

Addendum

LA01/2017/1648/F

Update

Further information was submitted by Gravis Planning in support of the planning application. This included a report entitled 'Further Information for Consideration at Planning Committee' and a 'Character Assessment'.

The report included a background to the application including; a description of the current dwelling; a description of the character of the area and the impact on residential amenity. In summary and in response to comments raised in the report:

- The report states that the existing dwelling is not of particular architectural merit and the roof line with hipped design is unique to the area. The report also makes reference to other development in the surrounding area including the extant planning permission at the end of Strandview Drive for 44 no. residential units (C/2011/0311/F).

As discussed in paragraph 8.5 of the Committee Report the existing dwelling is of similar design to those along this side of Strandview Drive with hipped roofs a characteristic of the majority of these. The extant permission for the housing development is located further along Strandview Drive and would not be viewed, should it be constructed, in the context of the application site.

- The report refers to the impact of residential amenity on adjacent property No. 3 and several properties opposite the site (nos. 4, 6 and 8 Strandview Drive).

The report states that the area of land immediately to the rear of no. 3 is a tarmac area used for parking and that their amenity space is elevated to the rear of the plot. Nevertheless, this area of tarmac is sited to the rear of the dwelling and should be afforded the same level of protection.

The report also advises that the balcony and staircase will have little impact on the 3 gable windows of no. 3. The staircase to the balcony is located adjacent to, and in close proximity to these gable windows, as such overlooking and loss of privacy is a concern.

- Balconies are a common feature along Strandview Drive thus local residents understand balconies are part of the character of the street. The separation distance between the site and properties opposite the site are adequate not to have an adverse impact.

Although balconies are a feature of the street it is the extent of the area of balcony and the excessive glazing which is of concern and out of character along the streetscene.

In relation to the impact on properties opposite the site (nos. 4, 6 and 8 Strandview Drive) it is the particular circumstance and character of the street which has led to a concern on the impact on properties opposite. As outlined in paragraph 8.9 of the Committee Report, properties opposite the site are at a much lower level and as such the proposed works to the application site would create a very dominant and overbearing effect from these properties.

- The resident of adjacent property no. 3 is supportive of the application.

A letter of support has been submitted by this resident on 20.09.2018. Points raised:

- The tarmacked area to the side and rear of my property is used as an access and circulation space for vehicles and I am not concerned about the proposed balcony.

As discussed previously the tarmac area is to the rear of the dwelling and should be afforded the same level of protection. Also the occupier of this property could change over time.

- The garden area is to the rear of the dwelling and is elevated. The proposed balcony will sit at a lower level than the amenity space.

The particular impact on the residential amenity of no. 3 Strandview Drive has been discussed at paragraph 8.10 of the Committee report. The impact of the balcony is on the side and front of no. 3 and not on the rear garden area.

The 'Character Assessment' submitted identifies existing and approved development in the wider context of the site, mostly along Strandview Avenue and Seafield Park. The only development highlighted along Strandview Drive is of the extant housing development discussed above, which is not constructed.

The character of the surrounding area is mainly defined by those buildings on this stretch of the street. Of secondary importance are buildings on other nearby streets.

Recommendation

That the Committee notes the contents of the Addendum and agrees with the recommendation to refuse, as set out in paragraph 10.1 of the Planning Committee Report.