



# Strategic Place Planning

Report of Handling

<b>Site Address:</b>	63 Grove Crescent, Aberdeen, AB16 5DU
<b>Application Description:</b>	Erection of single storey extension to the side and rear, formation of dormer to rear and formation of roof terrace on rear extension
<b>Application Ref:</b>	231029/DPP
<b>Application Type:</b>	Detailed Planning Permission
<b>Application Date:</b>	11 September 2023
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Marek Kowalczyk
<b>Ward:</b>	Mid Stocket/Rosemount
<b>Community Council:</b>	Rosemount and Mile End
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Jennifer Keohane

## **DECISION**

Refuse

## **APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

### **Site Description**

The application site is situated within the residential area of Cornhill, located to the north west of Aberdeen City Centre. The application property comprises of a one storey semi-detached property which holds a north facing principal elevation which overlooks a double driveway. The rear, south facing, elevation overlooks a large curtilage, where a single storey garage is situated to the south east of the curtilage, accessed via Grove Crescent to the south. A side curtilage to the west of the dwelling allows access from the front curtilage into the rear amenity space. The dwelling adjoins 61 Grove Crescent to the east and shares its boundary with neighbouring 65 Grove Crescent to the west.

### **Relevant Planning History**

None

## **APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

### **Description of Proposal**

Detailed planning permission is sought for multiple components of development which would be set within the side and rear curtilage of the application site. Firstly, permission is sought to erect a single storey extension, projecting 4.5 metres from the south, rear, elevation, spanning the entire 6.5 metre width of the existing dwelling, with an approximate height of 2.9 metres. The total footprint of the rear extension would measure approximately 28.7sqm. A window opening is proposed on its west elevation and double glazed sliding doors and an glazed paned are proposed for the south elevation, which would measure 2 metres high and 5.4 metres wide. The west and

south elevation would be harled to match the existing property. A roof terrace is proposed on the roof of the extension, accessed via the proposed dormer extension, which will be detailed below. A glazed balustrade is proposed along the perimeter of the terrace, which would measure 1.1 metres in height, resulting in an extension with a total height of 4 metres. The proposed plans received detail that the proposed terrace/roof of the rear extension would be tiled to finish.

The dormer extension is proposed for the south elevation of the existing roof plane and would have a depth of 4.4 metres and a width of 3.4 metres. The proposed dormer would be built off the wall head to a height of 2.4 metres. Glazed sliding doors would be located on the south elevation, allowing access onto the proposed terrace. The west elevation of the proposed dormer would be tiled to match the existing roof.

Finally, a side extension is proposed which would project 4 metres from the west facing gable and would measure 5.3 metres in length. The proposed side extension would sit 3 metres behind the north facing principal elevation and would measure 3 metres in height where the total floorspace would measure approximately 21.5 sqm. The north, south and west elevations would be harled to match the existing dwelling where a horizontal window would be located on the south elevation, measuring 3 metres wide and 500mm in height. The north facing elevation of the side extension would have an access door and window, where the flat roof would be finished in Sarnafil single ply membrane.

The proposed drawings detail a proposed first floor extension to sit above the existing single storey garage, but without providing any elevational drawings of the resultant building. However, this element of the proposal was not included in the description of the development on the application form and thus is considered to not form part of the proposed development. As such, this element of the proposal cannot be considered as part of this application.

On review of the plans provided, inconsistencies with the measurements across all plans have been noted, therefore all measurements quoted in this report are approximate.

### **Amendments**

None.

### **Supporting Documents**

All drawings can be viewed on the Council's website at:

<https://publicaccess.aberdeencity.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=RZSBO7BZMN300>

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Rosemount and Mile End 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 making any determination under the planning acts, regard is to be had to the provisions of the Development Plan; and, that any determination shall be made in accordance with the plan, so far as material to the application, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

## **Development Plan**

### National Planning Framework 4

- Policy 1 (Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises)
- Policy 2 (Climate Mitigation and Adaptation)
- Policy 3 (Biodiversity)
- Policy 14 (Design, Quality and Place)
- Policy 16 (Quality Homes)

### Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2023

- Policy H1 (Residential Areas)
- Policy D1 (Quality Placemaking)
- Policy D2 (Amenity)

## **Aberdeen Planning Guidance**

- Householder Development Guide

## **EVALUATION**

### **Principle of Development**

The site falls within a “Residential Area” designation on the Aberdeen Local Development Plan (ALDP) Proposals Map to which Policy H1 in the ALDP applies. Policy H1 supports new development and householder development within such areas providing it satisfies the following criteria:

- 1) Does not constitute “overdevelopment”;
- 2) Does not have an adverse impact to residential amenity and the character and appearance of an area; or
- 3) Does not result in the loss of open space.

