. Agent's Details (if any)	
Title	M & M'S	Ref No.	—
Forename	ALAN	Forename	MARTIN
Surname	CALDOW	Surname	CALDER
Company Name	—	Company Name	CALDER DESIGN
Building No./Name	1	Building No./Name	19
Address Line 1	ARKILL	Address Line 1	BEECHGIRNE
Address Line 2	CREBLIST	Address Line 2	TERRACE
Town/City	ABERDEEN	Town/City	ABERDEEN
Postcode	AB 25 2HW	Postcode	AB 15 5DR
Telephone	—	Telephone	01224 633489
Mobile	—	Mobile	07 841 751490
Fax	—	Fax	ALT 01224 641859
Email	—	Email	calderm@bt.com
<b>3. Address or Location of Proposed Development (please include postcode)</b>			
1 ARKILL CREBLIST ABERDEEN AB 25 2HW			
NB. If you do not have a full site address please identify the location of the site(s) in your accompanying documentation.			
<b>4. Describe the Proposed Works</b>			
Please describe accurately the work proposed:			
EXTENSION TO REAR & SIDE OF PROPERTY TO FORM GARAGE & SUNROOM/UTILITY.			
Have the works already been started or completed      Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If yes, please state date of completion, or if not completed, the start date:			
Date started:	<input type="text"/>	Date completed:	<input type="text"/>

If yes, please explain why work has already taken place in advance of making this application.

### 5. Pre-Application Discussion

Have you received any advice from the planning authority in relation to this proposal? Yes  No

If yes, please provide details about the advice below:

In what format was the advice given? Meeting  Telephone call  Letter  Email

Have you agreed or are you discussing a Processing Agreement with the planning authority? Yes  No

Please provide a description of the advice you were given and who you received the advice from:

Name:  Date:  Ref No.:

INITIALLY ADVISED BY EMAIL THAT NO APPLICATION WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE HOWEVER AFTER DISCUSSIONS & MEETING AT VERY RESTRICTED AREA WAS SUGGESTED CLIENT & I BOTH FEEL FULL APPLICATION IS APPROPRIATE

### 6. Trees

Are there any trees on or adjacent to the application site? Yes  No

If yes, please show on drawings any trees (including known protected trees) and their canopy spread as they relate to the proposed site and indicate if any are to be cut back or felled.

### 7. Changes to Vehicle Access and Parking

Are you proposing a new altered vehicle access to or from a public road? Yes  No

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

Are you proposing any changes to public paths, public rights of way or affecting any public rights of access? Yes  No

If yes, please show on your drawings the position of any affected areas and explain the changes you propose to make, including arrangement for continuing or alternative public access.

How many vehicle parking spaces (garaging and open parking) currently exist on the application site?

How many vehicle parking spaces (garaging and open parking) do you propose on the site? (i.e. the total of existing and any new spaces or reduced number of spaces)

Please show on your drawings the position of existing and proposed parking spaces and identify if these are for the use of particular types of vehicles (e.g. parking for disabled people, coaches, HGV vehicles, etc).

**8. Planning Service Employee/Elected Member Interest**

Are you / the applicant / the applicant's spouse or partner, a member of staff within the planning service or an elected member of the planning authority? Yes  No

Or, are you / the applicant / the applicant's spouse or partner a close relative of a member of staff in the planning service or elected member of the planning authority? Yes  No

If you have answered yes please provide details:

**DECLARATION**

I, the applicant / agent certify that this is an application for planning permission and that accompanying plans/drawings and additional information are provided as part of this application. I hereby confirm that the information given in this form is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

I, the applicant/agent hereby certify that the attached Land Ownership Certificate has been completed

I, the applicant /agent hereby certify that requisite notice has been given to other land owners and /or agricultural tenants Yes  No  N/A

Signature:  Name: CARDOR DUBIAN Date: 28<sup>th</sup> AUG 18

Any personal data that you have been asked to provide on this form will be held and processed in accordance with the requirements of the 1998 Data Protection Act.

# LAND OWNERSHIP CERTIFICATES

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas)

(Scotland) Act 1997

The Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas)

(Scotland) Regulations 1987

## CERTIFICATE A, B, OR CERTIFICATE C MUST BE COMPLETED BY ALL APPLICANTS

### CERTIFICATE A

Certificate A is for use where the applicant is the only owner of the land to which the application relates and none of the land is agricultural land.

