

TCP/11/16(369)
Planning Application 15/00083/FLL – Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse, Earnbank House, Kinkell, Strathallan, Auchterarder, PH3 1LD

INDEX

Papers submitted by the Applicant (***Pages 175-290***)

Decision Notice (***Pages 183-184***)

Report of Handling (***Pages 185-195***)

Reference Documents (***Pages 204-206***)

Redacted Representations (***Pages 241-290***)

TCP/11/16(369)

Planning Application 15/00083/FLL – Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse, Earnbank House, Kinkell, Strathallan, Auchterarder, PH3 1LD

**PAPERS SUBMITTED
BY THE
APPLICANT**

Notice of Review
Application Reference 15/00083/FLL

Table of Contents

1. Signed pro forma Notice of Review (Not confidential)
2. Supporting Statement (**CONFIDENTIAL**)
3. Additional Expert Testimonials
 - A. APS Notes and Comments on the Proposed Design (**CONFIDENTIAL**)
 - B. Letter from Fiona Fumme, Senior Paediatric Physiotherapist (**CONFIDENTIAL**)
 - C. Letter from Sheila Brooks, Social Worker (**CONFIDENTIAL**)
 - D. Occupational Therapy Report from Rhona Macleod-Garrad, Occupational Therapist (**CONFIDENTIAL**)
 - E. Outpatient Clinic Letter from Dr Kenneth McWilliam, Consultant Paediatric Neurologist (**CONFIDENTIAL**)
4. Copy Letter from Development Quality Manager refusing Application for Planning Permission (dated 7 May 2015) (Not confidential)
5. Copy Report of Handling Delegated Report (dated 25 March 2015) (Not confidential)
6. Copy of Application for Planning Permission (15/00083/FLL) and Associated Documents
 - A. Letter from DLA Piper dated 14 January 2015, enclosing Application for Planning Permission, associated documents and cheque (Not confidential)
 - B. Signed pro forma Application for Planning Permission dated 15 January 2015 (Not confidential)
 - C. Location plan showing the land to which the application relates and its situation to land in the locality (Not confidential)
 - D. Supporting plans and drawings describing the development to which the application relates (Not confidential)
 - E. Design and Access Statement (**CONFIDENTIAL**)
 - F. Supporting Statement (**CONFIDENTIAL**)
 - Schedule Part 1: Planning History (**CONFIDENTIAL**)
 - Schedule Part 2: Reasons for Refusal - Full Planning Permission (including copy of Development Quality Manager's decision) (Not confidential)

Schedule Part 3: Reasons for Refusal - Listed Building Consent (including copy of Development Quality Manager's decision) (Not confidential)

Schedule Part 4: The Reporter's LBC Appeal Decision (**CONFIDENTIAL**)

Schedule Part 5: The LRB Decision granting Listed Building Consent (Not confidential)

Schedule Part 6: Email from Council confirming the validity of the Current Application (Not confidential)

Schedule Part 7: Drawings (Not confidential. The sensitive information contained in this version of the Design and Access Statement has been redacted, so can be made public.)

Schedule Part 8: Expert Opinion Concerning the Care Needs
(**CONFIDENTIAL**)

7. **Copy letters of support** (Letters from supporters which have already been redacted are not confidential. Letters from medical professionals are **CONFIDENTIAL** and have been marked as such)

NOTE

The full copy of the documents marked as **CONFIDENTIAL** in the Table of Contents will be made available to the members of the Local Review Body. However, due to the nature of the contents they have not been published.

Notice of Review

NOTICE OF REVIEW

UNDER SECTION 43A(8) OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997 (AS AMENDED) IN
RESPECT OF DECISIONS ON LOCAL DEVELOPMENTS

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCHEMES OF DELEGATION AND LOCAL REVIEW PROCEDURE)
(SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2013

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (APPEALS) (SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2008

IMPORTANT: Please read and follow the guidance notes provided when completing this form.
Failure to supply all the relevant information could invalidate your notice of review.

