Full Planning Permission for Erection of Dwellinghouse at Site At Yonderton Bungalow, Craigston, Turriff

Applicant: Mr and Mrs W Strachan
Agent: Mantell Ritchie

Grid Ref: E: 375671 N: 855181
Ward No. and Name: W02 - Troup
Application Type: Full Planning Permission
Representations 0
Consultations 3
Relevant Proposals Map Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017
Designations: Countryside, Rural Housing Market Area
Complies with No
Development Plans: Refuse
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1. **Reason for Report**

1.1 The Committee is able to consider and take a decision on this item in terms of Section B.9.1 of Part 2A List of Committee Powers and Section C.3.1i of Part 2C Planning Delegations of the Scheme of Governance as the application is recommended for refusal but at least two Local Ward Members in the Ward in which the development is proposed, have requested that the application be referred to the Area Committee.

- Cllr. Cassie - To further examine the policy reasons for refusal.
- Cllr. Partridge – For further discussion on the reasons for refusal.

1.2 The Head of Finance and Monitoring Officer within Business Services have been consulted in the preparation of this report and had no comments to make and are satisfied that the report complies with the Scheme of Governance and relevant legislation.

2. **Background and Proposal**

2.1 The proposal is for full planning permission for a new dwellinghouse on a site at Yonderton, Craigston. The site is located in the countryside on agricultural land north of Fintry and west of Craigston.

2.2 The site is accessed by an unclassified road which comes off the B9105 to the west. The proposed site sits at an elevated position, of approximately 5 metres above the unclassified road and a steep bank. The site forms part of a larger field with hedgerow trees on the southern boundary onto which the proposed dwellinghouse is proposed to face. A location and site plan is attached as Appendix 1.

2.3 To the east of the site is the remains of a designed landscape dated from the 18-19th centuries at Craigston Castle identified on the Aberdeenshire Sites and Monument Record as a standard site. Various Listed Buildings are part of this adjacent landscape. The derelict property, “Yonderton Cottage” lies almost immediately east of the site. Numbers 1 and 2 Yonderton Cottages lie almost immediately west of the proposed site. The proposed site sits in a more elevated position than relative to these nearby properties.

2.4 The proposed development is a 2 storey, ‘H’ shaped dwellinghouse with a double gabled roof and detached double garage proposed to the front of the main building. Proposed materials/finishes for the dwellinghouse are a slate roof, wet dash render walls, timber windows and doors. Similar material finishes are proposed for the double garage. Elevation and Floorplan details are attached as Appendices 2 & 3.

2.5 The property would be served by mains water supply and a septic tank within the proposed curtilage east of the dwellinghouse, with the proposed surface water soakaway indicated d north of the site, which based on OS mapping available appears to be at a higher elevation.
2.6 The relevant planning history relates to adjacent and nearby sites and is as follows:


2.7 There was no supporting documentation submitted.

3. Representations

3.1 No valid letters of representation have been received.

4. Consultations

Internal

4.1 Business Services (Developer Obligations) has advised that the proposal does not trigger requirements under the local development policy and therefore there are no requirements for planning obligations.

4.2 Infrastructure Services (Roads Development) has advised that they do not object to the development proposals subject to conditions being applied to any consent.

External

4.3 Scottish Water has advised that there is currently sufficient capacity at the Turriff Water Treatment Works and therefore have no objection.

5. Relevant Planning Policies

5.1 Scottish Planning Policy

The aim of the Scottish Planning Policies is to ensure that development and changes in land use occur in suitable locations and are sustainable. The planning system must also provide protection from inappropriate development. Its primary objectives are:

- to set the land use framework for promoting sustainable economic development;
- to encourage and support regeneration; and
- to maintain and enhance the quality of the natural heritage and built environment.

Development and conservation are not mutually exclusive objectives; the aim is to resolve conflicts between the objectives set out above and to manage change. Planning policies and decisions should not prevent or inhibit
development unless there are sound reasons for doing so. The planning system guides the future development and use of land in cities, towns and rural areas in the long term public interest. The goal is a prosperous and socially just Scotland with a strong economy, homes, jobs and a good living environment for everyone.