### Overdevelopment and loss of open space

To ensure the proposal does not constitute as “overdevelopment” the built footprint of a residential property as extended should not exceed twice that of the original and no more than 50% of the rear curtilage should be covered in development.

Further to the note above regarding inconsistencies with the plans submitted, the measurements for the following calculations have been taken from the proposed plot layout.

The original footprint of the dwelling is approximately 59.3sqm and the proposed extensions would measure approximately 44.6sqm. Therefore, the combined proposal would increase the footprint of the main dwelling by approximately 75%. Whilst this would not double the footprint, the proposal would significantly increase the size of the dwelling. Due to the size of the rear curtilage, measuring at approximately 320.2sqm, the proposed side and rear extension, along with the existing garage and shed, would constitute 23% site coverage. As such, the proposal would not erode more than 50% of the rear garden space. Taking these considerations into account, the

proposal would not result in 'overdevelopment' of the site. However, overdevelopment cannot just be looked at in this sense. The siting of the proposal development and the potential adverse impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area must also be considered and such an assessment is undertaken below.

The proposal would also not give rise to loss of open space as it would be contained within the existing residential curtilage.

#### Impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area

Further to criteria 2 of Policy H1, consideration to the potential impact on character and amenity as a result of the proposed development will now be undertaken. 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 (Quality Placemaking). 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. This is echoed by the intent of Policy 14 (Design, Quality and Place) of NPF4, which sets out the six qualities of successful places. In addition, Policy 16 (Quality Homes), specifically section g, of NPF4 advises that householder development proposals will be supported where they do not have a detrimental impact on the character or environmental quality of the home and the surrounding area in terms of size, design and materials. The second part of section g) states that proposals should not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.

Furthermore, the Council's Aberdeen Planning Guidance (APG), the Householder Development Guide, details that proposals for extensions and or alterations require to be architecturally compatible in design and scale with the original house and 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. In addition, section 2.6 of the APG details that new dormers or roof extensions should respect the scale of the building and they should not dominate, overwhelm or unbalance the original roof.

As the overall application is multi-faceted, to allow for a full review of all elements, the potential impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area will be considered under each section of the proposed works.

#### *Proposed extension to rear with roof terrace*

Good quality design, careful siting and due consideration of scale, context and design of the main dwelling are key to ensuring that development does not erode the character and appearance of residential areas. The proposed rear extension would measure approximately 4.5 metres in length, 6.8 metres wide and approximately 3 metres in height. Whilst consideration has been given to the main dwelling in terms of the material finish, through the use of harling to match the main dwelling, there are concerns with the proposed projection of the extension. Section 2.3 of the APG states that single storey extensions will be restricted to four metres in projection along the boundary shared with the other half of the semi-detached property, as such, the proposed length of the rear extension does not comply with the APG. The applicant has not asked for any specific or mitigating factors or circumstances to be taken into account by the Planning Service. As such, as the proposal raises significant amenity impacts, as discussed below, there is no overarching reason to depart from the maximum projection in the guidance. Whilst the width of the extension does not conflict with policy or guidance, the overall scale of the proposal does not sit comfortably against the main dwelling. Additionally, due to the length and height, the rear extension would adversely impact the amenity afforded to the adjoining property, which will be discussed later in the report.

