



## Strategic Place Planning

Report of Handling by Development Management Manager

<b>Site Address:</b>	148 Victoria Street, Dyce, Aberdeen AB21 7BE
<b>Application Description:</b>	Erection of two storey extension to rear
<b>Application Ref:</b>	250366/DPP
<b>Application Type:</b>	Detailed Planning Permission
<b>Application Date:</b>	9 April 2025
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr B Sutherland
<b>Ward:</b>	Dyce/Bucksburn/Danestone
<b>Community Council:</b>	Dyce and Stoneywood

### **DECISION**

Refuse.

### **APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

#### **Site Description**

The application site consists of a detached 1½-storey dwellinghouse dating to the late 19<sup>th</sup> century in Dyce, set in the centre of a large residential curtilage of approximately 0.14 hectares. The dwellinghouse is built of granite ashlar to the front and coursed rubble to the sides and rear, with slate tile roof and white windows. To the rear (east) elevation are a pair of hipped roof wallhead dormers and a protruding 1½-storey gable wing, also constructed in granite. Adjoining the side (north) elevation and extending eastwards is a single-storey extension including double garage with pitched slate tile roof and walls finished in granite and brown-grey harling. There is a timber outbuilding with decking to the south-east corner.

The property is on the corner of and is accessed via both Victoria Street and Gladstone Place, separated on both sides by a granite wall approximately 1.3 metres in height. To the east is a grassed rear lane separated by a similar wall and across from which is the rear curtilage of the flatted cottage containing 4 and 6 Gladstone Place. To the south is the neighbouring detached dwellinghouse at 144 Victoria Street, contemporary with the application property and of similar design and layout, separated towards the front by a timber panel fence approximately 1.8 m high and towards the rear by a granite wall approximately 1.3 m high.

The area is primarily residential in character, largely consisting of detached dwellinghouses from various eras and styles. There is a church to the north and commercial properties on Victoria Street to the south.

#### **Relevant Planning History**

None.

## **APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

### **Description of Proposal**

It is proposed to demolish the garage element of the existing extension, the original protruding granite rear wing, the existing rear dormers and wall of the dwellinghouse. In the place of the original wing would be erected a 2-storey flat roof extension and porch. The extension would be approximately 6.5 metres long, 11.2 m wide and 6.8 m high, and would be clad in dark grey standing seam metal with single-ply membrane roof and black alu-clad timber framed windows and glazed doors, with two east-facing Juliet balconies formed on the first floor.

A garden wall approximately 1.3 m high and 6.8 m long would be built within the rear garden from the duntakings of the demolished rear wing. This part of the proposal is permitted development but has been explicitly included towards satisfying policy for the retention of historic granite, as discussed in detail in the Evaluation below.

### **Amendments**

In agreement with the applicant, the following amendments were made to the application –

A granite wall was included as part of garden landscaping using duntakings from the rear wing proposed for demolition.

### **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=SUCV51BZHQZ00>

## **CONSULTATIONS**

- **Dyce and Stoneywood Community Council** – No response 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

National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the long-term spatial strategy for Scotland and contains a comprehensive set of national planning policies that form part of the statutory development plan.

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

### Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2023

- Policy D1 (Quality Placemaking)
- Policy D7 (Our Granite Heritage)
- Policy H1 (Residential Areas)

## Aberdeen Planning Guidance

- Householder Development Guide
- Materials

## Other National Policy and Guidance

- Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions

## EVALUATION

### Key Determining Factors

The key determining factors in the assessment of this application are whether the proposed development would:

- impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area;
- impact upon the amenity of the area, including the residential amenity of immediately neighbouring properties;

### Policy Context

Policy 16 (Quality Homes), paragraph (g) of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) states 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; and*
- do not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring properties in terms of physical impact, overshadowing or overlooking.*

The application site also lies within a Residential Area, as zoned in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2023 (ALDP) Proposals Map. Policy H1 (Residential Areas) of the ALDP states that within existing residential areas, proposals for new householder development will be approved in principle if it:

1. *does not constitute overdevelopment; and*
2. *does not have an adverse impact to residential amenity and the character and appearance of an area; and*
3. *does not result in the loss of open space.*

## **Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area**

In determining whether the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and the surrounding area, Policy 14 (Design, Quality and Place) of NPF4 is relevant. Policy 14 encourages and promotes well-designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach. Policy D1 (Quality Placemaking) of the ALDP substantively reiterates the aims and requirements of Policy 14.

