



Strategic Place Planning

Report of Handling

Site Address:	107 Hilton Road, Aberdeen, AB24 4HX,
Application Description:	Erection of single storey extension to rear and 1.5 storey extension to gable
Application Ref:	190594/DPP
Application Type:	Detailed Planning Permission
Application Date:	16 April 2019
Applicant:	Mr Darren Lawrence
Ward:	Hilton/Woodside/Stockethill
Community Council:	Woodside And Hilton
Case Officer:	Sheila Robertson

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

APPLICATION BACKGROUND

Site Description

The application relates to a 1.5 storey, semi-detached, granite built dwelling house occupying an elevated position to the south side of Hilton Road, directly facing Stewart Park. The application property forms one half of a pair of semis, with fully hipped roofs and front dormers. The south side of Hilton Road, between Hilton Walk to the east and Mosman Gardens to the west, features 6 pairs of semi-detached dwellings and one detached, of similar architectural character and all featuring unaltered, fully hipped gables.

Relevant Planning History

There is no relevant planning history at the application site.

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of an extension to the side and rear, comprising 2 separate elements: a 1.5 storey gable extension and a single storey extension to the rear. The gable extension would be 2.2m in width and extend along the full length of the gable to within 169mm of the frontage, with a pitched roof sitting 228mm below the existing ridge, terminating at a straight gable and involving removal of the existing chimney. The roof would be finished with slate to match existing with granite tabling to the gable and terracotta ridge tiles. There would be no windows to the principal elevation; a partially glazed door would be inserted to the gable and a single roof light to the rear elevation. The gable extension would be constructed with granite ashlar blocks to the front and rear elevations and roughcast to the gable wall. To the rear, the extension would be single storey, 4.47m in width and with a projection of 2.25m from the original dwelling and extend across the new extension and part of the original rear elevation. The roof would be flat

and 2.6m in height. All walls would be completely glazed. The extensions would provide a utility room and extended kitchen at ground floor level and an additional bedroom at upper level.

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=PPORPTBZMO100>

CONSULTATIONS

Woodside and Hilton Community Council – No comments received.

REPRESENTATIONS

None

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Legislative Requirements

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

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

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

Aberdeen Local Development Plan (2017) (ALDP)

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

Supplementary Guidance

- The Householder Development Guide (HDG)

EVALUATION

Principle of Development

The application site is located within a residential area, wherein Policy H1 (Residential Areas) of the ALDP applies, and the application relates to householder development. The proposal would comply with this policy in principle if it does not constitute over-development of the site; the character and amenity of the surrounding area is not adversely affected; and it complies with associated SG. These issues are assessed in the evaluation below.

Scale and Design

To determine the effect of the proposal on the character of the area, it is necessary to assess it in the context of Policy D1 of the ALDP. This policy recognises that not all development will be of a scale that makes a significant placemaking impact but recognises that good design and detail adds to the attractiveness of the built environment. The HDG sets out limitations in terms of scale and dimensions and contains a general principle which expects that extensions should be architecturally compatible in design and scale with the original house and its surrounding area.

The proposed extension would comply with certain elements of the HDG; it would increase the original footprint of 93sq.m by a further 34sq.m, well under the maximum 100% increase on original permitted by the guidance; built site coverage would increase from 25% to 34.5%, thereby retaining a low level of development acceptable within the context of the surrounding area; and, given the scale of the rear garden, well in excess of 50% of the rear garden would be retained. The proposal would therefore not constitute over-development and be acceptable within the context of the both the plot size and surrounding area.

In terms of design, both elements of the extension would be subservient to the original dwelling house in terms of height. The rear element of the extension would be an acceptable addition in terms of its design, being of a simplified design that would not compete with the character of the original dwelling house and finished with contemporary materials that would contrast assertively with the traditional design and materials of the original architecture. However, while the principle of an extension to the gable would be acceptable, its design fails to meet the specific guidance contained in the Supplementary Guidance: Householder Development Guide, relating to proposals that would introduce a straight gable to a hipped roof profile, which states that 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. In this instance the hipped roof of the adjoining dwelling house, 105 Hilton Road, has not been altered or extended. This proposal, to add an extension to the gable that would terminate in a straight gable and see the removal of the chimney, would result in architectural unbalance in the roof profile between the two properties. Therefore, the proposal does not meet the criteria for the first exception and requires to be assessed against the second. For such an alteration to comply with the HDG, it would require the proposal not to have an adverse impact on the character or visual amenity of the wider area. In this case, the existing streetscape sees a consistent design theme of hipped roofed properties with symmetrical roof profiles, and it is within this context that the application property is read. While there have been alterations to these dwellings, principally to the rear, they all retain their original design character to their principal elevations, in the form of hipped roofs and tall chimneys to the gable walls. The roof form of these properties contributes significantly to the architectural character of the streetscape and the surrounding area. There are no examples of properties within this contextually relevant streetscape that have seen the hipped roof profile altered or extended to form a vertical gable end. Subsequently, the original architectural character of the street is retained, and approval of this proposal would introduce an intrusive feature to the streetscape, alter the balance between an unaltered pair of hipped semis, which coupled with the extension's form, mass and detailing, would initiate architectural erosion to an otherwise uniform design theme, to the detriment of the existing character and visual appearance of the streetscape. In addition, the incorporation of granite tabling does not reflect the original character of the dwelling house and the removal of the chimney would further increase visual imbalance.

This form of gable extension would therefore not only result in the loss of architectural balance between the pair of semi-detached properties and on the streetscape, but could set an unwelcome precedent for similar proposals being granted under current policies and guidance, to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area. This element of the proposal would directly conflict with the HDG and is therefore not considered to demonstrate due consideration for its context and the character of the streetscape, contrary to the aims of Policy D1.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Both extensions would be located sufficiently distant from all other neighbouring properties to ensure no impact to their receipt of internal day light or direct sunshine and there would be no

impact to neighbours' current levels of privacy. Residential amenity would therefore be retained in compliance with Policy H1.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

The proposed gable extension would appear architecturally incongruous with the original dwelling and the surrounding area, and would have an adverse impact on the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area as it would result in architectural imbalance between the application property and the adjoining hipped roofed property, which would disrupt the uniform character of the hipped roofed properties on Hilton Road and create a disruptive architectural feature within a street that otherwise retains its original form and character. This is in direct conflict with the Supplementary Guidance: 'The Householder Development Guide'. It would appear out of context and have a negative design contribution on its setting, to the detriment of residential character and visual amenity and the application is therefore contrary to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan Policies D1: Architecture and Placemaking and H1: Residential Areas, of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan and the relevant Supplementary Guidance: Householder Development Guide. Furthermore, it could set a precedent for similar proposals being granted under current policies and guidance which, cumulatively, would have a significant adverse impact on the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area. In this instance, there are no material planning considerations that would warrant a grant of planning permission, contrary to the local plan policies and guidance.