I hereby certify that -

- (1) No person other than myself \_\_\_\_\_ was owner 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 application.
- (2) None of the land to which the application relates constitutes or forms part of agricultural land.

Signed:

[Redacted Signature]

On behalf of:

CAUDON V. [Redacted]

Date:

25th Aug 18

### CERTIFICATE B

Certificate B is for use where the applicant is not the owner or sole owner of the land to which the application relates and/or where the land is agricultural land and where all owners/agricultural tenants have been identified.

I hereby certify that -

- (1) I have \_\_\_\_\_ served notice on every person other than myself \_\_\_\_\_ who, at the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the application was owner of any part of the land to which the application relates. These persons are:

Name	Address	Date of Service of Notice

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

or

- (3) The land or part of the land to which the application relates constitutes or forms part of agricultural land and I have \_\_\_\_\_ served notice on every person other than myself \_\_\_\_\_ who, at the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the application was an agricultural tenant. These persons are:

SIGNED

ON BEHALF OF

DATE.

## DECISION NOTICE

### The Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 Detailed Planning Permission

Martin Calder  
Calder Design  
19 Beechgrove Terrace  
Aberdeen  
AB15 5DR

on behalf of **Mr And Mrs Alan Caldow**

With reference to your application validly received on 10 September 2018 for the following development:-

**Erection of single storey extension and garage to side and rear  
at 1 Argyll Crescent, 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:

<u>Drawing Number</u>	<u>Drawing Type</u>
18/07/02	Elevations and Floor Plans
18/07/03	East Elevation (Proposed)
	Location Plan

#### REASON FOR DECISION

The reasons on which the Council has based this decision are as follows:-

The proposal fails to comply with the relevant policies of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan, namely Policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design) and H1 (Residential Areas) in that by reason of its volume, detail, scale and projection, the extension has not been designed with due consideration for the context of its setting. The proposal would have a negative impact on the external appearance of this listed

building, by introducing an extension of what is considered to be excessive projection, which would alter the form plan in a negative manner, thereby detracting from the character and integrity of the listed building and the setting of the terrace. Additionally, the proposal would disrupt the rhythm and pattern of development to the rear of this 'B' Listed terrace leading to erosion of the historic character and a negative impact on the wider character of the conservation area. The proposal would fail to protect neighbouring residential amenity contrary to Policy H1 (Residential Areas). The proposal is also contrary to the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy, Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement, Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions and thereby with Policy D4 (Historic Environment) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan. On the basis of the above and following on from the evaluation under policy and guidance, it is considered that there are no material planning considerations - including the matters raised in representation - that would warrant approval of planning permission in this instance.

**Date of Signing** 16 November 2018



**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

# Consultee Comments for Planning Application 181557/DPP

## Application Summary

Application Number: 181557/DPP

Address: 1 Argyll Crescent Aberdeen AB25 2HW

Proposal: Erection of single storey extension and garage to side and rear

Case Officer: Sheila Robertson

## Consultee Details

Name: Mr scott lynch

Address: Marischal College, Gallowgate, Aberdeen AB10 1YS

Email: slynch@aberdeencity.gov.uk

On Behalf Of: ACC - Roads Development Management Team

## Comments

I note that this application is for the erection of a single storey extension and garage to the side and rear of 1 Argyll Crescent, Aberdeen. The site is located in the outer city, in controlled parking Z.

There is currently insufficient information to assess the application. The "existing ground floor plan" says "proposed" on the drawing. The "proposed ground floor plan" is identical to the existing one, except it is lacking the word proposed. I'm unsure as to the extent of the extension and what it is to contain. Are there any bedrooms to be added, as this will alter the parking requirement? I also note that the application form states that there is currently 1 parking space as existing, and as a result of the application there will be a single garage space. Does this mean that the garage is to replace the existing parking space, or will it be in addition to this? Can the existing parking be denoted on the existing drawing, and the proposed parking clearly demarcated on the proposed drawing?

The application also states that it is for a garage, but there does not appear to be a garage shown on the site plan. I also note a large gravel area to the front, as well as a gravel area to the rear - are these for parking?

Upon receipt of the information requested I will be better placed to provide a comprehensive roads response.

