



Strategic Place Planning

Report of Handling by Development Management Manager

Site Address:	21 Balgownie Crescent, Aberdeen, AB23 8EJ
Application Description:	Erection of 2.5 storey extension to side/rear; formation of dormers to front and rear.
Application Ref:	231558/DPP
Application Type:	Detailed Planning Permission
Application Date:	11 December 2023
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Calum and Monica Craig
Ward:	Bridge of Don
Community Council:	Bridge of Don

DECISION

Refuse

APPLICATION BACKGROUND

Site Description

The application site relates to a 1.5-storey semi-detached dwelling in Bridge of Don, with basement, approximately 170m north of the River Don, which adjoins 23 Balgownie Crescent to the west. The internal basement level is accessed via an access hatch from the kitchen comprising a crawl space for the foundations. The property forms a hipped roof and has existing flat-roofed dormer windows on both the front and rear elevations. The property has a north-facing principal elevation which faces onto Balgownie Crescent with a driveway to the front. To the east sits a detached garage, separated from the dwelling via a gate and access lane to the rear of the site. To the rear sits an existing single storey extension and patio extending around the side and rear of the property which leads down to the garden ground via steps dropping by 1.4m in height. The garden measures 35m in length and is treated with low level hedging along both the east and west boundary and a wall to the rear which backs onto the rear gardens of other residential properties. The edge of the Old Aberdeen Conservation Area sits beyond, on the other side of Balgownie Road.

Relevant Planning History

The adjoining property, 23 Balgownie Crescent has been previously extended to the side to form a gable end and has a flat-roofed extension at ground floor level with a small external access door at the basement level which projects 3.5m along the mutual boundary and then steps in by 1m projecting to a full length of 6m. It is noted that this application is believed to have gained planning consent (850330) in 1985 and was therefore considered under a different policy context. The property to the west (19 Balgownie Crescent) has a single-storey extension that sits to the side and rear of the property. This property has a planning consent (890025) from 1989, also sitting within a different policy context.

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Description of Proposal

Detailed planning permission is sought for the erection of an extension that comprises two parts, a 1.5 storey side extension and a 2-/2.5-storey element to the rear, which wraps around the existing dwelling forming an 'L' shape. The development is expanded on further below.

Side extension

- The side extension would measure 4.4m in width, sitting flush with the front elevation of the dwelling and forming a gable end on the east elevation. This would incorporate a garage on the ground floor and a bedroom and bathroom on the first floor. The front elevation would be finished in roughcast render and fitted with a 3.1m by 2.2m grey roller garage door. The east elevation would be fitted with a single door and window, extract ducts and hand rails along the wall adjacent to the proposed side access path detailed below.
- A dormer would be erected on the front elevation of the side extension, measuring 1.78m in height and 3.55m in width, forming a three pane window with slate panelling on either side and 350mm high fascia.

Rear extension

- The rear extension which comprises the 2-/2.5-storey element would see a 2-storey element at the ground and basement level which would extend the width of the original dwelling and the 2.5-storey element which extends the width of the proposed side extension, however it is noted that owing to its design, the rear aspect of the extension gives the appearance of being 3-storeys. The projection at ground level would be c. 6.23m in length and the 2.5-storey element and flat roof at second floor level would project out further to c. 6.38m in length. The height of the extension would be c. 9.65m, with the ridge of the extension meeting the ridge of the original dwelling. The rear extension would accommodate a garden room at the lower ground level, an open kitchen/snug at the ground floor level and a bedroom with an en-suite on the top floor.
- The rear extension would be finished predominantly in glazing measuring 6.9m in width, with a 1.55m and 1.4m width of roughcast render on the either side. The second floor gable element would be triangular in shape and would also be predominantly glazed, framed with a grey aluminium fascia. The proposed roof would be finished in slate tiles to match the existing and fitted with a rooflight to the rear, three rooflights on the east elevation and two rooflights on the west elevation.
- The flat roof would be fitted with a flue on the southwest corner measuring 650mm in height, however while shown on the rear, south, elevational drawing, it has not been depicted on the side, east, elevational drawing.