### **Siting, Scale, Design and Materials**

The Council's Householder Development Guide Aberdeen Planning Guidance (HDG) states: *"Proposals for extensions, dormers and other alterations should be architecturally compatible in design and scale with the original house and its surrounding area"*.

The application site is a corner site from which the rear extension would be more visible from the side and rear on Gladstone Place than is typical of rear extensions. The character of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area is therefore more sensitive to changes within this curtilage than those elsewhere. The surrounding area is largely residential in character and consists mostly of detached dwellings built at various points since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The visual character of the area is mixed but in general typified by traditional pitched roof forms. Where flat-roof extensions to traditional properties do exist, these are either at the ends of gables and integrated to some extent into the form and finish of the building as a whole, as at 133a-141 Victoria Street, or are not especially visible from the street, as at numbers 3 and 4-6 Gladstone Place.

Appraising the dwellinghouse itself, its principal elevation is the west elevation, finished in fine detail with ashlar granite walls. Nevertheless, its opposite rear elevation is visible from Gladstone Place and well composed, consisting of a subsidiary contemporaneous granite built rear wing and two hipped roof wallhead dormers. These elements make positive contributions to the character of the dwellinghouse and street corner. While their removal is permissible in principle because the building has no official protection, any replacement should make a similarly positive contribution to place.

The HDG states that 2-storey extensions will generally be possible on properties of 2 or more storeys, subject to the HDG's General Principles, as quoted above. The existing dwellinghouse is 1½ storeys, whereby its first-floor accommodation rises well above the eaves line and is lit by bay dormers to the front and wallhead dormers to the rear. This presents an initial challenge of scale for integrating any 2-storey extension to the rear of the property, as the ceiling heights necessary for such an extension could result in a form which challenged the established scale and form of the existing dwellinghouse.

In this case, the proposed 2-storey extension would be a relatively unarticulated flat-roof box form breaching well above the eaves of the dwellinghouse and effacing most of its rear roof plane and wall. The large expanse of blank wall on the first floor north and south elevations and the direct repetition of the ground floor door/window arrangement at first floor level on the east elevation would increase the visual weight and prominence of the first floor. This imposing appearance at first floor level would exacerbate the severity of the extension's intrusion on the upper level of the original dwellinghouse. While the extension's walls would be set in from the gables and its roof below the ridge, the overall result would be a large extension of a severe contrasting form that would challenge the original dwellinghouse, to the significant detriment of its architectural merit as a late Victorian

villa and the character of the wider area.

Given this, established national guidance on the extension of traditional buildings is therefore materially relevant. While 'assertive contrast' extensions can be effective design solutions on traditional buildings, as described in *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions*, this demands a specification and design over and above what would ordinarily be found in an isolated new building. The contrasting forms must be integrated in such a way as to achieve an assemblage *"of greater lasting value than either on its own."* The large box form of the extension dominating the existing traditional villa would not achieve this.

The proposed porch canopy would likewise, by virtue of the deep fascia, exacerbate the heaviness of the proposed extension's appearance and its overbearing impact on the original dwellinghouse.

The extension's public harm would be most apparent from Gladstone Place, where the extension would be highly visible. From the busier thoroughfare of Victoria Street there would be less impact, although because of the large separation distance between the dwellinghouse and neighbouring buildings, the extension would still be apparent as a large unsympathetic form to the rear of the property, particularly when viewing the dwellinghouse in the context of its matching neighbour to the south, whereby both the application property and matching neighbour have hitherto been extended at a smaller scale using largely sympathetic forms and materials.

The use of dark grey standing seam metal cladding would in and of itself be an appropriate contemporary and contrasting material with the stonework of the dwellinghouse and many buildings of the surrounding area. Aberdeen Planning Guidance: Materials acknowledges that *"Metal can often be utilised to provide a clear, honest distinction and contrast between old and new."* However, the Guidance also makes clear that among other things, the scale of cladding must be sympathetic to the context. Given the issues of scale, form and mass described above, the use of metal cladding as proposed would not lend any significant benefit to the sympathetic integration of the extension's form with the original dwellinghouse.

The detached dwelling sits within a generous curtilage and its scale does not preclude the possibility of a substantial extension which would nevertheless be sympathetic and subordinate to the original house in scale and form. This is demonstrated to some extent by the level of incremental extension to the property which has already taken place, and the extensions undertaken at 133 Victoria Street. With this principle in mind, discussions have been had with the applicant's agent to modify the proposal through some reduction of the extension's scale and the reconsideration of its articulation and form to better integrate a large extension with the dwellinghouse. Following these discussions, ultimately the agent has advised that the applicant wishes to have the application determined in its current unacceptable form.

