

SCOTTISH BORDERS COUNCIL
PLANNING AND BUILDING STANDARDS COMMITTEE

2 FEBRUARY 2015

APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

ITEM:	REFERENCE NUMBER: 14/01332/FUL
OFFICER:	Mr C Miller
WARD:	Tweeddale East
PROPOSAL:	Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse
SITE:	14 Gallow Hill, Peebles
APPLICANT:	Mr Shanks and Mrs Logan
AGENT:	D & H Farmer

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site consists of a single storey detached dwellinghouse located on the western side of Gallow Hill, Peebles. The property looks out over green space and is bordered by other single storey houses, including houses at Crookston Court to the rear.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposals are to the rear of the dwellinghouse and involve replacement of the current conservatory with a single storey link and 1½ storey extension. Both will be clad in roof tiles and dry dash render to match the existing house. Four sets of white uPVC patio doors are proposed on the south-western elevation of the link and extension with the upper bedroom patio doors leading onto a glass and grey steel balcony.

The ridge lines of the link and extension are both lower than the main house ridge and all other walls are blank except for a pair of obscure glazed windows at ground floor facing north-east. Additional daylight is provided by a series of velux windows.

The application has been submitted by a senior official of the Council and is, consequently, presented to Committee for determination.

PLANNING HISTORY

None.

APPLICANTS' SUPPORTING INFORMATION

None.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Scottish Borders Council Consultees

None

Statutory Consultees

Peebles and District Community Council – Community Councils are not generally consulted on householder applications outwith Conservation Areas. Peebles and District Community Council were not consulted on this application nor did they request a formal consultation. However, they did make a representation which expresses concerns that the proposed development is overly large and out of proportion in relation to the size of the back garden. They feel that it constitutes over-massing given its elevated position relative to neighbouring properties.

Other Consultees

None

REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

None.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES:

Consolidated Scottish Borders Local Plan 2011

Policy G1 Quality Standards for New Development
Policy H2 Protection of Residential Amenity

OTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

“Privacy and Sunlight” Supplementary Planning Guidance

KEY PLANNING ISSUES:

The main determining issues with this application are whether the proposals comply with Development Plan Policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on extensions to dwellinghouses in residential areas and, in particular, the design, scale and potential impacts on privacy and daylight.

ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION:

Planning policy

Extensions to dwellinghouses outwith Conservation Areas are covered by Policies G1 and H2 of the Consolidated Local Plan. G1 seeks to raise quality of all developments and in relation to extensions, requires scale, massing and height to be appropriate to the surrounding area and to the character of the existing building. Policy H2 also seeks good “fit” of design within a residential area and careful consideration of impacts on surrounding properties, especially in relation to loss of privacy. The latter aspect is developed further within the “Privacy and Sunlight” SPG which contains advice on minimum overlooking distances as well as daylighting and sunlighting angles.

For the reasons set out in this report, it is considered that the proposals are in compliance with these Policies and Guidance.

Design

The property is located at Gallow Hill in Peebles which is a modern estate of houses to the south-east of the town. The immediate context of the property is of single storey houses of similar age, design and height, stepping down to the south-west and overlooking a large grassed area. The application proposes to extend the property entirely to the rear which will result in minimal impact from street view, maintaining the uniform nature of the houses and their ridgelines naturally following the topography.

The north-east elevation of the link and extension will be partly visible from the public street; the roofs and upper walls may be visible between existing houses but the lower parts will be concealed by a neighbouring garage and conifer hedging. The link is set in slightly from the gable of the existing house which allows its original roof shape to remain, thereby retaining the character of the house and relationship to the street scene.

To the rear, there is a sharp drop in levels from the rear face of the house and existing conservatory, sloping down to the north-western boundary in particular but also to the south-west. The slope has been used to achieve a two storey section at the rear of the extension connected to the house via a single storey link following the removal of the existing conservatory. The drop in levels still allows for pitched roofs to the link and extension with ridge lines below that of the main house, albeit with an asymmetrical roof pitch to the main extension.

The use of a lower link to an extension at right angles is a design approach used successfully elsewhere for rear extensions, particularly where it is not evident from the public street. Provided the upper floor extension does not cause significant impacts on neighbouring properties, then it is considered that the design approach and height are appropriate to the design and character of the house. The existing house remains largely unaffected from the public view.

In terms of scale of development, the Community Council have concerns over this, believing there will be overmassing in relation to neighbouring properties. Whilst impacts are discussed in the next section, the proposal does make efficient use of the significant drop in levels to enable overall ridge heights that are slightly lower than the existing house roof. The floor area occupies less than 25% of the available rear garden area and replaces an existing conservatory. Sufficient space has been allowed to the boundaries to retain the screen fencing on the north-eastern and north-western sides and the trees along the north-western boundary.