Site alterations

- The proposed extension would extend over the existing patio to meet the garden level and remove the steps. There would be a new external path along the east side of the dwelling, with three steps up to the new door on the east elevation, and additional steps down to meet the ground level, which would sit along the east boundary of the site.
- To the front of the property, there would be an increased driveway, measuring 5m in width and 5.31m in length, removing the low level boundary wall and lowering the dropped kerb to allow access into the driveway.

Amendments

The second floor patio and spiral staircase has been removed from the proposal. The dormer extension forming a door from bedroom 4 has also been removed.

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=S5HSX2BZIEZ00>

CONSULTATIONS

ACC - Roads Development Management Team – The proposed garage would be marginally too small, and not meet the 5.7m internal length between the internal walls of the garage. The driveway would allow two cars to be parked and the dropped kerb being greater than 10m in width would be acceptable due to the scale of the neighbouring dropped kerb.

Bridge of Don 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)
- Policy T3 (Parking)

Aberdeen Planning Guidance

- Householder Development Guide
- Materials
- Transport and Accessibility

EVALUATION

Principle of Development

In terms of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2023 (ALDP), the application site is located in a residential area under Policy H1 (Residential Areas) and the proposal relates to householder development. Householder development would accord with Policy H1 in principle if it does not constitute overdevelopment, adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area or result in the loss of open space.

The main planning considerations for this proposal relate to the scale and design of the proposed extension in the context of the impact it may have on the appearance and character of the surrounding conservation area. There is also a consideration for the impact on the amenity of any neighbouring properties.

The proposal comprises an extension within an existing residential curtilage and would thus not result in the loss of any open space. All other matters are discussed below.

Scale and Design

Policy 14 (Design, Quality and Place) of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) expects development to be designed to improve the quality of an area, be consistent with the six qualities of successful places and would not support development proposals which are poorly designed or detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area. Policy 16 (Quality Homes) of NPF4 notes that the development must not impact on the character or environmental quality of the home and surrounding area in terms of size, design and materials. To determine the effect of the proposal on the character of the area it is also necessary to assess it in the context of Policy D1 (Quality Placemaking) of the ALDP. This policy expects all development to ensure high standards of design, create sustainable and successful places and have a strong and distinctive sense of place. Proposals are required to ensure quality architecture, craftsmanship and materials and a well-considered layout.

Overdevelopment

In respect to the first criteria of Policy H1, guidance on what constitutes “overdevelopment” is set out within ‘General Principles 4 and 5’ at Section 2.2 of the Householder Development Guide (HDG) Aberdeen Planning Guidance (APG). This states that the built footprint of a dwellinghouse, as extended, should not exceed twice that of the original dwelling and no more than 50% of the rear curtilage of a dwelling should be covered by development. In terms of the current proposal, the existing dwelling has a footprint of 49m² and the rear curtilage around the dwelling extends to 455m². In relation to the site, the existing two outbuildings and proposed extension would cover 154m² (34%) and while this is a substantial area in relation to the original dwelling, would not overdevelop the rear curtilage of the site. However, the proposed extension has a footprint of 98m² and as such, would result in the footprint of the dwelling, as extended, being three times the size. It is noted that there are extensions in the surrounding area which have extended to the rear and side, albeit often to a lesser extent in terms of rear projection and floor area covered. An assessment of the properties in the surrounding area has been outlined below. Given the extent of the proposed footprint and the unacceptable level of development, which results in a 200% increase to the footprint of the existing dwelling, the proposal would adversely impact the character of the original dwelling and an extension of this scale would not be supported unless it remains visually subordinate to the original dwelling and does not present harm to the amenity of the surrounding area.

Scale

The Householder Development Guide (HDG) APG expects extensions to be architecturally compatible in design and scale with the host building and surrounding area and for the materials used to be complementary.

The proposed side extension would extend the property in a similar way to other half of the semi-detached property, following the form and height of the existing dwelling and being of a width that appears subordinate to the dwelling. The extension to the side therefore appears compatible in the context of the site from the front elevation. However, there are significant concerns with the scale of the overall development especially that which extends to the rear.