Use **BLOCK CAPITALS** if completing in manuscript

Applicant(s)

Name

Address

Postcode

Contact Telephone 1

Contact Telephone 2

Fax No

E-mail*

Agent (if any)

Name

Address

Postcode

Contact Telephone 1

Contact Telephone 2

Fax No

E-mail*

Mark this box to confirm all contact should be
through this representative: ☒

Yes ☒ No ☐

* Do you agree to correspondence regarding your review being sent by e-mail? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Planning authority

Planning authority's application reference number

Site address

Description of proposed
development

Date of application

Date of decision (if any)

Note. This notice must be served on the planning authority within three months of the date of the decision
notice or from the date of expiry of the period allowed for determining the application.

Nature of application

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Application for planning permission (including householder application) | ☒ |
| 2. Application for planning permission in principle | ☐ |
| 3. Further application (including development that has not yet commenced and where a time limit has been imposed; renewal of planning permission; and/or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition) | ☐ |
| 4. Application for approval of matters specified in conditions | ☐ |

Reasons for seeking review

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Refusal of application by appointed officer | ☒ |
| 2. Failure by appointed officer to determine the application within the period allowed for determination of the application | ☐ |
| 3. Conditions imposed on consent by appointed officer | ☐ |

Review procedure

The Local Review Body will decide on the procedure to be used to determine your review and may at any time during the review process require that further information or representations be made to enable them to determine the review. Further information may be required by one or a combination of procedures, such as: written submissions; the holding of one or more hearing sessions and/or inspecting the land which is the subject of the review case.

Please indicate what procedure (or combination of procedures) you think is most appropriate for the handling of your review. You may tick more than one box if you wish the review to be conducted by a combination of procedures.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Further written submissions | ☐ |
| 2. One or more hearing sessions | ☒ |
| 3. Site inspection | ☐ |
| 4. Assessment of review documents only, with no further procedure | ☒ |

If you have marked box 1 or 2, please explain here which of the matters (as set out in your statement below) you believe ought to be subject of that procedure, and why you consider further submissions or a hearing are necessary:

WE REQUEST THAT THE ISSUES OF (I) APPARENT BIAS (SECTION 7.1 OF SUPPORTING STATEMENT) AND (II) ARTICLE 8 CONCERNS (SECTION 7.6 OF SUPPORTING STATEMENT) ARE DETERMINED BY HEARING SESSIONS, AS STRUCTURED DISCUSSION OF THESE ISSUES IS REQUIRED. THE OTHER ISSUES RAISED IN THE SUPPORTING STATEMENT CAN BE DETERMINED BY ASSESSMENT OF REVIEW DOCUMENTS ONLY.

Site inspection

In the event that the Local Review Body decides to inspect the review site, in your opinion:

- | | Yes | No |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Can the site be viewed entirely from public land? | ☒ | ☐ |
| 2. Is it possible for the site to be accessed safely, and without barriers to entry? | ☐ | ☒ |

If there are reasons why you think the Local Review Body would be unable to undertake an unaccompanied site inspection, please explain here:

THE SITE IS VISIBLE FROM THE B8082 ROAD BUT ACCESS MUST BE ARRANGED WITH THE APPLICANT AS THEY LIVE IN THE PROPERTY SITUATED ON THE APPLICATION SITE.

Statement

You must state, in full, why you are seeking a review on your application. Your statement must set out all matters you consider require to be taken into account in determining your review. Note: you may not have a further opportunity to add to your statement of review at a later date. It is therefore essential that you submit with your notice of review, all necessary information and evidence that you rely on and wish the Local Review Body to consider as part of your review.

If the Local Review Body issues a notice requesting further information from any other person or body, you will have a period of 14 days in which to comment on any additional matter which has been raised by that person or body.

State here the reasons for your notice of review and all matters you wish to raise. If necessary, this can be continued or provided in full in a separate document. You may also submit additional documentation with this form.

PLEASE SEE SUPPORTING STATEMENT ENCLOSED.

Have you raised any matters which were not before the appointed officer at the time the determination on your application was made?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, you should explain in the box below, why you are raising new material, why it was not raised with the appointed officer before your application was determined and why you consider it should now be considered in your review.