This page is intentionally left blank

Hi Sheila,

Given that it's currently 3 bedroom (not sure why he's mentioning that it *can* be a 4 bed?) there is a requirement of 2 spaces. GIS suggests the rear parking area is somewhere between 9-11m. If it's 10 or above this would be 2 spaces, but if it's 9 it would be one. I'm prepared to give the applicant the benefit of the doubt and say that the rear is currently only 1 usable space, so provided that the proposed garage is fit for purpose (in line with our standards) then there will be no net detriment, and this will therefore be permissible from a roads perspective. For that reason, the garage dimensions should be increased to align with our standards. If scale is an issue, I doubt an extra 10cm would make much of a difference from a massing perspective, whereas those extra 10cm could mean the difference between being able to park, or not.

Scott

This page is intentionally left blank

# Comments for Planning Application 181557/DPP

## Application Summary

Application Number: 181557/DPP

Address: 1 Argyll Crescent Aberdeen AB25 2HW

Proposal: Erection of single storey extension and garage to side and rear

Case Officer: Sheila Robertson

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Stephen Whyte

Address: 7 Argyll Crescent Aberdeen

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:As you are aware the boundary wall is part of the B listing for Argyll Crescent.

Can you confirm that the entry off the lane into No1 Argyll Crescent will not in any way be enlarged and that no new entry is to be made in the boundary wall?

This page is intentionally left blank



# Comments for Planning Application 181557/DPP

## Application Summary

Application Number: 181557/DPP

Address: 1 Argyll Crescent Aberdeen AB25 2HW

Proposal: Erection of single storey extension and garage to side and rear

Case Officer: Sheila Robertson

## Customer Details

Name: Ms kirstin morgan

Address: ferryhill Aberdeen

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I wish to raise an objection to this application on the grounds that the application states there are no trees on or adjacent to the site - which is not correct.

SG: Trees & Woodland (a material consideration in the determination of planning applications) states:

### 7.1 Householder Applications

All trees present on a development site and within 15 metres of the site must be shown on the plans. The tree species, position of the trunk, diameter of the trunk and canopy spread must also be indicated on the plans.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **National Planning Policy**

Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)

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

Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement (HESPS)

<https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=f413711b-bb7b-4a8d-a3e8-a619008ca8b5>

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

H1: Residential Areas;

D1: Quality Placemaking by Design;

D4: Historic Environment

## **Supplementary Guidance**

Householder Development Guide

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

Transport and Accessibility

<https://www.aberdeencity.gov.uk/sites/default/files/5.1.PolicySG.TransportAccessibility.pdf>

## **Other Material Considerations**

Rosemount and Westburn Conservation Area Character Appraisal

[https://www.aberdeencity.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2017-11/Rosemount%20and%20Westburn%20Conservation%20Area%20Appraisal\\_0.pdf](https://www.aberdeencity.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2017-11/Rosemount%20and%20Westburn%20Conservation%20Area%20Appraisal_0.pdf)

Historic Environment Scotland 'Managing Change' publication: Extensions

<https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=0a55e2b8-0549-454c-ac62-a60b00928937>

This page is intentionally left blank

# NOTICE OF REVIEW

Under Section 43A(8) Of the Town and Country Planning (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997 (As amended) In Respect  
of Decisions on Local Developments  
The Town and Country Planning (Schemes of Delegation and Local Review Procedure) (SCOTLAND)  
Regulations 2013  
The Town and Country Planning (Appeals) (SCOTLAND) Regulations 2013

**IMPORTANT: Please read and follow the guidance notes provided when completing this form. Failure to supply all the relevant information could invalidate your notice of review.**

**PLEASE NOTE IT IS FASTER AND SIMPLER TO SUBMIT PLANNING APPLICATIONS ELECTRONICALLY VIA <https://www.eplanning.scot>**

1. Applicant's Details		2. Agent's Details (if any)	
Title	Mr	Ref No.	
Forename	Alan	Forename	Martin
Surname	Caldow	Surname	Calder
Company Name		Company Name	Calder Design
Building No./Name	1	Building No./Name	19
Address Line 1	Argyll Crescent	Address Line 1	Beechgrove Terrace
Address Line 2		Address Line 2	
Town/City	Aberdeen	Town/City	Aberdeen
Postcode	AB25 2HW	Postcode	AB15 5DR
Telephone		Telephone	
Mobile		Mobile	
Fax		Fax	
Email		Email	caldermartin@hotmail.com
<b>3. Application Details</b>			
Planning authority	Aberdeen City Council		
Planning authority's application reference number	181557/DPP		
Site address	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 70%;"> <p>1, Argyll Crescent Aberdeen AB25 2HW</p> </div> <div style="width: 25%; text-align: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin: 0 auto;"> <p style="margin: 0;"><b>RECEIVED</b></p> <p style="margin: 0;">28 JAN 2019</p> </div> </div> </div>		
Description of proposed development	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p>Erection of single storey extension and garage to side and rear at 1, Argyll Crescent, Aberdeen</p> </div>		

Date of application

Date of decision (if any)

**Note.** This notice must be served on the planning authority within three months of the date of decision notice or from the date of expiry of the period allowed for determining the application.