In accordance with the HDG, extensions to semi-detached properties will be restricted to 4m in projection along the boundary shared with the other half of the semi-detached property. In this case, the extension to the rear would be in conflict as it extends to a total projection of 6.38m at the second floor level of the extension, extending beyond the two extensions to the neighbouring properties on either side. This projection is not appropriate when considering the context of the site. In relation to height, the extension to the rear would comprise a 2.5-storey extension, which has the appearance of 3-storeys when viewed from the rear, to a 1.5-storey dwelling and as such, would not and could not be considered as being subordinate to the original dwelling. This is made more visually prominent as the ridge would extend up to meet the ridge of the side extension/original dwelling as opposed to being set lower to provide a clear separation and subordinate addition to the rear of the original dwelling. A key concern with the height of this extension is the introduction of a full-height basement level which diverges from the character of 1.5-storey dwellings along this row of properties and worsens the above identified overdevelopment impact, with other properties at most incorporating a raised patio or a shallow access door to the basement level. The width of the rear extension would measure 9.8m, spanning the width of the original dwelling and proposed side extension. The sheer scale of this extension in terms of its width creates an unacceptable form of development, which almost doubles the existing width of the dwelling. Therefore, the substantial height and width of the rear extension and addition of a full basement floor level would appear prominent on the rear elevation, encapsulating a significant majority of this 12m wide site and projecting further than the other extensions along Balgownie Crescent.

Side Extension Design and Front Dormer Window

The HDG would allow a hipped roof to be extended on one half of a semi-detached house where the other half of the building has already been altered in this way. The other half of the semi-detached property has been previously altered, extending to the side to introduce a garage and form a gable to the west elevation. The principal of a side extension of a similar form to the application property would therefore be acceptable and suitable in the context of the site. When reviewing the design of the side extension, the front and east elevations have been designed as an in keeping addition to the original dwelling, matching the form by continuing the existing eaves and ridge heights. The side extension in itself would therefore be complementary and compatible with the existing dwelling and takes due consideration for how the other half of the property has already been extended. However, in relation to the design detail, there is a substantial wall head above the garage door which presents a wide section of solid wall and as such, the door appears too short in relation to the proportions of the dwelling, though, this is not thought to represent any detrimental harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area. The side extension has also been finished in suitable materials to complement the original dwelling and the proposed door and window, and handrails attached to the wall appear compatible with the original dwelling and would not present visual harm to the surrounding area.

The HDG expects new dormers to respect the scale of the building and to avoid dominating, overwhelming or unbalancing the original roof. The dormer should not be built off the wall head or incorporate a solid apron below the window. Box dormers are also required to sit 600mm below

the ridge of the existing roof and sit 600mm away from the gable. In terms of glazing, dormers should have more glazing than solid panelling and windows should be placed at the extremities of the dormer, echoing the proportions and window arrangement of the floor below. The design of the dormer should have a horizontal proportion and be finished in materials to match the dwelling. In this case, the proposed front dormer is of a similar form to the existing, with a suitable level of glazing and would comply with the dimensions of the HDG. However, the dormer does not match the existing in that the proposal comprises panelling at the extremities of the dormer and in addition to diverging from the design of the existing dormer would represent a conflict with the HDG as these areas should be glazed. The dormer also sits at a slightly different height on the roof, creating an unbalanced appearance and does not align with the garage door on the ground floor level. As such, the dormer has not been ideally designed nor is it in keeping with the original dwelling and thus it is not cohesive with the proposed garage design. While this design is not detrimental to the character of the surrounding area, it would adversely impact the appearance of the semi-detached properties. In summary, the principle of a 1.5-storey side extension would be acceptable to this property, given the existing context of the semi-detached properties, however the dormer has not been appropriately designed and would not be compatible with the original dwelling.