WE INCLUDE FURTHER EXPERT TESTIMONIAL REGARDING THE NEED FOR A SECOND STOREY DEVELOPMENT. THE CASE OFFICER DETERMINED IN HIS DELEGATED REPORT THAT THE NEED FOR A SECOND STOREY DEVELOPMENT HAD NOT BEEN PROVED. HAD HE DOUBTED THE JUSTIFICATION FOR THE SECOND STOREY DEVELOPMENT, IT WAS INCUMBENT ON HIM TO REQUEST FURTHER INFORMATION FROM THE APPLICANT. IN THE EVENT HE DID NOT OFFER THE APPLICANT THIS OPPORTUNITY, SO THE RELEVANT FURTHER INFORMATION IS INCLUDED HERE. PLEASE SEE SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

List of documents and evidence

Please provide a list of all supporting documents, materials and evidence which you wish to submit with your notice of review and intend to rely on in support of your review.

- SUPPORTING STATEMENT
 - APS NOTES AND COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN
 - LETTER FROM FIONA FUMMEY, SENIOR PAEDIATRIC PHYSIOTHERAPIST
 - LETTER FROM SHEILA BROOKS, SOCIAL WORKER
 - OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY REPORT FROM RHONA MACLEOD-GARRAD, OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST
 - OUTPATIENT CLINIC LETTER FROM DR KENNETH MCWILLIAM, CONSULTANT PAEDIATRIC NEUROLOGIST
 - COPY OF APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS

Note. The planning authority will make a copy of the notice of review, the review documents and any notice of the procedure of the review available for inspection at an office of the planning authority until such time as the review is determined. It may also be available on the planning authority website.

Checklist

Please mark the appropriate boxes to confirm you have provided all supporting documents and evidence relevant to your review:

- ☒ Full completion of all parts of this form
- ☒ Statement of your reasons for requiring a review
- ☒ All documents, materials and evidence which you intend to rely on (e.g. plans and drawings or other documents) which are now the subject of this review.

Note. Where the review relates to a further application e.g. renewal of planning permission or modification, variation or removal of a planning condition or where it relates to an application for approval of matters specified in conditions, it is advisable to provide the application reference number, approved plans and decision notice from that earlier consent.

Declaration

I the applicant/agent [delete as appropriate] hereby serve notice on the planning authority to review the application as set out on this form and in the supporting documents.

Signed

DWS Per

Date

1st July 2015

PERTH AND KINROSS COUNCIL

Mr And Mrs Philip Medley
c/o DLA Piper Scotland LLP
Collins House
Rutland Square
Edinburgh
EH1 2AA


Pullar House
35 Kinnoull Street
PERTH
PH1 5GD

Date 7th May 2015

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT

Application Number: 15/00083/FLL

I am directed by the Planning Authority under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts currently in force, to refuse your application registered on 26th January 2015 for permission for **Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3 1LD** for the reasons undernoted.



Development Quality Manager

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy PM1A: Placemaking, as the density and overall scale of the proposal does not contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built environment and the design, density and siting of the development does not respect the character and amenity of the place.
The scale and mass of the proposals will be over dominant and have an adverse impact on the building's character.
2. The proposal is contrary to Policy PM1B: Placemaking (b) and (c) as the height, scale and mass of the whole proposal does not complement its surroundings or integrate sensitively with the existing building.
The proposed extension to the rear and the single storey infill with upper flat roofed dormer does not play a subordinate role. Instead it dominates and consumes the rear elevation and competes with the existing well-proportioned 19th Century wing.

Justification

The proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no material reasons which justify departing from the Development Plan

The plans relating to this decision are listed below and are displayed on Perth and Kinross Council's website at www.pkc.gov.uk "Online Planning Applications" page

Plan Reference

15/00083/1

15/00083/2

15/00083/3

REPORT OF HANDLING DELEGATED REPORT

Ref No	15/00083/FLL	
Ward No	N7 - Strathallan	
Due Determination Date	25.03.2015	
Case Officer	Richard Welch	
Report Issued by		Date
Countersigned by		Date

PROPOSAL: Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

LOCATION: Earnbank House, Kinkell, Strathallan, Auchterarder
PH3 1LD

SUMMARY:

This report recommends **refusal** of the application as the development is considered to be contrary to the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and there are no material considerations to justify setting aside the Development Plan.

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 12 February 2015

SITE PHOTOGRAPHS



BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for the same development proposal as was submitted previously in 2014 (14/00445/FLL). The previous planning application was refused under delegated powers and this refusal was upheld by the Perth and Kinross Local Review Body (the PKLRB). The related listed building consent application (14/00448/LBC) was refused under delegated powers, however, the appeal was upheld by the Reporter and listed building consent granted subject to conditions.

