



OLD ABERDEEN HERITAGE SOCIETY

P&S: Effect of Requisition		
Application Number		
RECEIVED - 8 DEC 2015		
NO.	Sec.	MAO
Case Officer Initials		
Date Approved		

Planning Dept
Aberdeen City Council
Marischal College

11 Greenbrae Cresc
Denmore
Bridge of Don
Aberdeen
AB23 8LH
8th Dec 2015

Dear Sirs,

29 St Machar Drive – Proposed 1 ½ storey rear extension with front, rear and side dormers: and front canopy

The Society wishes to object to the above application on the following grounds:-

(1) This proposal constitutes **overdevelopment of the site**. The Council's Supplementary Guidance on "The Sub-Division and Redevelopment of Residential Curtilages" (pp 6, 5.2) stipulates that "no more than a third of the total site area should be built upon. Densities of **less than 33%** will be required **in areas of lower density housing**".

We contend that 29 St Machar Drive is in an area of "**lower density housing**" (small bungalows with traditional long back gardens), and so a redevelopment should **not occupy as much as this proposal**, (which, in any case, appears to be at least 33%).

Although this proposal is not for a new dwelling with the curtilage, the same principle applies.

(2) "The Householder's Development Guide" states that proposals for extensions "should be **architecturally compatible in design and scale with the original house and the surrounding area**. Any extension or alteration proposed should **not** serve to **overwhelm** or dominate the original form or appearance of the dwelling".

We submit that this proposal is **not compatible** in design, nor, especially, in **scale**, with the original house, and its two neighbours. It does, indeed, **overwhelm** the original form of no.29 St Machar Drive, a modest, traditional bungalow.

Unfortunately, it is not possible for the Society to comment on the **materials used** or **finishes** to the building, because the applicant has still (on the last day for public representations to be submitted) **not yet** given the Planning Dept any such details, and the Planning Dept, it seems, has not requested them. This is entirely unacceptable.

(3) This proposal is to turn a 2 or 3 bedroomed house into a 6 bedroomed one. The Council's Supplementary Guidance "Transport and Accessibility" (both the current version and the proposed one), lays down parking guidelines for new residential development such as this.

The Council's Residential Dwelling Parking Guidelines for this area (Zone 3, the "Outer City"), stipulates 3 parking spaces to be provided for houses with 4 or more bedrooms. This proposal provides no parking spaces, and so is contrary to guidelines.

We note that the applicant's "Site Layout Plan" shows a vehicle parked to the left of the frontage of this bungalow. There is, however, no application for the formation of a driveway, and permission for this would have to be sought before even thinking of depicting a car parked here, as in the applicant's plans.

There is no turning space here, in any case, and a car would have to reverse on to an extremely busy major artery with constant, heavy traffic. It is inconceivable that planning permission would be given for a driveway here. In any case, it would only provide one space.

Three spaces can not be found. The local area suffers from a severe shortage of parking, and there will not be anywhere for the occupants of the proposed enlarged property to park.

This problem is just another function of the overdevelopment of the site. Bungalows like this were not designed or intended for 6 bedrooms. Over-intensification of use such as this puts an especial strain on parking and traffic in such a busy and congested area.

(4) This proposal is contrary to Policy D5 of the Local Plan, in that the proposed extension would affect the setting of the Old Aberdeen Conservation Area, as viewed from St Machar Drive, particularly the west side, but also from beside Dunbar Cottage. The setting of Dunbar Cottage (in the Conservation Area) and its curtilage, which extends to the boundary with no.29 St Machar Drive, would be harmed by the proposal, as from several vantage points, there would be a backdrop of a large extension not in keeping with the style or scale of no.29. This would be detrimental to the character of the Old Aberdeen Conservation Area.

In the light of all the foregoing, our Society requests that this application be refused, as contrary to the Local Plan Policy and Supplementary Guidance.

Yours faithfully,



Mrs B McPetrie (Planning Secretary)