



Strategic Place Planning

Report of Handling

Site Address:	20 Colthill Road, Aberdeen, AB13 0EF.
Application Description:	Erection of 2 storey gable end extension and single storey extension to rear
Application Ref:	181370/DPP
Application Type:	Detailed Planning Permission
Application Date:	2 August 2018
Applicant:	Mr Gary Robertson
Ward:	Lower Deeside
Community Council:	Cults, Bieldside And Milltimber
Case Officer:	Roy Brown

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

APPLICATION BACKGROUND

Site Description

A modern gable roofed 1½ storey dwelling and its associated front and rear curtilage within an established residential area. The dwelling has a north facing principal elevation and a garage attached on its west side. The site is bounded by Colthill Road to the north; 22 Colthill Road to the east; 69 and 71 Colthill Circle to the south; and 18 Colthill Road to the west. The south and west boundaries have 2-3m high hedges.

Relevant Planning History

Planning permission was refused in July 2017 (Ref: 170234/DPP) for an upper storey extension to the side of 24 Colthill Road (and other works to the dwelling).

Planning permission was granted in 2014 (Ref: P141521) at 37 Colthill Crescent and in 2006 (Ref: P061805) at 22 Colthill Road for the erection of 1½ storey side extensions.

APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

Description of Proposal

The erection of a two-storey extension to the side of the dwelling and a gable roofed single storey extension to the rear.

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=PCS6PCBZG5Y00>

CONSULTATIONS

Aberdeen City Council Roads Development Management – No objection following the submission of a site plan indicating a double driveway in the front of the property and provided that the driveway is implemented in accordance with their comments in that:

- It is at least 5m in width and 5.5m in depth within the existing property;
- The gradient is no greater than 1:20;
- It is internally drained with no surface water discharging onto the public road/footpath; and
- It is not surfaced with loose materials over the first 2m of the driveway adjacent to the footpath.

Cults, Bieldside and Milltimber Community Council – No response

REPRESENTATIONS

None

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Legislative Requirements

Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that where, in making any determination under the planning acts, regard is to be had to the provisions of the Development Plan and that determination shall be made in accordance with the plan, so far as material to the application unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Aberdeen Local Development Plan (ALDP) 2017

Policies D1 - Quality Placemaking by Design and H1 - Residential Areas

Supplementary Guidance (SG)

The Householder Development Guide and Transport and Accessibility

EVALUATION

Principle of Development

The application site is within a residential area, under Policy H1 of the ALDP, and the proposal relates to householder development, which would accord with this policy in principle if it does not constitute over development, adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area and it complies with the SG. These issues are assessed in the below evaluation.

Design and Scale

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 of the ALDP. 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.

The HDG states that proposals for extensions should be architecturally compatible in design and scale with the original house and its surrounding area. Materials used should be complementary to the original building. Any extension 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.

Although the side extension would have a pitched roof; the extension would have a two-storey flat section of roof at almost the maximum height of the dwelling and would have far steeper roof pitch of approximately 45 degrees compared to the 38 degrees of the main dwelling as opposed to terminating at conventional gable end with a ridge. As a result, the proposed extension would serve to overwhelm the original 1½ storey gable appearance of the dwelling and would not be visually subservient in terms of height, massing and scale. It would not correspond with the roof form of the main dwelling and would appear as a two-storey extension which would dominate the 1½ storey form of the original dwelling, particularly on the publically visible western elevation. As this extension would be readily publicly visible from Colthill Road, the proposal would adversely affect the character and visual amenity of the streetscape.

The finishing materials of the proposed extensions would broadly match and thus complement those of the existing dwelling. However, the sole use of harling as an external finishing material on the west elevation of the side extension would serve to accentuate the overall massing and two storey appearance of the extension.

The proposal would result in a reduction in footprint by approximately 2sqm. Therefore, the built footprint of the dwelling as extended would not be double that of the original dwelling and less than 50% of the rear curtilage would be covered by development, in compliance with the HDG. It would not necessarily constitute over-development.

The proposed single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling would be of an acceptable design and scale to the original dwelling and the surrounding area in terms of its ridge and eaves heights, its external finish which would resemble the principal elevation of the original dwelling and its roof pitch which would align with and match that of the main dwelling.

Nevertheless, because of the substantial two-storey form of the proposed side extension which would serve to overwhelm the original gable 1½ storey with the dwelling, the design and scale of the proposal would not be architecturally compatible with the original building and the surrounding area and would have an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding area, in conflict with Policies D1 and H1 of the ALDP and its associated SG.