Earnbank House is a category B listed building dating from the 1830's with a later 19th Century single storey extension and attic wing to the rear.

The present development proposal consists of:-

1) alterations to the existing late 19th century rear wing, 2) the demolition of a single storey lean-to extension with modern greenhouse, 3) the erection of a single storey and attic wing to match existing with a new projecting canopy, 4) the formation of an infill extension with upper flat roofed dormer linking the two rear wings at ridge level, 5) the erection of a flat roofed garden room to the west, 6) installation of solar panels and 7) re-slating the whole house. Other alterations include slappings in the 19th century rear wing.

SITE HISTORY

06/01294/LBC Installation of new matching first floor 12 pane sash and case window to bedroom 3 August 2006 Application Permitted

14/00445/FLL Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse to form ancillary accommodation and installation of solar panels 18 June 2014 Application Refused Review Dismissed by Local Review Body

14/00448/LBC Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse to form ancillary accommodation and installation of solar panels 18 June 2014 Application Refused Appeal Allowed

PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION

None for this application.

NATIONAL POLICY AND GUIDANCE

The Scottish Government expresses its planning policies through The National Planning Framework, the Scottish Planning Policy 2014 (SPP), Planning Advice Notes (PAN), Creating Places, Designing Streets, National Roads Development Guide and a series of Circulars.

The Scottish Planning Policy 2014 makes specific reference to listed buildings (para.141). Where planning permission and listed building consent are sought for development to, or affecting, a listed building, special regard must be given to the importance of preserving and enhancing the building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest. The layout, design, materials, scale, siting and use of any development which will affect a listed building or its setting should be appropriate to the character and appearance of the building and setting.

Scottish Historic Environment Policy 2011

The Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) sets out Scottish Minister's policies for the historic environment and provides a framework that informs the

day-to-day work of a range of organisations that have a role and interest in managing the historic environment, including local planning authorities.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Development Plan for the area comprises the TAYplan Strategic Development Plan 2012-2032 and the Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014.

TAYplan Strategic Development Plan 2012 – 2032 - Approved June 2012

Whilst there are no specific policies or strategies directly relevant to this proposal the overall vision of the Tay Plan should be noted. The vision states “By 2032 the TAYplan region will be sustainable, more attractive, competitive and vibrant without creating an unacceptable burden on our planet. The quality of life will make it a place of first choice, where more people choose to live, work and visit and where businesses choose to invest and create jobs.”

Perth and Kinross Council Local Development Plan 2014 – Adopted February 2014

The Local Development Plan was adopted by Perth and Kinross Council on 3 February 2014. It is the most recent statement of Council policy and is augmented by Supplementary Guidance.

The relevant policies are, in summary:

Policy PM1A - Placemaking

Development must contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment. All development should be planned and designed with reference to climate change mitigation and adaption.

The design, density and siting of development should respect the character and amenity of the place, and should create and improve links within and, where practical, beyond the site.

Policy PM1B - Placemaking

All proposals should meet all the following placemaking criteria:

- (a) Create a sense of identity by developing a coherent structure of streets, spaces, and buildings, safely accessible from its surroundings.
- (b) Consider and respect site topography and any surrounding important landmarks, views or skylines, as well as the wider landscape character of the area.
- (c) The design and density should complement its surroundings in terms of appearance, height, scale, massing, materials, finishes and colours.
- (d) Respect an existing building line where appropriate, or establish one where none exists. Access, uses, and orientation of principal elevations should reinforce the street or open space.

- (e) All buildings, streets, and spaces (including green spaces) should create safe, accessible, inclusive places for people, which are easily navigable, particularly on foot, bicycle and public transport.
- (f) Buildings and spaces should be designed with future adaptability in mind wherever possible.
- (g) Existing buildings, structures and natural features that contribute to the local townscape should be retained and sensitively integrated into proposals.
- (h) Incorporate green infrastructure into new developments and make connections where possible to green networks.