**4. Nature of Application**

- Application for planning permission (including householder application)
- Application for planning permission in principle
- Further application (including development that has not yet commenced and where a time limit has been imposed; renewal of planning permission and/or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition)
- Application for approval of matters specified in conditions

**5. Reasons for seeking review**

- Refusal of application by appointed officer
- Failure by appointed officer to determine the application within the period allowed for determination of the application
- Conditions imposed on consent by appointed officer

**6. 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.

Please indicate what procedure (or combination of procedures) you think is most appropriate for the handling of your review. You may tick more than one box if you wish the review to be conducted by a combination of procedures.

- Further written submissions
- One or more hearing sessions
- Site inspection
- Assessment of review documents only, with no further procedure

If you have marked either of the first 2 options, please explain here which of the matters (as set out in your statement below) you believe ought to be subject of that procedure, and why you consider further submissions or a hearing necessary.

The proposal as detailed is the optimum solution to building an extension and garage to the property with no viable alternatives offered during up front consultation. It is in keeping with the existing character of the Crescent and would not disrupt the rythmn and flow. There was no alternative location for a garage acceptable to the Planning Dept.

**7. Site inspection**

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

- Can the site be viewed entirely from public land?
- Is it possible for the site to be accessed safely, and without barriers to entry?

If there are reasons why you think the Local Review Body would be unable to undertake an unaccompanied site inspection, please explain here:

### 8. Statement

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. **Note:** 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.

If the Local Review Body issues a notice requesting further information from any other person or body, you will have a period of 14 days in which to comment on any additional matter which has been raised by that person or body.

State here the reasons for your notice of review and all matters you wish to raise. If necessary, this can be continued or provided in full in a separate document. You may also submit additional documentation with this form.

See attached documents.

Have you raised any matters which were not before the appointed officer at the time your application was determined? Yes  No

If yes, please explain below a) why your are raising new material b) why it was not raised with the appointed officer before your application was determined and c) why you believe it should now be considered with your review.

## 9. List of Documents and Evidence

Please provide a list of all supporting documents, materials and evidence which you wish to submit with your notice of review

Proposal Drawings.  
Original Building Drawings from 1889.  
Document titled - Right of Appeal Discussion Document  
Sample photographs of other garages and extensions in Conservation Areas and on Listed Buildings around Aberdeen.

**Note.** The planning authority will make a copy of the notice of review, the review documents and any notice of the procedure of the review available for inspection at an office of the planning authority until such time as the review is determined. It may also be available on the planning authority website.

## 10. Checklist

Please mark the appropriate boxes to confirm that you have provided all supporting documents and evidence relevant to your review:

Full completion of all parts of this form

Statement of your reasons for requesting a review

All documents, materials and evidence which you intend to rely on (e.g. plans and drawings or other documents) which are now the subject of this review.

**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 from that earlier consent.

## DECLARATION

I, the applicant/agent hereby serve notice on the planning authority to review the application as set out on this form and in the supporting documents. I hereby confirm that the information given in this form is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Signature:  Name:  Date:

Any personal data that you have been asked to provide on this form will be held and processed in accordance with Data Protection Legislation.



## Right of Appeal Discussion Document

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for your recent letters with regard to Application Ref No.s 181556/LBC and 181557/DPP, signed on 16<sup>th</sup> November, for the erection of a single storey extension and garage to the rear of 1, Argyll Crescent, Aberdeen, AB25 2HW, which state your refusal for planning permission and listed building consent. Based on our various discussions with the Planning Authority this year via Martin Calder the decision did not come as a surprise. However, we are keen to appeal this decision and will lay out our reasons below.

We would first like to highlight that the proposal as submitted is essentially the same concept as provisionally submitted to the Planning Authority by Martin Calder in March 2018. These were submitted given our knowledge that any submission would be sensitive, as the previous owner had failed in his submissions, and was in our view the most logical option to extend our property in a fashion that kept pace with current expectations for a modern living space whilst remaining in keeping with the character of the area. Any modern property with 3 or 4 bedrooms would include a garage and an open aspect on to the private garden areas to provide a high quality comfortable lifestyle with plenty of natural light and suitable space for utility appliances. We fully expected that there would need to be discussion and potentially compromise to obtain planning permission for any extension.