The proposed roof terrace would be situated atop the proposed rear extension, sitting approximately 3 metres above ground level. On review of the wider area, it is noted that nothing of this type exists within the surrounding area. Whilst glass balustrades are proposed to enclose the roof terrace, thus reducing its massing against the main dwelling, in terms of the context of the site, it is noted that no other properties located within the surrounding area have a roof terrace. As such, the installation of such a feature would not be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, consideration in terms of the impact the proposed roof terrace would have on residential amenity, in particular the adjoining house at 61 Grove Terrace is required. As detailed previously, the proposed extension would project 4.5 metres along the shared boundary and sit approximately 3 metres above ground level. Whilst the proposed plans do not include information relating to the adjoining property, following a site visit it was noted that the adjoining 61 Grove Crescent has a single storey extension to the rear, where no further alterations to the property are apparent. The proposed rear extension would far surpass that of the neighbouring property, where the combined projection and height would impact the neighbouring property. Additionally, the installation of a roof terrace would allow direct visibility into the rear curtilage of this adjoining property from this elevated position, significantly reducing the privacy of the neighbouring residents.

Further to the above, Policy H1 of ALDP details that householder development will be approved in principle if it does not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the surrounding area. This is echoed within Policy 16, specifically section g), of NPF4, which advises that development should not have detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking. In terms of daylighting and sunlighting (overshadowing), Appendix 2 of the Council's APG details the requirements in ensuring extensions and alterations do not impact the amenity afforded to neighbouring properties. Due to the siting of the proposal, neighbouring 65 Grove Crescent, located to the west of the application site, would not be impacted in terms of daylighting and sunlighting (overshadowing). With regard to the adjoining property at 61 Grove Crescent, it is noted that this dwelling has a small single storey extension to the rear where windows and doors are located closest to the shared boundary treatment. In addition, there is a paved area situated closest to this boundary which would appear to be used as an outdoor seating area. In line with assessments detailed under Appendix 2 of the APG, in terms of daylight, whilst it is noted the proposal would be situated to the west of the neighbouring property, assessments show the proposal would adversely impact the neighbouring property in terms of daylight, this would likely be the case as the sun moves east to west and would be particularly evident in winter months when the sun is lower in sky. Furthermore, in terms of sunlighting (overshadowing), the combined projection and height of the extension would adversely impact the neighbouring property, particularly the windows situated closest the shared boundary and the paved area which appears to be used as an outdoor seating area. This calculation of the impact has been made without including the glazed balustrade for the terrace, which does not, in itself, contribute to the loss of sunlight.

In terms of privacy, whilst the proposal rear extension would have glazed units on the south elevation, allowing visibility over and access into the enclosed rear curtilage, the main concern is the installation of a roof terrace, sitting at a height of approximately 3 metres above ground level. Appendix 3 of the APG details that the addition of balconies to the existing residential dwellings will require careful consideration of their potential impact upon privacy. Any proposed balcony which would result in direct overlooking of the private garden/amenity space of a neighbouring dwelling, to the detriment of neighbours' privacy, will not be supported by the planning authority. The installation of a roof terrace would allow clear visibility into the rear curtilage of the adjoining house 61 Grove Crescent and would be to the detriment of the neighbours privacy. The use of glazed balustrades, whilst minimising the visual impact or the impact on the neighbouring curtilage in terms of daylight and sunlighting (overshadowing) would serve to allow continuous outward

visibility while using the roof terrace. Where solid panelling may mitigate this issue, this would then increase the visual impact and the impact in terms of daylighting and overshadowing. The installation of a roof terrace, in such a location, would significantly impact the amenity of the surrounding residents, in particular that of adjoining 61 Grove Crescent, where the proposal is in direct conflict with the requirements set out under the APG.

In terms of character of the wider area, whilst the applicant has made reference to a neighbouring property, located to the southwest of the application site, where a large extension and dormers have been installed. Whilst this has been noted by the Planning Service, the context of that situation is substantially different to what is being proposed within this application. The alterations to that property complied with the relevant planning policies and guidance and did not result in any adverse impacts on the immediate neighbours. Although they are semi-detached houses, the alterations and extension were carried out as one project to avoid adverse impacts arising for either neighbour. Importantly, those alterations did not include a roof terrace. That situation has no bearing on the consideration of this current application. Furthermore, each application is assessed on its own merits.