Policy PM2 - Design Statements

Design Statements should normally accompany a planning application if the development comprises 5 or more dwellings, is a non-residential use which exceeds 0.5 ha or if the development affects the character or appearance of a Conservation Area, Historic Garden, Designed Landscape or the setting of a Listed Building or Scheduled Monument. A design statement may also be required to accompany a planning application for other forms of development where design sensitivity is considered a critical issue.

Policy HE2 - Listed Buildings

There is a presumption in favour of the retention and sympathetic restoration, correct maintenance and sensitive management of listed buildings to enable them to remain in active use. The layout, design, materials, scale, siting and use of any development which will affect a listed building or its setting should be appropriate to the building's character, appearance and setting.

SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDANCE

Perth and Kinross Council's Placemaking Guide provides guidance and design principles which identify the objectives of Perth & Kinross Council in achieving consistent, high standards in design.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation Team

The case officer is the conservation officer therefore no formal consultation response issued.

REPRESENTATIONS

29 letters of support for the planning application have been received.

The following material planning considerations are raised in the representations:

- a) The development would be largely out of sight and would not mar the landscape;
- b) The plans are sympathetic to the character of the property and this is an opportunity to restore the entire building;
- c) In the history of the house there have already been additions to the building which is not untypical of any house as its use and needs change;

- d) The increase in footprint is small;
- e) The proposal replicates the existing extension;
- f) The addition to the rear of the house in no way interrupts the classic Georgian style of the front and corrects the perceived aesthetic flaw of the irregular Victorian addition by restoring balance and symmetry to the building;
- g) The plan's design to make an inaccessible home into an accessible, high quality and inclusive environment should be considered as of paramount importance;
- h) Planning authorities must perform their functions in a manner which encourages equal opportunities and inclusive environments;
- i) The (LBC) application is supported by the Scottish Government and therefore the planning application should not be refused.

Other comments provided relate to the short and long term needs of one of the occupants of Earnbank House.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS RECEIVED:

Environment Statement	Not Required
Screening Opinion	Not Required
Environmental Impact Assessment	Not Required
Appropriate Assessment	Not Required
Design Statement or Design and Access Statement	Submitted
Report on Impact or Potential Impact eg Flood Risk Assessment	Not Required

APPRAISAL

Sections 25 and 37 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that planning decisions be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for the area comprises the approved TAYplan 2012 and the adopted Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2014.

The determining issues in this case are whether the proposal complies with development plan policy; and, if not, whether there are any other material considerations which justify a departure from policy.

Policy Appraisal

The listed building consent granted on appeal for the same development proposal as the present planning application is recognised and given weight to. The Reporter's decision was not appealed by Perth and Kinross Council. This application for the same development proposal is considered as a planning application, not a listed building application. In light of the listed building consent, the most relevant policies are the Placemaking policies,

PM1A, PM1B, and PM2. Listed building policies are not considered in light of the Reporter's decision to grant listed building consent.

Policy PM1A on Placemaking states that development must contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment. The design, density and siting of development should respect the character and amenity of the place.

The relevant criteria to this application from the second policy on Placemaking, Policy PM1B are;

- (b) Consider and respect site topography and any surrounding important landmarks, views or skylines, as well as the wider landscape character of the area
- (c) The design and density should complement its surroundings in terms of appearance, height, scale, massing, materials, finishes and colours.
- (f) Buildings and spaces should be designed with future adaptability in mind wherever possible.

The design statement policy, PM2, states that such a document may also be required to accompany an application where design sensitivity is considered a critical issue. A design statement was submitted with the application.

Design and Layout

Proposals for alterations to the late 19th Century rear wing include the formation of a relatively wide flat roofed dormer on the west elevation of the wing, the complete re-arrangement of the existing window openings and the formation of three substantial slappings. The proposed new wing will also immediately abut and consume the whole of the east elevation and the proposed garden room will abut the west elevation.

The proposed first floor window on the south elevation of the existing wing is considerably taller than any other existing window, even the ground floor windows which were historically larger than the first floor to avoid a visual imbalance. This proposed window is now creating a significant visual imbalance. A window in this position will also involve the removal of the chimney breast wall and any future reuse of this stack.

There is therefore a considerable amount of change proposed for this 19th Century wing and collectively it is all-encompassing and harmful to the character and appearance of the building.