It must be highlighted that there are alternative designs for a 1½ storey side extension to this dwelling which would allow an equivalent internal layout and accommodation which could be compatible in design and scale with the dwelling and which would comply with these policies and guidance. The applicant was, however, unwilling to take this approach.

Planning History

The form of the proposed side extension essentially matches that of the extension at 24 Colthill Road which was refused in 2017 (Ref: 170234/DPP) under the same adopted ALDP and associated SG which is used to assess this application. That application was refused for similar reasons to the current proposal. Whilst each planning application is assessed on its own merits against the relevant policies and guidance, it can be noted that the proposed side extension is very similar in design and scale to the side extension at 24 Colthill Road (Ref: 170234/DPP), which is just two properties along, and was assessed against the same policies and guidance and refused due to its incompatible design and scale.

It is recognised that there are 1½ storey side extensions in the surrounding area, notably 22 Colthill Road (Ref: P061805) and 37 Colthill Crescent (Ref: P141521). The SG advises that no existing extensions which were approved prior to the introduction of the related guidance will be considered by the Planning Authority to provide justification for a development proposal which would otherwise fail to comply with the guidance set out in this document. Both of these extensions were approved prior to the adoption of the SG and thus cannot be used to justify the design of this proposal, which would be incompatible with the architectural form of the original

dwelling. Nevertheless, it must be noted that the extension at 22 Colthill Road differs from the proposed extension as it has a conventional pitched roof, which terminates at a ridge and has a 1½ storey appearance and the extension to 37 Colthill Crescent, which does have a flat section of roof was considered acceptable partially on the basis that it would not be visible from any public viewpoints. The proposed extension would be both highly visible from the public elevations and would incorporate a substantial flat section of the roof. The grant of planning permission for such an extension would serve to set an unwelcome precedent for similar inappropriately designed extensions to the 1½ storey dwellings in the area, which would incrementally erode the character of the surrounding area. The side extension would not be architecturally compatible with the design and scale of the original building and the surrounding area.

Amenity

Calculations, using the 45-degree rules in the Supplementary Guidance: 'The Householder Development Guide' show that the proposed side extension would have negligible impact on the level of amenity afforded to neighbouring residential properties by way of sunlight and the level of background daylight afforded to habitable rooms.

The proposal would be located on the western boundary and 18 Colthill Road has a window on its east elevation (facing the application site) approximately 1.2m away from the boundary. It has been confirmed by the agent and through a further site visit that this window serves unconverted loft space. Whilst this proposal would result in a two-storey extension approximately 1.2m from this window, which would impact the level of sunlight and background daylight into this room, it is not a 'habitable room' and therefore the proposal would not adversely affect the level of amenity afforded to this property.

The proposed side extension would incorporate a large double rooflight at first floor level on its rear elevation. Given the large hedges on the the south and west boundaries, the distance of the proposal to the curtilage at 22 Colthill Road, the surrounding context whereby the dwelling of 18 Colthill Road would prevent direct overlooking into much of its rear curtilage, and the obscure angles between the rooflight and neighbouring curtilage which would mitigate direct overlooking, the rooflight would not have a significant adverse impact on the level of privacy and would not be overbearing. It would thus not adversely affect the level of amenity afforded to any surrounding residential property. The rear extension would not adversely affect the level of privacy afforded to any residential property given the boundary treatment on the south and west boundaries and the absence of glazing on its east elevation.

The proposal would thus not adversely affect the level of neighbouring residential amenity by way of sunlight, daylight and privacy, in accordance with Policies D1 and H1 of the ALDP and the SG.

Off-Street Parking Provision

The site would no longer have three off-street parking spaces and the resulting garage/external store would not be able to facilitate a car given it would be 2.9m in length. The amended plans indicate a double driveway in the front curtilage.

Had the Planning Authority been minded to grant planning permission, it would have been granted subject to a condition requiring the double driveway to have been completed prior to the proposed extension being brought into use.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

The proposal would not be architecturally compatible with the original dwelling in terms of its design and scale. The two-storey flat-roofed form and roof steeper pitch of the proposed side extension would overwhelm the 1½ storey gable roofed form of the dwelling and thus it would not appear subservient in terms of height, mass and scale. As the side extension would be readily publicly visible on the streetscape, it would have an adverse impact on the visual character of Colthill Road. The proposal would therefore adversely affect the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies H1 – Residential Areas and D1 – Quality Placemaking by Design of the Aberdeen Local Development Plan; and the Supplementary Guidance: 'The Householder Development Guide'. There are no material considerations that warrant the grant of planning permission in this instance.