Overall, whilst a single storey extension may be acceptable, in this instance the proposed design and scale of the rear extension and roof terrace are not in keeping with the character of the wider area. The adverse impact the proposal would have on surrounding area, specifically that of adjoining 61 Grove Crescent, deem the proposal as unacceptable. The proposed height and projection, along with the installation of a roof terrace create clear conflicts with the Householder Development Guide, specifically in terms of the impact it would have on daylighting, sunlighting (overshadowing) and privacy. Due to the adverse impact the proposal would have on the character and amenity of the wider area, the proposed rear extension and roof terrace does not comply Policy H1 (Residential Areas) and Policy D1 (Quality Placemaking) of the ALDP. Furthermore, the works would not be viewed as a successful place and would impact the character and environmental quality of the application dwelling as well as the surrounding area. The proposal would have a physical impact on neighbouring properties and would overshadow and allow direct visibility into the rear curtilage of the neighbouring properties. As such, the proposal does not comply with Policy 14 and Policy 16 of NPF4.

#### Formation of Dormer to Rear

As detailed previously, section 2.2 of the Council's APG details the general principles when assessing proposals for extensions, dormers and other alterations. In addition to these principles, section 2.6 of the APG details that new dormers or roof extensions should respect the scale of the building and should not dominate, overwhelm or unbalance the roof. Section 2.8 of the APG provides further clarity on assessing such applications, whereby, the dormer extension should not appear to dominate the original roof; the dormer extension should not be built directly off the wall head, a small apron may be acceptable on non-public elevations; the roof of the proposed extension should not extend to, or beyond, the ridge of the existing roof, the roof of the extension should generally be a minimum of 600 below the existing ridge; and the dormer extension should be a minimum of 600mm in from the gable.

In terms of this application, the proposed dormer is of a scale which would overwhelm and dominate the existing roof, the proposal would be built off the wall head and would measure approximately 2.4 metres in height and would project approximately 4.5 metres from the roof to allow direct access onto the proposed roof terrace. The roof of the proposal would sit approximately 400mm below the existing ridge and would meet the upper section of the hipped roof. Double glazed doors are proposed for the south elevation which would allow access onto the proposed roof terrace. Consideration in terms of adjoining 61 Grove Crescent is required, which currently has a roof light. The introduction of a dormer extension, as proposed, would completely unbalance the roof and serve to overwhelm and dominate both the application dwelling and roof of the adjoining property.

The scale of the dormer, its siting and size of the double doors would allow clear visibility over the rear curtilage of the application site and surrounding properties, thus, the proposal in its current form would significantly impact the character and visual amenity of the wider area, where there would be a significant impact in terms of privacy and overlooking. As such, the proposed dormer does not comply with the guidelines as detailed within the Council's APG, nor does it comply with Policies H1, D1 and D2 of the ALDP or Policies 14 and 16 of NPF4.

#### Single storey extension to side

As detailed previously, section 2.2 and 2.3 of the Council's APG gives clear guidance when assessing extensions or alterations to a residential dwelling. While this element has been detailed as a porch, due to its scale and formation of a bathroom internally, this would be considered a side extension although it is noted that the front door of the property is on this side elevation.

As with the rear extension, consideration to the main dwelling in terms of the material finish of the side extension have been made, again harled to match the existing dwelling. However, the scale, specifically in terms of its width and length, appears somewhat out of context to the main dwelling. This is evident when viewing the north elevation, where the extension would project some 4 metres out from the west facing gable. As a result, it would almost double the overall width of the property. The scale of the side extension would not marry well with the main dwelling. The width of the proposed side extension would, to some extent, unbalance the symmetry between the application dwelling and the adjoining 61 Grove Crescent where although a side entrance porch is located to the east of the neighbouring property, this is of a scale which would be seen as a porch and is suitably located so as not to dominate and overwhelm the adjoining properties. Notwithstanding, given other dwellings in the surrounding area have garage extensions to the side (albeit narrower than the extension proposed), the width of the side extension would not cause sufficient harm to the amenity of the area to, in itself, warrant refusal of planning permission.

Due to the size and layout of the side curtilage, and the inaccuracies detailed on the plans received, there is concern the proposed extension would sit uncomfortably close to the shared boundary located to the west of the dwelling. Indeed, it appears from the information currently available, that the side extension would be a width that wouldn't fit within the space available at the side of the house. At 4 metres wide it appears to exceed the width of the side curtilage at that point.