However, it became clear over the subsequent months that there was no appetite to achieve any form of compromise or mutually agreed position acceptable to the Planning Authority. As a result we have reverted to our original proposal which we still believe is the best option and most in keeping with the character of the area and spirit of this property from its original construction. It is probably at first worth detailing some of the feedback we have received over the past 8 months as it in many ways justifies the extension as detailed to be the most in keeping with this property and least impact on the area in general.

The first response by Email, dated 7<sup>th</sup> March 2018, stated that the current single storey space projecting to the rear of our property should be considered an existing extension and that we would end up with a 96 m<sup>2</sup> "combined" extension on a 91 m<sup>2</sup> property. However, the original plans of our property from 1889 show the single storey projection is original to the building. It should also be noted that our property was a single building comprising 2 apartments with a communal bathroom and shared utility space within this single storey projection to the side and rear. The remaining 12 buildings of the Crescent were not built at the same time, they were in fact built of it 2 years later. This property was originally envisaged as a building in it's own right and not built to a set pattern or shape within the concept of an entire Crescent. We clarified this point and confirmed that the original footprint of our building was 137 m<sup>2</sup> and the extension proposed was only an additional 50 m<sup>2</sup>. The Planning Authority conceded this point and responded on the 14<sup>th</sup> March 2018 by stating the following; "The Planning Authority would not support the Household and Listed Building Applications for any form of extension to the rear of the existing dwelling". To emphasise their view that this was not subject to further discussion they underlined this position with the following statement; "For the purposes of clarification, the Planning Authority has now set out our position and there will be no more opportunity for negotiation." Our understanding of this was that no extension, regardless of scale, would be approved to the rear of the building. This response could be considered as being prejudicial and unreasonable.

Subsequent to this response we prepared and submitted further concepts via Martin Calder detailing an extension to the side of the existing single storey part of our home for consideration which seemed to receive little positive feedback either and in many ways supported our view that

the original concept was the best option. Much of the feedback we were provided by Email was contradictory and conflicting to the extent that we felt a meeting on site would be the best way to understand the Planning Authority position and advice. This onsite meeting took place on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2018 with two representatives of the Planning Authority and unfortunately little progress was made in terms of understanding what would be acceptable. Some of the advice given is noted below to highlight this point.

- Any extension to the side of the existing single storey space would likely cause maintenance issues with the house due to water and damp. We do not disagree.
- We should not modify the form and profile of the original single storey roof, but need to build above the window of the rear lower room without casting a shadow on the garden area of the adjacent property. Given the existing roof comes below this window and we can't avoid cutting through the window of this room without building up we are still unsure of what was expected. Was the intent that we raise and move the apex of the existing roof and build it sideways thereby permanently changing the rear aspect of the building against the original look?
- The Victorian style skylight we proposed to overcome this issue was not considered in keeping with a Victorian house. Suitable modern alternatives were discussed and examples to be provided, but these never arrived.
- We were advised we could not come within 3 ft of the dividing wall thereby reducing the footprint considerably and creating a space where water could gather to create maintenance issues. This is despite the fact that 2 recent extensions to other properties on the Crescent do come right up to the dividing walls.
- None of the existing windows could be opened up wider to create a larger integral living space flowing from the current rear lower bedroom through to the kitchen in the single storey area. This combined with the restrictions in building up to the dividing wall would essentially restrict us to a small single space rather than a large open one in keeping with modern design and lifestyle expectations.
- We also discussed what options this left us to build a separate garage at the bottom of the garden given we would no longer build to the rear of our property. It was stated categorically that no permission would be given for a garage of any form. Principally as this would break the form and character of the wall at the rear of the property adjacent to the common area, but also because we would not be allowed to break through the boundary wall adjacent to the private lane running adjacent to our property. Even if we re-instated the current opening on to a parking area at the rear of our property. When we highlighted that we had previously been informed by Aberdeen Heritage that the previous owner had been offered a compromise position with regard to a garage we have to question what it was. There was no compromise position suggested to us.
- The severe restrictions placed on the possible extension resulted in a net increase to the internal area of only 13sqm .
- We would also like to highlight that the Roads Department currently state there is inadequate provision garage and carparking in this area.