The proposed single storey and attic wing extension to the rear has been designed to mimic the existing 19th Century wing and is therefore the same height, width and scale. By doing so it immediately takes any significance away from the existing wing. It is not subordinate in scale. Its immediate

proximity and abutment to the existing wing, including the linking infill extension with dormer above, dominates the scene, engulfs the remaining rear wall of the original building and creates a mass that is considered unacceptable.

The submitted Design and Access Statement suggests that the design is acceptable as it is "extension by replication". This approach may be the appropriate in certain situations but it does not work successfully here because of the position of the proposed extension and its proximity to the existing wing. The mass and dominance is detrimental to the traditional wing and the house as a whole. The Design and Access Statement also suggests that the veranda proposed to the side would create the look of a single storey extension. The side elevation is visible from the public road and the continuation of the roof would add to the visual bulk and mass.

The proposed formation of a large flat roof dormer linking the two rear wings at ridge level consumes the remaining wall of the rear elevation and covers over a first floor window. Regardless of whether or not it can be seen from any part of the public domain, traditional buildings should be read 'in the round'. This addition will be visible for any occupier of the house or visitor when in the rear garden. Such roof additions are visually heavy and dominant. It also adds to the mass of the proposed extension which combined completely overwhelms and dominates the 19th century wing and is not subordinate to the host building.

This proposed garden room to the west will be set back from the principal elevation behind an existing brick garden wall. Only glimpse views of it will be available as you approach along the public road from the west (more so in the winter months). The style of the proposed garden room is contemporary, a very different approach to the proposed extension mentioned above. It better represents its time and continues the building's evolution. This aspect is considered acceptable.

Design and layout conclusion

The cumulative impact of the design and layout proposals is all-consuming and will have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of this traditional building.

Other relevant matters

The listed building consent granted on appeal directly considered the same proposal on issues arising from the listing of the building. Whilst the Reporter makes various comments on the proposal, also of relevance are the findings and conclusions of Perth and Kinross Local Review Body on reviewing the original planning application.

The conclusions of the PKLRB were that the scale and massing of the proposed rear extension, particularly the form and height of the flat roof dormer, would have an over-dominant effect on the rear elevation of the

building. In addition, the extensive slappings proposed were considered to have a cumulative adverse effect on the building. It is important to note that the PKLRB considered these impacts in relation to the building in general as part of a planning application and as a historic building. The impacts on the building and its setting were considered "in the round" (side and rear elevations of a historic building have interest as well as the building's frontage). Both, somewhat differing conclusions have been considered. Ultimately, the issue is whether the proposal complies with the development plan and, if not, whether there are any other material considerations which justify a departure from policy. As set out above, it is considered that the proposal does not comply with the development plan. The question is whether there are any other material considerations which justify a departure.

The Design and Access Statement indicates that it should be read in conjunction with an Occupational Therapy Report dated 19/5/2014 which was submitted with the previous planning application. This sensitive document contains personal information relating to the needs of one of the occupants of Earnbank House and that persons needs in order to reside at the property long-term. The report outlines the changes necessary to accommodate the needs of the occupant, including wide doorways for walker or wheelchair access, level access into and around the property, adequate wheelchair turning space and a ground floor wet room and bedroom. There is no specific reference to any requirements for first floor accommodation.

Letters of support for this current application include information from medical and care professionals outlining the reasons why the house requires adaption. Again there is no specific reference in this information to the need for an upper storey.

One letter of support suggests that an upper storey is needed in order for all the house occupants to sleep on the same level, although the suggestion in the information mentioned above is that one of the occupants may eventually need to live and sleep at ground floor level.

The Supporting Statement refers to Article 8 (Right of respect for private and family life) of the European Convention Human Rights and that it is unlawful for a public authority to interfere or act in a way which is incompatible with a Convention right. "A public authority must, therefore, equip itself with sufficient information about the proposed interference and then carry out a decision-making process which balances the Article 8 rights and interests of the applicant with those of the community..." (pg.20). These rights can be said to apply not only to the one occupant referred to but to all members of the family residing in the property.

The special needs of the person are fully recognised in what must be difficult circumstances. It can be noted that at no point has the Council suggested that the building cannot be adapted. At previous pre-planning application stages it was made clear to the applicant's agents that it may be possible to adapt the building internally and design a single storey extension successfully without seriously compromising the character of the building.

