

Report To: The Planning Board

Date: 2 September 2020

Report By: Head of Regeneration and Planning

Report No: 19/0158/IC  
Plan 09/20

Local Application  
Development

Contact Officer: James McColl

Contact No: 01475 712462

Subject: Erection of dwellinghouse and garage (amendment to planning permission 16/0319/IC) at  
Vacant Site, 13 Dunvegan Avenue, Gourock



### SUMMARY

- The planning application was refused by Inverclyde Council.
- The applicant appealed the decision to the Scottish Ministers.
- The appeal was dismissed.

Details of the appeal may be viewed at:

<https://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/CaseDetails.aspx?ID=120902>

## INTRODUCTION

In November 2019, the Council refused planning permission for an amended house design as “the materials used in the construction of the dwellinghouse do not comply with planning permission 16/0319/IC and, as such, the design of the dwellinghouse is not acceptable”.

## NOTIFICATION OF APPEAL DECISION

An appeal against the refusal was lodged with the Scottish Government on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2020. The grounds of appeal were that:

- The grounds of refusal issued by the Planning Authority relate to a previous planning application rather than the planning application proposal that was under consideration, and accordingly the grounds are not considered to be valid.
- The proposal is in completely conformity with the Inverclyde Local Development Plan and there are no material considerations which warrant a refusal of the application.

The appointed Reporter has found that as the Council had previously granted planning permission for a dwellinghouse on the site, matters such as the principle of development and details which were previously approved and have not changed were outwith the scope of assessment.

At the time of the site inspection the house was substantially complete. The Reporter considered the principal changes from the previous planning permission to be:

- the use of red roof tiles and the formation of a pitched roof above the front entrance projection;
- the use of white drycast render on the rear elevation and front entrance projection;
- the colours of the other external materials;
- adjustments to ground levels with larger underbuild to the rear elevation;
- alterations to the window arrangements;
- two balconies on the south-west elevation.

It was considered that the changes which affect the appearance of the rear of the dwellinghouse do not have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties or the surrounding area, given the lack of visibility of this elevation.

Considering the position of the site within the context of the wider area, the Reporter noted that Dunvegan Avenue is characterised by a range of house styles with a variety of external materials. The dwellinghouse on the appeal site was found to be larger and higher than neighbouring properties and it was noted that it occupies a prominent position close to the road. As a result of these characteristics, the changes affecting the front and side elevations for which consent was retrospectively sought were considered to have the potential to have a much greater impact than if the property was smaller and set in a more secluded location.

The Reporter found that the design changes to the roof have an overbearing effect and increase the visual impact of the development, thus having an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

With regard to materials, the use of red roof tiles was considered to make the dwellinghouse on the appeal site more visually intrusive, particularly when viewed from a south-easterly direction and that this detracts from the character and appearance of the area.

The Reporter found no disagreement with the use of render. It was considered that whilst a more compatible colour of brick would have been preferred, it is the cumulative effect of the brick with the mahogany timber effect weatherboard and the red roof tiles that has an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, particularly due to the prominence of the dwellinghouse. In considering details submitted by the appellant, the Reporter was of the view

these demonstrated that the overall appearance of the dwellinghouse could be improved by changing the colour of the roof tiles and using a simpler and more harmonious palette of materials.

In assessing the balcony arrangement together with the revised window arrangement, the Reporter was generally content.

Considering the garage, the Reporter found that the proposed use of red roof tiles together with the extensive use of white render to be inappropriate and would result in the garage having an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Overall, the Reporter found the proposal did not comply with the requirements of Policy 20 of the LDP due to the roof design, materials used on the dwellinghouse and proposed materials for the garage having an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. It was also concluded that the proposal did not accord with Policy 1 in terms of having regard to the qualities of successful places.

The appeal was dismissed.

Subsequent to this decision the applicant has submitted a revised application which addresses concerns over the roof profile, the use of facing materials and the previously unauthorised balconies. This is under consideration at the time of writing of this report.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board notes the position.

Stuart Jamieson  
Head of Regeneration and Planning

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 – Background Papers. For further information please contact James McColl on 01475 712462.