### Overdevelopment

Guidance on what constitutes 'overdevelopment' is set out within 'General Principles 4 and 5' at section 2.2 of the HDG. 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, calculations confirm that the existing rear curtilage extends to 832 sqm, and whilst the proposed extension would add 78 sqm, the built area, including the existing extensions, built elements to be removed, outbuilding, and area of decking would result in 75% of the rear curtilage remaining unbuilt. The collective size of both existing and proposed extensions would result in the original house being increased in footprint by approximately 74%. Such an increase would be substantial and, as has been explained above, the design of the resulting large scale of development would be detrimental to the character of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area. Nevertheless, it would not itself be overdevelopment as according to the HDG.

### Retention of Granite

Policy D7 (Our Granite Heritage) seeks the retention and appropriate reuse of all historic granite buildings, structures and features. The use of an unspecified amount of granite salvaged from the demolition of the rear wing and walls would be supported by this policy in general terms. Any alignment with Policy D7 is insufficient to outweigh the principal issues of scale and design discussed above.

### Open Space

The proposed householder development would be wholly contained within the existing residential curtilage of the application property and no open space would be lost.

### Summary

To summarise, the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 14 and 16 of NPF4 and Policies D1 and H1 of the ALDP, as well as the relevant guidance contained within the Householder Development Guide.

### **Impact on the Amenity of the Area**

In relation to assessing impacts on residential amenity, the HDG states that "*No extension or alteration should result in a situation where the amenity of any neighbouring properties would be adversely affected. Significant adverse impact on privacy, daylight and general amenity will count against a development proposal.*"

### Daylight and Sunlight Receipt

The proposed extension would be at a sufficient distance from any neighbouring properties that it would not have a significantly adverse impact on daylight or sunlight receipt to neighbours.

### Privacy and Outlook

The proposed extension would have ground floor windows on its south and east elevations facing the rear gardens of neighbours. The ground floor windows to the south would largely face onto the mutual boundary fence approximately 9 m away and standing approximately 1.8 m high. The windows facing east would be approximately 18 m from the neighbouring rear curtilage of 4 and 6 Gladstone Place. Based on this spatial arrangement, the proposal would not have any significant adverse impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties.

Notwithstanding issues raised above on the harm that the extension would cause to the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area, the extension would be at sufficient distance from neighbouring properties that it would not have any significant impact on the outlook enjoyed by any particular property.

### Summary

To summarise, the proposed development would preserve the amenity of the surrounding area, including the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties, in accordance with Policy 16 of NPF4 and Policy H1 of the ALDP, as well as the relevant guidance contained within the Householder Development Guide.

## **Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises, Climate Mitigation and Adaptation**

Policy 1 (Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises) of NPF4 requires significant weight to be given to the global climate and nature crises in the consideration of all development proposals. Policy 2 (Climate Mitigation and Adaptation) of NPF4 requires development proposals to be sited and designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.

The proposed householder development would be sufficiently small-scale such that it would not make any material difference to the global climate and nature crises, nor to climate mitigation and adaptation. The proposals are thus acceptable and do not conflict with the aims and requirements of Policies 1 and 2 of NPF4.

## **DECISION**

Refuse.

## **REASON FOR DECISION**

Due primarily to its disproportionate scale as a 2-storey extension on a 1½-storey dwellinghouse, the proposed plain box form cutting into most of the roof, and the elevational treatment which would exaggerate the harmful effects of scale and form, the proposed extension would dominate the existing dwellinghouse at its prominent corner site when viewed from Gladstone Place, failing to be subordinate to it and harming its character and that of the surrounding area. This is particularly given the architectural merit of the traditional dwellinghouse and its rear elevation, which currently make a positive contribution to the character of the area.

The development would therefore be contrary to the first General Principle of Aberdeen Planning Guidance: Householder Development Guide and against the design principles of Policies 14 (Design Quality and Place) of National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) and D1 (Quality Placemaking) of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2023 (ALDP), in particular the requirements to be distinctive and welcoming. Likewise, the development would be contrary to Policy 16 (Quality Homes) of NPF4, which supports householder development only where it does not have a detrimental impact on the character of the home in terms of size, design and materials, and Policy H1 (Residential Areas) of the ALDP, which does not support development which would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of an area.