5.2 Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan 2014

The purpose of this Plan is to set a clear direction for the future development of the North East. It promotes a spatial strategy. All parts of the Strategic Development Plan area will fall within either a strategic growth area or a local growth and diversification area. Some areas are also identified as regeneration priority areas. There are also general objectives identified. In summary, these cover promoting economic growth, promoting sustainable economic development which will reduce carbon dioxide production, adapt to the effects of climate change and limit the amount of non-renewable resources used, encouraging population growth, maintaining and improving the region’s built, natural and cultural assets, promoting sustainable communities and improving accessibility in developments.

5.3 Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017

Policy R2: Housing and employment development elsewhere in the countryside.
Policy P1: Layout, siting and design.
Policy C1 Using resources in buildings
Policy RD1: Providing suitable services.
Policy RD2: Developers’ obligations.

5.4 Other Material Considerations

An Equalities Impact Assessment is not required because the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any differential impacts on those with protected characteristics.

6. Discussion

6.1 The key policy issues relevant to this application for a new dwelling in the countryside are the principle of development when assessed against Policy R2, whether the detailed design of the proposal is acceptable in terms of Policy R2 and P1 and whether the site can be appropriately serviced under policies RD1 and RD2.

The principle of development

6.2 The principle of the development is determined through Policy R2 while siting is considered through Policy P1.

6.3 Policy R2 set out the context regarding principle and location. The proposed location lies within the Rural Housing Market Area and Policy R2 states that
we will also allow development proposals in the rural housing market area if they meet any of the following criteria, be appropriate in the greenbelt (see Policy R1: Special rural areas), involve the refurbishment or replacement, on the same site, of an existing house or disused building, involve remediation of redundant brownfield land opportunities, if they are small-scale employment proposals, or a small-scale addition to an existing cluster or group of at least five houses. The policy also makes clear that siting and design of any new development will be a primary consideration.

6.4 It is considered that this proposal does not meet any of the requirements of this policy in that it would not be an appropriate in the greenbelt, the site is greenfield and therefore the proposal does not involve the refurbishment or replacement of a house or building nor does the proposal involve the remediation of redundant brownfield land. In addition, the proposal is not for employment purposes and it does not relate to a cluster or group of at least 5 houses. In light of this the principle of development fails to comply with Policy R2 and therefore cannot be supported by the Planning Service.

6.5 In addition to the above, the location, which is in elevated position within the landscape, would be visually intrusive within the rural area when travelling north on the B9105. As such the siting and design of the proposed development is considered unacceptable under Policy R2.

Layout Siting and Design

6.6 Under Policy R2 it is clear that siting and design of any new development will be a primary consideration for any development and will also be assessed against Policy P1. In assessing the proposal, it is considered that the layout, siting and design of the proposal is not well located within the landscape and its design neither reflects nor complements the architectural scale and design of buildings nearby.

6.7 The proposed design for a 4 bedroomed, 2 storey dwellinghouse, appears to be identical to the design approved for the replacement dwelling and Yonderton Bungalow under APP/20186/2385, located approximately 200m to the north, beyond the brow of the hill and as such is considered well detached and distant from the proposed site. The design proposed at Yonderton Bungalow was approved as it reflected the scale and design of the substantial farmhouse nearby, as set out in the related design statement submitted in relation to that earlier application.

6.8 However, the acceptability of that proposal in that other location does not infer an acceptability for the same scale and design in a very different location, particularly one so visible due to its elevated position within the landscape. As such, it is considered that the design, scale and massing of the proposed dwellinghouse is not acceptable and bears no relationship to the nearby buildings or character of the surrounding countryside. The agent did not submit a design statement in support of this application and as the principle of development could not in principle be supported, it was not considered
appropriate to request a design statement. As such, the design and location of
the proposed development fails to satisfy Policy P1 and Policy R2.