In general the tone of all Emails and discussion was negative and provided no guidance on what compromises could be made. Discussion on an alternative style and location for an extension were restrictive to the point of not being practical or worthwhile and any alternatives for a garage were dismissed immediately.

After some discussion my wife and I agreed that having invested so much time and money in maintaining the property to a high standard that rather than move out we would make a formal application to erect an extension comprising of a garage, utility room and sun lounge that would in our view enhance the building and keep it up to date with modern lifestyle aspirations in the style we originally proposed and in keeping with the overall style and character of the area. This would ensure that it met the requirements of any modern family with the financial means to own and maintain such a property effectively.

This we feel gives a summary of the discussion that has taken place so far and sets the context for the application as made. We will now lay out our specific responses to the reasons given by the Planning Authority for rejecting this application.

In both these letters it states the extension fails to comply with Policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design) and D4 (Historic Environment) "by reason of its volume, detail, scale and projection, and that the proposal has not been designed with due consideration for the context of its setting. The proposal would have a negative impact on the external appearance of this listed building by introducing an extension of what is considered to be excessive projection, which would alter the form plan in a negative manner, thereby detracting from the character and integrity of the listed building. Additionally the proposal would disrupt the rhythm and pattern of development to the rear of this "B" Listed terrace leading to erosion of the historic character and a negative impact on the wider character of the conservation area."

The volume, scale and projection of the proposal are driven by the need to place the garage immediately to the rear of the existing single storey area. We have been told explicitly that no consideration would be given to adding a garage at the bottom of the garden as it would require a new opening to be made in the boundary wall. The only opening available to us is therefore the current one. There is no option to add parking to the front areas as it is a common area owned by all the occupants of the Crescent and the private lane to the side is also a shared area providing access to the rear of all the properties on Argyll Crescent, many along Westburn Drive and also the nursery adjacent to the lane. Notwithstanding this the area to the front is of far superior construction, form and appearance in terms of the character of the area and surely no changes to form and shape of this space could be seen to be acceptable. There are several garages further along the lane which we have formerly considered, but each and every one that has become available for purchase is too small to accommodate most large modern cars. A point well understood by the Planning Authority representatives who visited my property. My current main car is 2 cm shorter than the overall length of these garages and the latest model of my 11 year old car is 2 cm longer. It is hard to conceive of a modern 3 or 4 bedroom house that would not include a suitable garage or look to add one on the land available.

With regard to the sun room and utility area these are in our view of a reasonable scale and projection, but more importantly can only reasonably be placed to the rear of the single storey area. The restrictions imposed on layout, form and size for a space to the side make this an impractical option and would likely lead to maintenance issues in the future whilst reducing the sunlight in to the adjacent garden. Building this without a separate garage would leave us no available private parking space.

The detail of the proposed extension is entirely sympathetic to the existing area in terms of material and look. It replicates the rear aspect of the building in a way that any other extension would fail to. It much more accurately reflects the character of the Crescent and our property than any of the other extensions approved and built over the past 4 years. Building either upwards from or to the side of the existing single storey area would alter the rear aspect irrevocably from the original drawings.

It should again be noted that our property was built prior to the remaining 12 properties as a single building in its own right. There are details to the front of the building that differ from the remainder, the rear is different in detail, the shape is square and regular and not of a tapered Crescent style. The single storey area has from construction been larger than any of the others in the area. The other outbuildings along the rest of the Crescent are of varying sizes from new and due to subsequent modification. Few reflect the original footprint with a variety of add on storage and extensions in differing styles and quality. The rhythm and pattern to the rear of the other buildings on the Crescent has historically and recently been broken repeatedly. The original single storey space comprised of 4 separate spaces, a kitchen, scullery, laundry and coal shed, which have been combined in to one kitchen at some point in the past. In many ways the proposed extension is entirely in keeping with this intent; a large space to the rear of the property that includes a utility area and garden access in a modern context. The scale is more modern, but the concept and character are the same with materials in keeping with the original build.

With regard to the character of the area we feel there is limited impact to the broader community given the lane to the side of our property is for private access only and has no through access. It is not an area that is subject to through traffic and the proposed extension is much more in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area than many around Aberdeen including Argyll Place and Queen's Lane for example. The front of the building is of far superior appearance and quality and the rear intended to be utilitarian.

We would also like to highlight that there is clear evidence to show that naturally lit areas away from heavy traffic noise which embrace outdoor space have been shown to improve health and mental well being in a busy world.