



## Strategic Place Planning

Report of Handling by Development Management Manager

<b>Site Address:</b>	26 Spey Road, Aberdeen, AB16 6SE
<b>Application Description:</b>	Erection of single storey extension to front
<b>Application Ref:</b>	240225/DPP
<b>Application Type:</b>	Detailed Planning Permission
<b>Application Date:</b>	27 February 2024
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Stephen Jeffery
<b>Ward:</b>	Northfield/Mastrick North
<b>Community Council:</b>	Mastrick, Sheddocksley and Summerhill

### **DECISION**

Refuse

### **APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

#### **Site Description**

The application site comprises the curtilage of a two-storey terraced dwelling set within a row of eight properties running to the east and west. The property has a south-facing principal elevation with a 12m driveway leading onto Spey Road and a rear garden to the north adjoined with other residential plots. The dwelling has an existing rear single-storey extension, a rear dormer extension and an outbuilding sitting on the north boundary. There is an existing slate-finished awning above the front door measuring 3.1m in height and projecting 500mm from the front elevation of the dwelling shared with the neighbouring property. The dwelling is finished in render, with white PVC windows and a tile roof.

#### **Relevant Planning History**

161469/DPP - Rear dormer – Approved Unconditionally 29.11.2016.

### **APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

#### **Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a front extension to create an enclosed front porch and extend the living room outwards. The extension would span the entire width of the dwelling, measuring 5.9m in width, 3.4m in height and projecting 1.6m from the front elevation. It would be finished in a dry dash render with brick basecourse, white PVC windows and a tile roof.

#### **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=S9IK1BBZKLE00>

## CONSULTATIONS

**ACC - Roads Development Management Team** – No concern with the proposal. The driveway would remain in excess of 10m and there would be no change to the parking provisions for the site.

**Mastrick, Sheddocksley and Summerhill 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

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 over development, 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 front extension, in the context of the impact it may have on the appearance and character of the surrounding area and its impact on the existing streetscape. Consideration must also be given to 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, Design and Impact on the Surrounding Area

Policy 14 (Design, Quality and Place) of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) expects development to be designed to be consistent with the six qualities of successful places and to not have an adverse impact on 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. 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) 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. The Householder Development Guide Aberdeen Planning Guidance (APG) expects all development to be architecturally compatible in design and scale with the host building and surrounding area and for the materials used to be complementary.

The APG expects front extensions to respect any established building line and be of a scale and design which is complementary and consistent with the original dwelling as to not detract from its design or the character of the street. Porch extensions are required to be modest, not incorporate additional rooms and incorporate a substantial proportion of glazing to minimise massing.

In this case, there is a clear and uniform residential context of terraced properties in the immediate vicinity which extends to the wider Mastrick area, illustrated by the location plan. The properties in this residential area have clearly defined building lines with a well-established pattern throughout these rows of housing. The determining issues of the proposed development relate to the impact of the scale and design of the front extension on this streetscape and established building line which would not be compliant with the APG or with ALDP Policy D1 and NPF4 Policy 14.

The proposed front extension would span the entire width of the dwelling, having a similar appearance to a typical rear extension, to introduce a porch and extending the existing living room. The proposal would therefore be in conflict with the guidance as it would include an additional room beyond that of a typical porch and is not a modest addition to the front of the property. The extension would sit at a greater height than the existing awning to the dwelling which is shared with neighbouring property, introducing a solid structure which does not respect the scale of the existing porch opening. Nor would it visually align with the existing site context or the awnings to other properties which all sit at a similar height set just above the front facing windows.

With respect to its design, the proposed front extension has not incorporated substantial glazing, presenting a predominantly solid front elevation with the two side elevations being finished entirely in solid render set on the east and west boundaries, presenting a solid wall to the neighbouring properties. The massing and dominance of this extension would therefore impact on the existing open character to the front of this row of terraced properties, being prominently visible from the public road. The extension has therefore not been appropriately designed as a front extension, presenting a large-scale solid addition which would interfere with the established frontage of the dwelling and result in an adverse impact on the distinctiveness of these terraced properties and the attractiveness of the uniform and open front curtilages of this row of terraced housing.

Due to the identified area context, the proposed extension would detract from the existing established building line where no other properties in this row have been extended to the front, introducing a forward projection which overwhelms the existing front elevation and loses the clearly defined frontage of the dwelling. In the wider context, there is only one example of a front extension along the whole of Spey Road which received planning consent (ref. 940408) in 1994; to number 16, which comprises a modest porch with a single door and window spanning c. 1/3 the width of the property. In the wider context, there are a few further examples of typical porch extensions, but none of these span the full width of their respective property, in order to maintain the front elevation of the dwelling. The proposed works would result in a precedent being set for development diverging from the established building line and pattern of housing in the surrounding area as well as for large scale front extensions which detract from the principal elevation of these dwellings, harming the character of the area.