Rear Extension Design

The existing ground floor level has an external height of 3.35m from the patio level to the underside of the eaves, which is the form, proportion and scale of other 1.5-storey dwellings in the surrounding area. The steps from the patio drop by 1.4m in height to the garden level. Due to the introduction of the additional basement level, using this drop in ground level, the rear elevation would have a 3-storey appearance which would diverge from the form and 1.5-storey appearance of the existing rear elevation and cover the appearance of the original dwelling. The introduction of this additional level would also result in the basement and ground floor levels having an approximate external height of c. 2.4m each, resulting from the limited 1.4m height offered from the change in ground level. This, combined with the extended width of the extension, gives these two floors levels a short and elongated appearance when compared with the rear elevation of the original dwelling as well as other rear elevations along Balgownie Crescent. The second floor pitched element, however, has a height of 4.9m from the fascia to its ridge height. In terms of the architecture of a building, as the windows and extension become larger as they move up the building, these two elements of the rear elevation give it a top heavy form which dominates the roof and proposed extension. This concern is made more prominent as the flat roof and pitched roof would overhang the lower floor levels by 700mm, presenting an overbearing second floor element. In respect to the rear elevation as a whole, the second floor element and the existing dormer do not appropriately align with the glazing on the ground and basement levels, creating further unbalance to this rear elevation. The presence of the wide render border on each side of the glazing draws further attention to this and makes the glazing appear out of proportion to the rest of the dwelling and extension. There is a further disconnect in that the second floor presents a separation between the existing roof space and the new second-storey element, where the lower levels present one expansive width, losing the form of the original rear elevation. This adds to the dominant appearance on the existing roof space and in making the lower floor levels appear compressed in comparison, with a lack of cohesion between the existing building and proposed design.

In assessing the modern design of the rear extension and the proposed materials, there is a mix of materials to match the existing dwelling and new materials aiming to present the extension as a modern addition. The use of slate to match the roof would be acceptable as it would be complementary and allows this material to be used on the side and front elevations of the dwelling. However, the use of render on the rear elevation, paired with grey aluminium windows and fascia around the second floor element of the extension draws focus to the fact that the design of the extension does not relate to the original dwelling and is unbalanced. The APG on materials identifies render as a tool to unifying an aesthetic and for modern properties, expects its use to

either complement the existing building or for contemporary design to offer an assertive contrast. In this case, the form and chosen materials do not fully align to visually create a clear separation between the dwelling and the contemporary extension. In addition, where a modern addition is introduced, this, as outlined above, should remain subservient to the original dwelling in the interesting of maintaining the character of it and as such, should not wrap around it. Although the elevation of this extension would sit to the rear, it would still present harm to the appearance of the surrounding area, given that there is a wide driveway and opening at 18 Balgownie Road, making the rear of the dwelling visible from public view; sitting opposite the public footpath that leads from Mill Cottages, resulting in an open view of the proposed rear elevation from the Old Aberdeen Conservation Area.

The character of the surrounding area is fairly consistent, with predominantly 1.5-storey semi-detached properties of a similar style to the application property. Many of these properties have been previously extended to the side, as has the other half of the semi-detached property and as such, this element of the proposal would be in keeping with the surrounding area. When reviewing the tension with the APG, the concern with the proposal relates to overdevelopment, wrapping around the dwelling to the side and rear, its projection of 6.38m and the height of a 2.5-storey extension with 3 full floor levels and a ridge that meets that of the original 1.5-storey dwelling. In relation to the surrounding area, there are examples of extensions which extend to the rear and side (No's 5, 7, 19) and while these properties do not have any recent planning consent, they do contribute to the context of the area given the level of development in the area. It is noted however, that these properties form single storey extensions which remain subordinate to the original dwelling.

In relation to this projection, this would be greater than the neighbouring properties and the prominent context of the area. While it is noted that the neighbouring property (23 Balgownie Crescent) has a projection of 6m in total, this is stepped off the boundary and measures 3.5m along the mutual boundary to avoid overshadowing the application site, and comprises a ground floor extension with an access door at basement level which remains subordinate to the dwelling. There is an additional property at 25 Balgownie Crescent with an apparent external basement access, however, this sits under a modest ground floor extension measuring c. 4m in width and 2.5m in projection to the side of the patio. The extension at 11 Balgownie Crescent comprises a side and rear extension with a pitched roof gable which extends the width of the dwelling. Although it is noted that this development gained planning consent (ref. 111413) in 2011, while it was approved under a different planning context, its merits when reviewing the context of the surrounding area can be considered. This extension presents a 1.5-storey extension to a 1.5-storey dwelling with a ridge height sitting below the side extension/original dwelling ridge height. There is also a clear break between the two rear extensions to avoid its massing and maintaining a distinction between the existing dwelling and an addition. The extension to this site also measures c. 3.5m in projection and does therefore not conflict with the current HDG. As such, there are extensions with a large footprint in the surrounding area, as well as extensions which span the width of the original dwelling and side extension. However, there are no extensions along this row of properties which introduce a full external basement level to create an extension which matches the appearance and projection as the one proposed. As such, the combination of the proposals height, projection and footprint, resulting in a design which does not relate to the original dwelling and surrounding area, would present adverse harm to its appearance and character. This could also set a precedent for both a projection of this extent for rear extensions to semi-detached properties and other 2.5-storey extensions to properties of this size.

