



## Strategic Place Planning

Report of Handling

<b>Site Address:</b>	97 Springfield Road, Aberdeen, AB15 7RT
<b>Application Description:</b>	Erection of 2 storey extension to rear and replacement garage to side
<b>Application Ref:</b>	210541/DPP
<b>Application Type:</b>	Detailed Planning Permission
<b>Application Date:</b>	19 April 2021
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Fraser Moonie
<b>Ward:</b>	Hazlehead/Queen's Cross/Countesswells
<b>Community Council:</b>	Craigiebuckler and Seafield
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Roy Brown

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Refuse

### **APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

#### **Site Description**

The application site comprises a 1½ storey detached dwellinghouse and its front and rear curtilage in a residential area. The dwellinghouse has a northeast facing principal elevation that fronts Springfield Road and a southeast facing side elevation that fronts Springfield Gardens. The application site is bounded to the northwest and southwest by residential properties. The property has a sun room extension to its rear and an attached garage extension to its northwest side.

#### **Relevant Planning History**

None

### **APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

#### **Description of Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling and the erection of a garage extension to its northwest side, which would replace the existing rear extension and attached garage extension. The extension would cover an area of c.55sqm, would project c.6.5m to the rear, and would be located c.1m from the northwest boundary.

The extension would be built over two storeys and would comprise flat roofed single storey element, which would have an eaves height of c.3.2m, and an asymmetric upper storey element that would have a maximum height of c.5.7m, a mono-pitched roof on its northwest side, and vertical elevations on its southwest and southeast sides.

The walls of the extension would be finished in dark grey timber/timber effect cladding and white dry dash render. The pitched roof would be finished in roofing tiles 'to match existing'. The fasciae and would be formed in dark grey aluminium, and the windows / patio doors would be framed in uPVC.

The garage would be c.6.5m in length and c.2.8m in width. It would be flat roofed with a maximum height of c.3.5m and finished in white dry dash render. It would have a c.2.3m x c.2.4m garage door that fronts Springfield Road.

### **Supporting Documents**

All drawings can be viewed on the Council's website at:

<https://publicaccess.aberdeency.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QRTGDLBZIQJ00>

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Craigiebuckler and Seafeld 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, 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)**

Policy H1 - Residential Areas

Policy D1 - Quality Placemaking by Design

#### **Supplementary Guidance (SG)**

The Householder Development Guide (HDG)

Transport and Accessibility

#### **Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan (2020)**

The Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan (Proposed ALDP) was approved at the Council meeting of 2 March 2020. A period of representation in public was undertaken from May to August 2020 and the Proposed ALDP has since been submitted to the Scottish Government Planning and Environmental Appeals Division for Examination in Public. The Proposed ALDP constitutes the Council's settled view as to what the final content of the next adopted ALDP should be and is now a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017 will continue to be the primary document against which applications are considered. The exact weight to be given to matters contained in the Proposed ALDP (including individual policies) in relation to specific applications will depend on whether –

- such matters have or have not received representations as a result of the period of representations in public for the Proposed ALDP;

- the level of representations received in relation to relevant components of the Proposed ALDP and their relevance of these matters to the application under consideration.

The foregoing can only be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The following policies of the Proposed ALDP are of relevance in the assessment of this planning application:

Policy H1 - Residential Areas

Policy D1 - Quality Placemaking

Policy D2 - Amenity

## **EVALUATION**

### **Principle of Development**

The application site is located in a residential area, under Policy H1 of the ALDP, and the proposal relates to householder development. Development would accord with this policy in principle if it does not constitute over development, adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area, it does not result in the loss of valuable and valued areas of open space and it complies with the Supplementary Guidance, in this case the Householder Development Guide (HDG). Given the proposal relates to householder development, it would not result in the loss of open space. The other 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, dormers and other alterations 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 or alteration 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.'*

### **Proposed Rear Extension**

Notwithstanding the maximum height of the rear extension would be lesser than that of the original dwelling by c.1.2m, it would not be of design, form and scale that would be compatible with the original house or the surrounding area and this is primarily as a result of its upper storey element. The two-storey flat roofed form of its prominent public facing southeast elevation and its substantial c.8.6m projection from the rear roof slope would serve to dominate the original 1½ storey hipped roofed form of the dwelling, particularly from the streetscape of Springfield Gardens. Its asymmetrical form whereby it would have a pitched roof on the northwest elevation and a vertical wall on the southeast elevation would be inconsistent with the relatively symmetrical appearance of the original dwelling and those within the surrounding area.

Because of the massing and incompatible form of the rear extension relative to the original dwelling, the contrasting grey timber (or timber effect) clad finish and large c.1.8m high windows on the southwest and south elevations of the upper storey element would serve to emphasise the scale of the extension.