Permitted development rules would permit 50% usage of the available rear garden area with a single storey extension up to 4m in height. Even upper floor extensions can be permitted development in rear gardens in certain circumstances subject to sufficient distances to boundaries. The proposed design is therefore appropriate in relation to the character of the house and the surrounding setting, given it is utilising the drop in levels, not exceeding the existing ridge height and occupying less than 25% of the rear garden.

In terms of materials, integration with the existing house will be helped by matching roof tiles, wall render, basecourse material and white uPVC patio doors.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy H2 and the “Privacy and Sunlight” SPG seek to ensure that householder extensions do not have significant adverse impacts on their immediately adjoining residential neighbours. This is in relation to the main impacts on amenity caused by privacy or daylight/sunlight reduction together with an overall assessment of impacts caused by dominance.

In the case of the proposed link and extension, those impacts have clearly been assessed and addressed in the submission. Although the Community Council have expressed some concerns regarding overmassing impacts on neighbouring properties, there have been no third party objections lodged.

The properties to the north-east and south-west will not experience significant impacts due to separation distances and the level of mature screening. Applying the 25° daylighting rule from the SPG to the nearest habitable room window to the north-eastern property, there is comfortable clearance and no obstruction. The application also proposes shower and landing ground floor windows facing this property. However, they will be obscure glazed and face into a high fence and higher conifer hedge. Similarly to the south-west, the adjoining property is well screened by a high conifer hedge which will ensure no overlooking, even from the upper floor proposed bedroom 12m from the hedge. The distance and the hedge also determine that there would be no daylighting impacts on that property.

The impacts on the Eildon Housing Association scheme below the site to the north-west are potentially greater because of the proximity and elevation of the application proposals: The Crookston Court houses are semi-detached single storey houses with two rear facing windows per property. The agent has provided a 25° daylighting section from the habitable window of the most affected house which demonstrates no obstruction and clearance, meaning no unacceptable impact upon daylight. This is partly due to a combination of design devices, including accommodating an asymmetrical roof pitch and locating the extension 4.25m from the Crookston Court boundary. The potential daylighting impacts on the closest house are, therefore, still within the guidance in the SPG and are considered to be acceptable.

In terms of overlooking of this property, the extension itself will have no windows on the NW facing wall and only two velux windows in the roof which are high level and could not provide a view out to Crookston Court. Any oblique view from the upper bedroom patio doors is also within the buffer separation rules contained within the SPG, taking into account the angle of windows and level differences. Impacts are reduced further, especially at ground level, through the presence of screen fencing and trees. As the insertion of windows on the north-western wall of the extension would not require planning permission in the future, it would be important to ensure permitted development rights are restricted on this wall.

The initially submitted plan showed a balcony serving the upper floor bedroom. This could have led to concerns over direct overlooking from the balcony to the Crookston Court houses. However, this has now been altered to a Juliet balcony which has no floor projection beyond the face of the extension and would, thus, not allow any wider viewing than that already afforded by the patio doors. Should there be an intention in the future to seek a projecting balcony, this would require a new planning application.

In conclusion, the proposals accord with Local Plan Policy H2 and the guidance in the relevant SPG. Through careful design and the amendment of the balcony, the

link and extension can be accommodated within the rear garden without significant detriment to the amenity of adjoining residential properties.

CONCLUSION

The proposals comply with Development Plan Policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance on extensions to dwellinghouses in residential areas in that the design and scale of the extension are in keeping with the character of the existing building and any impacts on privacy and daylight of adjoining residential properties are acceptable and within the published guidance.

RECOMMENDATION BY SERVICE DIRECTOR (REGULATORY SERVICES):

I recommend the application is approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with Section 58 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, as amended by the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(Scotland) Order 1992 (or any subsequent provisions amending or re-enacting that Order), no additional window or other opening shall be made in the north-western elevation of the building(s) unless an application for planning permission in that behalf is first submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the privacy and amenity of the occupiers of adjacent properties.

DRAWING NUMBERS

D001 Existing Floor Plan
D005 Floor Plans
D006 Proposed Elevations
D007 Daylight Projections
D008 Location Plan/Block Plan
Photographs

Approved by

Name	Designation	Signature
Brian Frater	Service Director (Regulatory Services)	

The original version of this report has been signed by the Service Director (Regulatory Services) and the signed copy has been retained by the Council.

Author(s)

Name	Designation
Craig Miller	Principal Planning Officer