In summary, the principal of extending the dwelling to the side to match the neighbouring property could be acceptable, however, the scale and design of the proposed front dormer and rear extension would not be compatible with the original dwelling or subordinate to its existing scale. Due to the context of the site in relation to the scale of the garden and existing extensions to the neighbouring properties, development which diverges from the HDG in relation to its projection,

height or floor area may be justified, however, this combination of overdevelopment comprising a 2.5-storey extension, with the appearance of a 3-storey rear elevation to a 1.5-storey dwelling, wrapping around the rear and side elevations presents excessive development to the site and adversely impacts the architectural form of the original dwelling as well as the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This visual impact would also extend to views from the Old Aberdeen Conservation Area to the south at Balgownie Road. The design further adds to the visual impact of the proposal, introducing a top heavy second floor element which presents an overbearing and unbalanced rear elevation and makes the basement and ground floor levels look compacted in comparison, diverging from the form and appearance of the original dwelling and adding to the lack of cohesion across the design on the front and rear elevations. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 14 and Policy 16 of NPF4 and Policy H1 and D1 of the ALDP in respect to the adverse impact of its size and design on the character of the surrounding area.

Site Alterations

The proposed path and steps along the east boundary would follow the existing ground levels dropping to the garden ground. This path would rise by three steps (c. 750mm) to meet the new door on the east elevation and descend again on the other side of the door. The proposed path and steps would not present adverse visual harm to the original dwelling and surrounding area in relation to their scale and design and would be acceptable provided they would not result in adverse overlooking to the neighbouring property. This consideration has been assessed below.

Amenity

Policy 16 of NPF4 under section g) ii) would support householder development where it does not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking. Policy D2 (Amenity) expects development to be designed to optimise the amenity afforded to the application dwelling and avoid adversely affecting any external private and public space. The proposal is not considered to adversely impact the amenity afforded to the original dwelling and would incorporate sufficient glazing for views and light.

In relation to overshadowing, the 45° calculation for sunlight and the 45° method for daylight under appendix 2 of the HDG has been assessed using the site plan and site visit information. In relation to 23 Balgownie Crescent, these assessments have approximated less than 1m² of adverse overshadowing to the neighbouring site, confined to a strip immediately to the rear of the neighbouring extension. Due to its location and the fact that the gardens are south facing, this is not considered to present detrimental harm to the enjoyment of the site. In relation to daylight, there is a window to the rear of the neighbouring extension, however, daylight to this window would likely be unaffected due to its height on the extension and as such would not cause any overshadowing. In relation to 19 Balgownie Crescent, the overshadowing assessment has identified up to 23m² of adverse overshadowing resulting from the 2.5-storey pitch of the rear extension. Due to the existing extension at the neighbouring property, the impact of this overshadowing would be confined to a c. 3m² area (accounting for the raised height of the neighbouring patio) of adverse overshadowing to the neighbouring patio, extending to the rear of the window to the neighbouring extension. In relation to daylight, the 45° method would suggest that the 2.5-storey extension would not block daylight afforded to this neighbouring rear window facing onto the patio.

In terms of privacy, the proposed door on the east elevation would exit onto the external path, raised c. 750mm above the existing path level. However, this door would face the solid wall of the neighbouring extension and therefore not result in overlooking from this aspect of the proposal. Due to the nature of the proposed dormer sitting on the front elevation of the dwelling, this would overlook the public road and therefore also not present any harm to the privacy of neighbouring properties. The proposed rear extension would introduce a gable end facing towards the rear garden on the site which would be finished in substantial glazing up to the second floor level. On

the basement level and ground floor, the glazing would sit 1.55m and 2.5m from the west and east boundary respectively and the outlook from these would be similar to any rear window to a dwelling, however noting that full length windows of this span may encourage persons to stand and look out for longer periods of time than a standard window. As such, there would not be detrimental harm to the privacy of the neighbouring sites in relation to overlooking from these levels. In relation to the 2.5-storey element, these windows sit 1.5m from the east boundary, with the higher windows which someone would be expected to look out of sitting 2.6m from the boundary. Due to the height of the boundary treatment in the garden, there is potential for overlooking at this second floor level into the neighbouring gardens from the use of full height windows, presenting an opportunity for users to look down into the garden. However, as the first-floor plans depict that the windows are set back from the fascia and the smaller side windows would not offer an opportunity to look out of, there would not be a detrimental impact on the privacy of the neighbouring sites.