The side elevation of the application property is visually prominent on Springfield Gardens and Springfield Road. The surrounding area is characterised by mid-twentieth century and modern 1½ storey hipped roofed semi-detached and detached dwellings. The introduction of the two-storey flat roofed extension on such a prominent location of the streetscape would disrupt the consistent

architectural character and visual amenity of the surrounding area. There are no extensions comparable to the design and form as the proposed extension in the surrounding area. The design, scale and form of the proposed extension would thus be incongruous to the established urban form and architectural character of the surrounding area.

Notwithstanding every proposal would be assessed on its own merits, the grant of planning permission for such a proposal could set an unwelcome precedent for two storey extensions to 1½ storey hipped roofed dwellings in prominent public locations in the surrounding area. Such a precedent could have a significant adverse impact on the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

As such, the design, form and scale of the proposed rear extension would not be architecturally compatible with the original dwelling and the surrounding area and would adversely affect the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area, in conflict with the Householder Development Guide, and Policies D1 and H1 of the ALDP.

Amendments which could reduce the scale of the extension and result in the form of the extension being compatible with that of the original dwelling, mainly by way of forming a pitched roof on its southeast elevation, were suggested by the Planning Service in advance of determination. However, no such amendments were made and the initially submitted plans for the rear extension are therefore being considered.

#### Proposed Side Garage Extension

Notwithstanding its render finish would be compatible in the context of being a side garage extension and comparable to other side garage extensions in the surrounding area, its elevations would uncomfortably rise above the eaves of the original dwelling. This would have an unbalanced appearance on the principal elevation and would detract from the visual amenity of the streetscape. This design feature is inconsistent with the other garage extensions in the surrounding area, and thus would serve to detract from the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area, in conflict with Policies D1 and H1 of the ALDP; and the HDG.

The garage would not be of internal dimensions that would be able to facilitate a parked vehicle as its 2.6m width would be less than the 2.7m width required by the Transport and Accessibility Supplementary Guidance. Given the existing garage was of similar dimensions, the proposal would not result in the loss of an off-street parking space.

#### Built Footprint

The proposed extensions would not necessarily constitute over-development of the site in terms of footprint. It would comply with the HDG in that it would not result in the footprint of the dwelling being doubled as the extended dwelling would have a footprint c.81.3% larger than that of the original dwelling. Furthermore, c.25% of the rear garden would be covered by development, less than the 50% permitted by the HDG.

#### **Amenity**

Calculations using the 25 and 45-degree methods in the HDG demonstrate that the proposed extension would adversely affect the level of background daylight or sunlight afforded to the southeast elevation of the rear extension of 99 Springfield Road. Nevertheless, given the extensive amount of glazing serving that room in the neighbouring property, the impact on the side facing windows would not adversely affect the residential amenity of that property by any significant degree. Notwithstanding the ground level of 99 Springfield Road is lower than that of the application property, the proposal would have negligible impact on the level of sunlight and background daylight afforded to the rear curtilage of 99 Springfield Road given the extension

would be set back from the northwest boundary shared with this property and the vast majority of the usable private garden ground would be unaffected.

The proposed rear extension would not adversely affect the level of privacy afforded to any neighbouring residential property given its glazing would be orientated over Springfield Gardens to the southeast; to the rear of the property, where there are high trees and shrubs which screen the glazing from 2 Springfield Road to the southwest; and to the northwest, its rooflights would face the side extension of 99 Springfield Road and would have a high sill height of c.1.6m above the first floor level, which would mitigate overlooking down into the ground floor level of the neighbouring extension.

The proposal would have negligible impact on the level of residential amenity afforded to any neighbouring property by way of privacy, sunlight and background daylight.

### **Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan**

In relation to this particular application, the policies in the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2020 substantively reiterate those in the adopted Local Development Plan and the proposal is acceptable in terms of both Plans for the reasons previously given.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Refuse

### **REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION**

By way of its two storey flat roofed form, unbalanced asymmetric design, projection to the rear, and extensive glazing at the upper level, the proposed rear extension would not be architecturally compatible in design and scale with the symmetrical 1½ storey hipped roofed form of the original dwelling and the other residential properties of the surrounding area. Given its prominent location, which would be readily visible on the streetscape of Springfield Gardens and Springfield Road, the proposed extension would adversely affect the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The elevations of the proposed single storey garage extension would uncomfortably rise above the eaves of the original dwelling which would have an unbalanced appearance on the principal elevation and from the character and visual amenity of the streetscape.

The proposal could set a precedent for similar proposals in the surrounding area, which could significantly detract from the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

It would therefore conflict with Policies H1 – Residential Areas and D1 – Quality Placemaking by Design and of the adopted Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017; the Supplementary Guidance: ‘The Householder Development Guide’; and Policies H1 – Residential Areas, D1 – Quality Placemaking and D2 - Amenity of the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2020.

There are no material planning considerations that warrant approval in this instance.