

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

**APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED UNDER POWERS DELEGATED TO
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER**

PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)

REF : 17/01409/FUL

APPLICANT : Mr Harry Thomson

AGENT : James Blackwood

DEVELOPMENT : Extension to form new living room

LOCATION: 16 Craig Brown Avenue
Selkirk
Scottish Borders
TD7 4NB

TYPE : FUL Application

REASON FOR DELAY:

DRAWING NUMBERS:

Plan Ref	Plan Type	Plan Status
HT/EX/01	Location Plan General	Refused Refused

NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 4
SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:

Consultation responses were received from: Roads - the proposal would lead to a loss of off-street parking and the application could not be supported; community council - proposal ignores the established building line which will not make a positive contribution to the area. The proposal will reduce off-street parking and would result in over-development of the site. There will be an adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining properties.

Four representations were received. The material grounds contained within the representations can be summarised as follows:
Over development of the site; reduction in off-street parking; design issues; privacy relating to proposed new development.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:

Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016
PMD2 - Quality standards
HD3 - Protection of residential amenity
EP7 - Listed buildings
IS7 - Parking provision and standards

The site is not strategic, therefore the policies contained within SESplan have not been considered.

The following are also material:
Placemaking and design
Privacy and sunlight guide

Recommendation by - Ranald Dods (Planning Officer) on 21st November 2017

The application is made to construct an extension to the front of 16 Craig Brown Avenue, Selkirk. The house is a single storey house with traditional proportions and detailing. To the south of the property is an area of land which currently is not used and is enclosed by a fence. To the south of that is a boundary hedge to the curtilage of number 6 Russell Place, which is a category C listed building. To the east of the site is the garden ground of number 3 Tait's Hill. It should be noted that although the land to the east of the site is currently garden ground, an application to erect a single storey house on that land has recently been determined subject to the conclusion of a legal agreement (17/01308/FUL). That application was submitted some three weeks prior to this application. The potential development of the adjacent plot in line with 17/01308/FUL is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

The house which it is proposed to extend was granted outline planning permission in 2006 (06/01038/OUT) although the subsequent reserved matters application which proposed a house of 89m² (07/00387/REM) was refused by area committee. The decision was unsuccessfully appealed on the grounds that the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site, to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring properties. A further reserved matters application was submitted (07/02030/REM) proposing a 1.5 storey dwellinghouse. That was also refused by the area committee, the decision being upheld on appeal with the Reporter concluding the proposal could not be accommodated satisfactorily within the site, without compromising the density or character of the surrounding area.

A further application (08/01874/REM) was submitted, which proposed a house much reduced in size and plot coverage. The reduced size of the house allowed a satisfactory level of amenity to the house and surrounding properties to be achieved. The permission included a condition requiring that the area allocated for car parking shall be used only for that purpose in order to ensure that there is adequate off-street parking associated with the property. Permitted development rights were also removed since the house was seen to be the maximum size that could be reasonably allowed without potentially causing detriment to the amenities of adjoining properties. The permission therefore established the maximum practicable size of house that could be developed on the site. The existing house measures some 82m² and the proposed extension would take the area of the building to 110m².

The single storey extension would be on the south facing elevation of the building, within the area used for off-street parking for the house. Currently there is space for two cars to be parked off the public road. Granting permission would reduce that to one space. It is unlikely that permission would have been given to the previous application without the provision of two off-street parking spaces as that would not have complied with the council's parking standards. The current application now proposes the removal of one of those parking spaces in order to construct an extension. That is at odds with the parking standards set out in the LDP which require 2 parking spaces per dwelling. Reducing the available off-street parking to one space would increase the pressure on the on-street parking provision which could have a negative impact on road safety.

The proposal includes two windows in the east elevation. One would be within the extension and the other in the room which currently serves as a living room but would become a bedroom. These windows would both overlook the garden ground of 3 Tait's Hill, the site of a house proposed by 17/01308/FUL. In order to safeguard privacy, if permission was granted, a screen fence would have to be erected on the mutual boundary and the window from the extension removed (as that room has another window). That issue could be dealt with by condition. The proposed extension will, however, have a negative impact on the adjoining proposed house (17/01308/FUL) to the north east. That house has been designed to take account of the existing house and the application for that was, as noted above, submitted prior to the application for the extension. The extension does not relate well to or respect the adjoining proposed house and would have an adverse impact on the amenity of it due to its proximity to the boundary and forward position of the extension relative to the proposed house.

The proposed extension would not be detrimental to the setting of the listed building to the south east and it is acceptable in terms of its visual relationship to the existing house and street, aside from concerns above regarding its poor relationship to the adjacent house plot.

REASON FOR DECISION :

In consideration of the application which originally granted permission for the house, it was acknowledged that further extensions to the house could raise issues of amenity to the surrounding area. The proposed extension raises those issues. The development is contrary to policies PMD2, HD3 and IS7 of the Local Development Plan 2016. The proposed extension would reduce the available off-street parking below the minimum set out in the LDP. This will potentially have a negative effect on road safety. The extension would also result in a poor relationship with the house proposed to the north east of the site, which would be potentially detrimental to the amenity of that house.

Recommendation: Refused

- 1 The proposed extension would reduce the available off-street parking below the minimum standard specified in the Local Development Plan 2016. The extension would also not relate well to the adjoining proposed property to the north east, and would be potentially detrimental to its amenity. The development is, therefore, contrary to Policies PMD2, HD3 and IS7 of the Local Development Plan 2016.

“Photographs taken in connection with the determination of the application and any other associated documentation form part of the Report of Handling”.