In summary, the proposed extension would result in minor overshadowing on the east neighbouring site to the side of the patio but would not block daylight from entering any windows to the neighbouring properties. This overshadowing is present due to the 6.38m projection and height of the second floor element of the extension which extends beyond the length of the two neighbouring extensions. The proposal would present minor tension with Policy 16 of NPF4 and Policy D2 of the ALDP and as such, the scale of the development, diverging from the 4m restriction to the projection (in line with the HDG) would not be acceptable as it is not suitable in the context of the site and would not avoid harm to the neighbouring site which would otherwise be mitigated through a reduction in its projection.

Parking

The proposed extension would increase the number of bedrooms to 4. The Transport and Accessibility APG states that the parking requirement for this would increase from two off street parking spaces to three.

The APG requires garages to meet the following minimum dimensions:

- Internal size of 5.7m by 2.7m.
- Minimum effective entry of 2.25m wide and 1.98m in height.

The proposed garage would have an internal length of c. 5.67m and would therefore be marginally too short in relation to the requirements of the APG. However, as this is only 0.03m below the standards for a garage, it would not prevent a car from parking in the space and would therefore be acceptable. There are proposed steps within the garage, however, there would still be a 3.3m internal width at this point which would be sufficient for parking a car.

A driveway is required to be 5m in length and either 3m in width for a single driveway or 5m in width for a double driveway. The proposed driveway plan shows a proposed driveway of 5m in width and 5.31m in length. As such this would be suitable to accommodate two parking spaces to the front of the dwelling. The parking to the site has been accommodated to widening the existing dropped kerb to share with the neighbouring property. Roads Development Management have agreed to the proposed 13.6m dropped kerb due to the existing width of the neighbouring single dropped kerb. The proposal would therefore allow for three spaces for car parking, complying with Policy T3 of the ALDP.

Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises, Climate Mitigation and Biodiversity

Policy 1 (Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises) of NPF4 requires planning authorities when considering all development proposals to give significant weight to encouraging, promoting and facilitating development that addresses the global climate emergency and nature crisis. Similarly,

Policy 2 (Climate Mitigation and Adaptation) of NPF4 encourages, promotes and facilitates development that minimises emissions and adapts to the current and future impacts of climate change. Policy 3 (Biodiversity) seeks the enhancement of biodiversity.

Due to the small-scale nature of the development it does not offer the opportunity to address the global climate emergency and nature crisis, minimise emission or to enhance biodiversity.

DECISION

Refuse

REASON FOR DECISION

The proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site, resulting in the built footprint of the dwellinghouse, as extended, being three times the size of the original dwelling. The scale and design of the proposed rear extension would not be subordinate or compatible with the original dwelling and would be in conflict with the Householder Development Guide Aberdeen Planning Guidance due to its projection which extends by more than 4m, resulting in adverse overshadowing to the neighbouring site. The combination of this overdevelopment, introducing a 2.5-storey extension, with the appearance of a 3-storey rear elevation, to a 1.5-storey dwelling and the non-complaint projection would present excessive development on the site, diverging from the character and appearance of the original dwelling and surrounding area. The design of the rear extension, spanning the width of the dwelling and side extension and extending the proposed gable end up to the ridge of the original dwelling further adds to the visual dominance of the proposal, presenting an overbearing second floor element above the two lower floor levels, which appear misaligned and too short in comparison. The proposal therefore does not complement the form or design of the original dwelling and would present visual harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore not complaint with Policy 14 (Design, Quality and Place) and Policy 16 (Quality Homes) of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) and Policy H1 (Residential Areas), Policy D1 (Quality Placemaking) and Policy D2 (Amenity) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan (ALDP) 2023 and there is significant conflict with the Householder Development Guide Aberdeen Planning Guidance.