The Reporter in the listed building consent appeal gave little, if any, weight to the needs aspect of the appellants' case. In this planning application, the specific needs of the person and the benefits of investment in renovation and maintaining beneficial use of the building are recognised but are not considered to outweigh the significant impact on the character and appearance of the building. Further, it is not considered in terms of ECHR, Article 8 that refusal of permission would constitute an unfair, disproportionate right to respect for family life where a single storey extension may be designed without seriously compromising the character of the building.

Landscape

The site is particularly picturesque, located to the south of Kinkell Bridge on a fork in the road with Kinkell Cottage as its only neighbour to the east. On the north side of the bridge there is an old tollhouse and gothic gateway leading to Millearn House. This cluster of historic structures all add to the setting of Kinkell Bridge and in turn the picturesque setting of Earnbank House.

The house is instantly noticeable when driving over the bridge as it sits slightly side on to the bridge with the open driveway framing the view of the front but also the side of the house.

The rear looks onto open farmland and despite tree lined avenues of deciduous natives the rear can be seen when approaching the Kinkell Bridge from the south-east.

Residential Amenity

The proposals will have minimal impact on the adjacent residential amenity given the setback, central position of Earnbank House within a sizeable plot from the only immediate neighbouring property which sits slightly forward of Earnbank House.

Visual Amenity

Earnbank House is the only 2-storey property in the immediate and nearby locale. The closest neighbour, Kinkell Cottage, is a single storey property. The proposals as described above will add to the height, mass, scale and density of Earnbank House which in turn will impact to some degree on its relationship to its surroundings and other buildings in the locale.

Roads and Access

There are no road access issues.

Drainage and Flooding

There is no drainage or flooding issues.

Developer Contributions

The Developer Contributions Guidance is not applicable to this application and therefore no contributions are required in this instance.

Economic Impact

The economic impact of the proposal is likely to be minimal and limited to the construction phase of the development.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the application must be determined in accordance with the adopted Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this respect, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the adopted Local Development Plan 2014 and there are no material considerations to justify setting aside the Development Plan. On that basis the application is recommended for refusal subject to the reasons noted below.

APPLICATION PROCESSING TIME

The final recommendation for this application was not made within the statutory determination period due to seeking further clarification from Legal Services.

LEGAL AGREEMENTS

None required.

DIRECTION BY SCOTTISH MINISTERS

None applicable to this proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse the application

Reasons for Recommendation

- 1 The proposal is contrary to Policy PM1A: Placemaking, as the density and overall scale of the proposal does not contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built environment and the design, density and siting of the development does not respect the character and amenity of the place.
The scale and mass of the proposals will be over dominant and have an adverse impact on the building's character.
- 2 The proposal is contrary to Policy PM1B: Placemaking (b) and (c) as the height, scale and mass of the whole proposal does not complement its surroundings or integrate sensitively with the existing building.
The proposed extension to the rear and the single storey infill with upper flat roofed dormer does not play a subordinate role. Instead it

dominates and consumes the rear elevation and competes with the existing well-proportioned 19th Century wing.

Justification

The proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no material reasons which justify departing from the Development Plan

Informatives

The applicant is advised that a modestly scaled single storey (accommodation at ground floor level only) extension on the south elevation would be acceptable in principle.

Procedural Notes

Not Applicable.

PLANS AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THIS DECISION

15/00083/1
15/00083/2
15/00083/3

Date of Report 15/04/2015



DLA Piper Scotland LLP
Collins House
Rutland Square
Edinburgh
EH1 2AA
DX ED271 Edinburgh 1
T +44 131 345 5181
F +44 131 242 5523
W www.dlapiper.com

Nick Brian
Development Quality Manager
The Environment Service
Perth & Kinross Council
Pullar House
35 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5DG

Your reference

Our reference

KAM/KAM/362412/1
UKM/66734589.1

14 January 2015

By Recorded Delivery

Dear Mr Brian

**MR AND MRS PHILIP MEDLEY ("THE APPLICANTS")
EARNBANK HOUSE, KINKELL BRIDGE, PERTHSHIRE, PH3 1LD
APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING PERMISSION
CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT EXTENSION INCORPORATING
GARDEN ROOM**

On behalf of and as instructed by the Applicants and in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 9 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013, please find enclosed the following items in respect of the subject application:

