

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL

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

PART III REPORT (INCORPORATING REPORT OF HANDLING)

REF : 17/01731/FUL

APPLICANT : Ms Lynne Marshall

AGENT : AD Architectural Design

DEVELOPMENT : Extension to dwellinghouse

LOCATION: 34 Edinburgh Road
Peebles
Scottish Borders
EH45 8EB

TYPE : FUL Application

REASON FOR DELAY:

DRAWING NUMBERS:

Plan Ref	Plan Type	Plan Status
706/01	General	Refused
706/02	Floor Plans	Refused
706/08	Roof Plan	Refused
706/05	Sections	Refused
706/06	Sections	Refused
706/07	Elevations	Refused
BOTH VIEWS TO WEST	General	Refused
706/PP	General	Refused

NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS: 0

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:

No representations were received.

A consultation response was received from the Archaeology Officer. There are no known archaeological implications for this proposal.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES:

Scottish Borders Local Development Plan 2016
PMD2 - Quality standards
HD3 - Protection of residential amenity

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

The following council guidance is material:
Placemaking and design;
Privacy and sunlight guide.

Recommendation by - Ranald Dods (Planning Officer) on 9th March 2018

Site and proposal

The site is to the rear of an existing bungalow dating from the 1930s on Edinburgh Road, Peebles. The house sits approximately 2m above the level of the road. The site is the rear garden of the property. A wall roughly 1.6m from the rear wall of the house is approximately 1.5m in height and retains the garden ground. That ground slopes up at about 20 degrees over a few metres before the slope becomes slightly less acute as it rises to the rear of the garden, some 15.5m from the rear wall of the house. There are houses to the north and the south of the site. To the east lies farmland which was the subject an application for planning permission in principle (17/00015/PPP) for a residential development. Although that application was refused, the decision has been appealed (17/00050/REF) and a decision on that appeal is pending.

The proposal is to extend the building to rear. The extension would provide a utility room and bathroom on the lower level and a bedroom and bathroom on the upper level. Access would also be formed to an additional bedroom in the roof space, two roof lights providing daylight to that room. A series of roof lights would be inserted into the extension and the existing house.

Principle

Several extensions have been created to rear of properties on Edinburgh Road, although none is of the scale proposed in this application. The houses to the north, numbers 36 and 38 and those to the south, numbers 30 and 32, all have had accommodation created within the roof space, dating from the early 1990s to 2008. The dormer extensions necessary to create the additional accommodation are visible, to varying degrees, on the north and south roof planes of all but number 30. These are not elegant solutions, the majority of which predate the council's SPG "Placemaking and Design" and policy PMD2 in the LDP. There are examples of dormers and some small scale extensions to the side and rear of properties along Edinburgh Road, those extensions are modest in nature and have been designed to integrate well with the existing house.

Design and layout

The extension would be square in planform, extending 6m from the rear of the house. Due to the topography of the site, extensive groundworks would be required to the slope of the garden in order to construct the extension. Much of the lower level of the extension would be below ground level. The eaves of the extension would sit 400mm above the regraded ground and a slope in the order of 40 degrees would be formed approximately 1.3m from the rear of the extension, rising some 1.5m towards the upper level of the garden.

The first floor walls of the extension would be angled to approximately 80 degrees and form part of the roof structure, although the roof itself is flat, sitting roughly 250mm below the existing ridge. A series of roof lights (one to the north, two to the east, five to the south and one to the west) would be inserted into the roof of the extension and the existing house.

Being almost the same height as the existing house, the extension will be visible from Edinburgh Road. A 2 metre wide linking element would form a corridor between the existing roof and the upper floor of the extension. That link would be slightly off centre and has been designed in an attempt to reduce the massing of the extension. Whilst it may reduce the bulk of the new structure on the existing roof, the effect of forming that link would be to form visual break between the house and the extension. The main mass of the extension would then appear disconnected from the house when viewed from the road.

The design as proposed is not acceptable for this location in terms of its scale and form. The extension would be a dominant feature on the building and granting permission for this would set an undesirable precedent for similar extensions on other buildings within the area. The applicant was advised that I had concerns regarding the proposed extension. In order to give full consideration to the proposal, the applicant was asked to provide drawings showing the view from Edinburgh Road and these were subsequently submitted. Those do not alleviate my concern about the potential impact this extension could have on this modest property, rather they emphasise it.

The scale and massing of the extension are appropriate to neither the surroundings nor the existing building. It does not respect the built form of the surrounding area. It is acknowledged that the adjoining properties have dormer extensions which wrap around the roof plane and are visible from the sides of the properties.

Those dormers are, however, of a different scale than the proposal under consideration. They are part of the roof structure of the properties which do not project beyond the rear walls, rather than as an extension beyond the rear wall of the house which is separated from the roof structure. Policy PMD2 aims to ensure that developments are of a suitably high quality. It emphasises the Scottish Government's clear intention to raise the quality of new development. Simply because properties along Edinburgh Road have dormer extensions which do not comply with that aim is not sufficient justification to set aside the terms of policy PMD2, thereby perpetuating and encouraging poor quality design. I appreciate the applicant has attempted to reduce the impact of the development, but the net result will still be a jarring relationship with the existing building.

Neighbouring Amenity

The extension will cast a shadow over the garden of the property to the north. That would, however, be restricted to the southern portion of that garden, somewhere in the order of the first 2m on the 21st of March. The degree of overshadowing is therefore acceptable and not of significant detriment to the neighbouring property.

The extension would project some 6m from the rear of the house. Within the vertical elements, there would be windows to a habitable room which would overlook the garden of the property to the south. The windows would be above the level of the 1.8m high fence on the mutual boundary and a short section of beech hedging. This would result in a loss of privacy to that adjoining property. The impact on the privacy of the property to the south is not an insurmountable issue and the applicant indicated that they would be willing to delete the windows which overlook the neighbouring garden, although revised drawings have not been submitted. A condition could be imposed requiring the deletion of the windows if permission were to be granted.

If the appeal relating to residential development east of the site (17/00050/REF) is allowed, any layout will have to take account of existing properties on Edinburgh Road. It is likely that there will be sufficient distance between any proposed properties (if the appeal is successful) and the extended house for privacy not to be a significant issue.

REASON FOR DECISION :

The proposed extension would not be sympathetic to the form and design of the existing roof and would dominate the rear of the building. When viewed from Edinburgh Road, the extension will be visible as a mass protruding from the rear of the property. In this instance, the scale and massing of the proposal does not respect the existing house or the neighbouring built form. While the existence of other extensions in the street are acknowledged, these do not provide sufficient mitigation for an extension of this form and scale which would not be a sympathetic addition to the existing building. For these reasons, the proposal is contrary to policy PMD2.

Recommendation: Refused

- 1 The development would be contrary to Policy PMD2 of the Local Development Plan 2016 in that the proposed extension would not be sympathetic to the existing building in its form and scale and it would, therefore, have an adverse visual impact on the building and surrounding area.

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