Guidance on what constitutes “overdevelopment” is set out within ‘General Principles 4 and 5’ at Section 2.2 of the Householder Development Guide 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 or front curtilage of a dwelling should be covered by development. In terms of the current proposal, the existing dwelling has a footprint of 39m<sup>2</sup>, the rear curtilage extends to 80m<sup>2</sup> and the front curtilage measures 85m<sup>2</sup>. The combined footprint of the rear extension and proposed front extension would be 25m<sup>2</sup> and would thus not result in doubling the original footprint. While the development would not result in overdevelopment with respect to floor area in line with the APG, the proposed extension would see a full width extension to both the front and rear curtilage, a rear dormer extension and a c.16m<sup>2</sup> outbuilding to the rear which spans the full width of the site, presenting substantial development of the site.

In summary, the front extension is of a scale which is inconsistent with the existing streetscape and detracts from and disrupts the distinctive frontage of this row of terraced dwellings, diverging from the clear and established building line which is currently consistent throughout the wider residential area. The extension has been designed similar to a rear extension, comprising a full width extension with insufficient glazing. The extension would also extend the living room forward, resulting in the front extension including additional accommodation beyond a porch entrance into the property which would be in conflict with the APG for front extensions, presenting a significant visual massing impact and dominance fronting towards the public road and interfering with and disrupting the existing visual frontage of the building. The development would also result in substantial development of the site, resulting from the cumulative impact of the existing rear extension and outbuilding, with additional proposed development in the front curtilage. The proposal would therefore harm the visual character and appearance of the existing streetscape as well as diverge from the wider character of the surrounding residential area, conflicting with Policies 14 and 16 of NPF4 and Policies H1 and D1 of the ALDP as well as the Aberdeen Planning Guidance.

### 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 would not adversely impact on the amenity afforded to the original dwelling.

Appendix 2 of the APG sets out calculations to aid in assessing the potential amenity impact on the surrounding buildings. The property to the west (28 Spey Road) has a window to their lounge on both the front and rear elevation adjacent to the shared boundary with the application site. With respect to daylight the 45° line would pass close to the centre of the neighbouring front window

presenting some overshadowing to this living space (with an existing level of overshadowing to this room from the existing rear extension). While this alone may not be detrimental to the enjoyment of this space, the presence of the proposed solid elevation up against the shared boundary, on the public elevation which would typically be open and undeveloped, presents an adverse visual and overbearing impact on the outlook from this window. There is considered to be little impact on the property to the east owing to the existing awning which overshadows the windows on the front elevation which lead into the entrance hallway of this property.

In summary, the proposed extension would present a visually overbearing impact on the neighbouring property owing to the existing open nature of the front curtilage of these properties and add to the overshadowing of light received by this window. The cumulative impact of the existing rear extension and proposed front extension set on the boundary shared with 28 Spey Road would impact on the enjoyment of the lounge/dining living space from both the front and rear of this single internal space. The proposal would therefore have tension with Policy 16 of NPF4 and Policy H1 and Policy D2 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 scale and design of the development would introduce a large scale front extension which would interfere with and disrupt the established building line of this row of terraced properties, detracting from the distinctiveness of the streetscape and frontage of the properties as well as the attractiveness of their open front curtilages. The proposed extension has not been designed as a modest subordinate porch extension in that it would be the same width as the dwelling, include additional living accommodation adjacent to the porch and not incorporate substantial glazing, in direct conflict with the Householder Development Guide Aberdeen Planning Guidance.

The visual impact of this extends to the wider area, where there are currently existing small-scale entrance porches and as such, the proposed extension would set a precedent for full-width front extensions, losing the form of the dwelling's front elevation and the building line of this row of properties, diverging from the character of terraced properties in the Mastrick area and resulting in development which would be visually similar to the rear elevation of a terraced property. The development would also result in substantial development of the site due to the presence of the existing full width rear extension and outbuilding. As such, the proposal would not comply with Policies 14 (Design, Quality and Place) or 16 (Quality Homes) of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) nor Policies H1 (Residential Areas) or D1 (Quality Placemaking) and of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2023 (ALDP).

As well as the visual impact on the street scene, the presence of solid elevations sitting on the shared boundaries with the two neighbouring properties would present a visually overbearing impact where the existing character of the front curtilage is open and consistent. The situation for 28 Spey Road is worsened due to the presence of the existing rear extension to the application dwelling, with development overbearing the windows to a single internal space within the neighbouring property to both the front and rear. The proposal would therefore be in tension with Policy 16 (Quality Homes) of NPF4 and Policies H1 (Residential Areas) and D2 (Amenity) of the ALDP.