Servicing the site

6.9 Policy RD1: Providing suitable services requires that developments are
appropriately serviced. The proposal would be served by the public water
supply and Scottish Water has confirmed that there is capacity at the Turriff
Water Treatment Work. In terms of the drainage arrangements the applicant
has advised that foul water would be disposed of via a septic tank and
soakaway and surface water via a separate soakaway. However, no
information regarding the private drainage arrangements has been submitted,
although the agent advised that the information would be submitted upon
validation of the application. In this instance it was not considered prudent to
request this information in light of the issues with the principle of development.
As such this aspect of the proposal fails to comply with Policy RD1.

6.10 In terms of access and parking, Roads Development has confirmed that they
have no objections to the proposed development. The Planning Service has
no concerns, therefore this aspect of the proposal is considered acceptable.

6.11 In terms of servicing and access, although the latter is considered acceptable,
the Planning Service are not satisfied that the site can be adequately serviced
in terms of the private drainage arrangement as the appropriate information
has not been submitted. In light of this the proposal cannot comply with Policy
RD1: Providing suitable services.

6.12 In terms of meeting the requirements of Policy RD2 “Developers’ obligations”,
the proposal satisfies the policy in that no contributions are required.

6.13 Regarding Policy C1 “Using resources in buildings”, a condition can be
attached to were consent to be granted.

Conclusion

6.14 In conclusion the proposal does not meet the criteria of policies Policy R2:
Housing and employment development elsewhere in the countryside, Policy
P1: Layout, siting and design and the applicant has failed to demonstrate that
the proposal meets Policy RD1: Providing suitable services contained within
the 2017 Local Development Plan. No material considerations have been
identified that might justify setting aside these policies and on this basis the
application for full planning permission is recommended for refusal.

7. Area Implications

7.1 In the specific circumstances of this application there is no direct connection
with the currently specified objectives and identified actions of the Local
Community Plan.
8. **Implications and Risk**

8.1 An equality impact assessment is not required because the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any differential impacts on those with protected characteristics.

8.2 There are no staffing and financial implications.

8.3 There are no risks identified in respect of this matter in terms of the Corporate and Directorate Risk Registers as the Committee is considering the application as the planning authority in a quasi-judicial role and must determine the application on its own merits in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations justify a departure.

9. **Sustainability Implications**

9.1 No separate consideration of the current proposal’s degree of sustainability is required as the concept is implicit to and wholly integral with the planning process against the policies of which it has been measured.

10. **Departures, Notifications and Referrals**

10.1 **Strategic Development Plan Departures**

None

10.2 **Local Development Plan Departures**

None

10.3 The application is a Departure from the valid Local Development Plan and has been advertised as such. Any representations received have been circulated as part of the agenda and taken into account in recommending a decision. The period for receiving representations has expired.

10.4 The application does not fall within any of the categories contained in the Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (Notification of Applications) (Scotland) Direction 2009 and the application is not required to be notified to the Scottish Ministers prior to determination.

10.5 The application would not have to be referred to Infrastructure Services Committee in the event of the Area Committee wishing to grant permission for the application.
11. Recommendation

11.1 REFUSE for the following reasons:-

1. The proposal does not comply with Policy R2 (Housing and employment development elsewhere in the countryside) as contained in the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017, in that;
   - It does not involve the refurbishment or replacement on the same site of an existing house or disused building;
   - It does not involve the remediation of redundant brownfield land;
   - It does not involve the small scale growth of a settlement identified in Appendix 4 of the Local development Plan;
   - It does not constitute an appropriate addition to an existing cluster of at least five houses; and
   - It is not required for the succession of a viable farm holding.

2. The proposal does not comply with Policy P1 (Layout, siting and design) as contained in the Aberdeenshire Local development Plan 2017 in that the scale and design of the proposed house are out of character with the immediate surroundings and existing nearby properties.

3. The proposal does not comply with Policy RD1 (Providing suitable services) as contained in the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2017 in that insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the site can be provided with adequate foul and surface water drainage.

Stephen Archer
Director of Infrastructure Services
Author of Report: Sheena Lamont
Report Date: 22 June 2018
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