As with the proposed rear extension, consideration in terms of the potential impact the proposed side extension would have on the amenity afforded to the surrounding area must be considered. Whilst the proposed side extension would not impact adjoining 61 Grove Crescent, consideration in terms of 65 Grove Crescent is required. Again, as detailed previously, information relating to the neighbouring properties has not been provided as part of the application, however, utilising information available to the Planning Service, assessments have been carried out. Due to its proximity to the shared boundary to the west, the proposed side extension would impact neighbouring 65 Grove Crescent in terms of daylight where the area most impacted would be the side curtilage located to the east of the neighbouring property. The proposed side extension would not impact the neighbouring property in terms of sunlight (overshadowing). In terms of privacy, the proposal would have windows on the north south elevation, where the overall impact would be negligible.

However, there are concerns that the overall scale of the proposal, both in its width and length, would not fit within the side curtilage. Whilst the proposed side extension element of the proposal does not significantly conflict with policies which would warrant refusal in its own right, when combined with the scale of the proposed rear extension, the overall development would almost double the footprint of the main dwelling and so, would negatively impact the character of the

wider area. As such, does not comply in full with Policies H1 and D1 of the ALDP, nor do they meet the criteria as detailed within Policy 14 and Policy 16 of NPF4.

### Conclusion

The overall proposal is excessive in terms of the scale of the rear extension and while measurements generally used to determine whether overdevelopment would occur have not been exceeded, the cumulative impact of what is being proposed would significantly alter the application site thus leading to a form of overdevelopment. The projection of the rear extension does not comply with guidelines as detailed within the APG where there would be a significant negative impact on the adjoining property. This along with the proposed roof terrace and proposed dormer would adversely impact the character and amenity of the surrounding area, with the latter being wholly unacceptable due to its scale and overall design. It is noted that the proposed side extension, as a standalone element, does not significantly conflict with policies, this application has been assessed as a whole, where, the overall proposal is not acceptable. Whilst it is acknowledged that properties within the wider area have been altered, none have the amenity impacts on neighbours that arise from this proposal. The outcome of the assessment, as detailed within this report, shows the overall works are excessive and would significantly alter the application dwelling, where the character of the wider area would be impacted, as such, the proposal does not comply with Policy H1, D1 and D2 of the ALDP, nor does it comply with Policies 14 and 16, specifically section g, of NPF4, as such, this application cannot be supported.

### **National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4)**

Policy 1 (Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises) of NPF4 states that when considering all development proposals, significant weight will be given to the global climate and nature crises. Policy 2 (Climate Mitigation and Adaptation) encourages, promotes and facilitates development that minimises emissions and adapts to the current and future impact of climate change. While Policy 3 (Biodiversity) looks to protect biodiversity and ensure it is enhanced, however, given the nature of the proposal there are no requirements for this policies to be used in the assessment of this application.

In terms of this application, the works result in a significant increase in terms of development and therefore in respect of Policies 1 and 2 the works could result in a significant risk to and impact on climate change.

### **DECISION**

Refuse

### **REASON FOR DECISION**

The combined effect of the rear and side extensions, along with the proposed roof terrace and dormer extension would significantly overwhelm the dwelling and results in overdevelopment and therefore the proposal does not adhere to the relevant criteria of Policy H1 (Residential Areas) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2023 (ALDP).

The overall design and scale of all aspects of the proposal would alter the overall aesthetics of the dwelling as well as affecting its character and resulting in an unbalance of the symmetry between the application site and the adjoining property at 61 Grove Crescent. Furthermore, the projection of the rear extension does not adhere with Council guidance, as set out in the Householder Development Guide Aberdeen Planning Guidance. As such, the character of the area would be affected by this development and overall, the proposal fails to comply with Policy H1 (Residential Areas) and Policy D1 (Quality Placemaking) of the ALDP, the Householder Development Guide Aberdeen Planning Guidance and with Policy 14 (Design, Quality and Place) and Policy 16 (Quality Homes) of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4).

The proposed dormer and roof terrace do not comply with the criteria outlined in the Householder Development Guide Aberdeen Planning Guidance, in that they would significantly impact on the existing level of residential amenity for neighbouring residents in terms of loss of privacy. Furthermore, the rear extension is would result in an adverse daylight and sunlight impact for 61 Grove Crescent. Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with Policy H1 (Residential Areas) and Policy D2 (Amenity) of the ALDP, the Householder Development Guide Aberdeen Planning Guidance and with Policy 16 (Quality Homes) of NPF4.