- (i) signed pro forma application form containing (a) the particulars referred to in Regulation 9 (2) of the 2013 Regulations and (b) the certificate required under Regulation 15;
- (ii) location plan showing the land to which the application relates and its situation to land in the locality;
- (iii) the supporting plans and drawings describing the development to which it relates:
 - (a) Drawing 14/00445/1
 - (b) Drawing 14/00445/2
 - (c) Drawing 14/00445/5
 - (d) Drawing 14/00445/6
 - (e) Drawing 14/00445/7;
- (iv) supporting statement with schedule in 8 parts, and
- (v) our cheque in the sum of £202 payable in respect of the Council's fee.

Please note that the Applicants respectfully request that the testimonials and other information set out within Part 8 of the schedule to the supporting statement is treated by the Council as confidential.

DLA Piper Scotland LLP is regulated by the Law Society of Scotland.

DLA Piper Scotland LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in Scotland (number SC0300365) which is part of DLA Piper, a global law firm, operating through various separate and distinct legal entities.

A list of members is open for inspection at its registered office and principal place of business, Collins House, Rutland Square, Edinburgh EH1 2AA and at the address at the top of this letter. Partner denotes member of a limited liability partnership.

A list of offices and regulatory information can be found at www.dlapiper.com.

UK switchboard
+44 (0)8700 111 111



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



KAM/KAM/362412/1
UKM/66734588.1
Continuation 2
14 January 2015

Should you have any queries regarding the application please contact Katie McPherson on 0131 345 5181 (or by email at Katie.McPherson@dlapiper.com) otherwise we look forward to receiving the Council's written confirmation that the application is valid in due course.

Yours faithfully

DLA PIPER SCOTLAND LLP

Encs.



The Royal Bank of Scotland

Edinburgh West End Office
142-144 Princes Street, Edinburgh, EH2 4EQ

83-51-00

PAY Perth & Kinross Council*****

Two Hundred Two Pound(s) and 0p ONLY*****

***** ONLY

A/C PAYEE ONLY

DATE 14-Jan-2015

£ *****202.00

For DLA PIPER SCOTLAND LLP
OFFICE ACCOUNT



HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Town and Country Planning (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997
The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2013

Please refer to the accompanying Guidance Notes when completing this application
PLEASE NOTE IT IS FASTER AND SIMPLER TO SUBMIT PLANNING APPLICATIONS
ELECTRONICALLY VIA <https://eplanning.scotland.gov.uk>

1. Applicant's Details		2. Agent's Details (if any)	
Title	Mr and Mrs	Ref No.	SRT/KAM/362412/1
Forename	Philip	Forename	
Surname	Medley	Surname	
Company Name		Company Name	DLA Piper Scotland LLP
Building No./Name	Earnbank House	Building No./Name	Collins House
Address Line 1	Kinkell Bridge	Address Line 1	Rutland Square
Address Line 2	Perthshire	Address Line 2	
Town/City		Town/City	Edinburgh
Postcode	PH3 1LD	Postcode	EH1 2AA
Telephone		Telephone	0131 345 5181
Mobile		Mobile	
Fax		Fax	
Email	sam@kinkell-bridge.co.uk	Email	Katie.McPherson@dlapiper.com
3. Address or Location of Proposed Development (please include postcode)			
Earnbank House, Kinkell Bridge, Perthshire, PH3 1LD			
NB. If you do not have a full site address please identify the location of the site(s) in your accompanying documentation.			
4. Describe the Proposed Works			
Please describe accurately the work proposed:			
Alter and extend Earnbank House to provide additional accommodation. Demolish single story extension at rear of house. Construct replacement extension, construct garden room, carry out other internal alterations and fit solar panels. A major reason for the proposed work is to provide self-contained level access accommodation at ground floor level for a severely disabled family member.			
Have the works already been started or completed Yes ☐ No ☒			
If yes, please state date of completion, or if not completed, the start date:			
Date started:		Date completed:	

If yes, please explain why work has already taken place in advance of making this application.

N/A

5. Pre-Application Discussion

Have you received any advice from the planning authority in relation to this proposal? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please provide details about the advice below:

In what format was the advice given? Meeting ☐ Telephone call ☐ Letter ☐ Email ☐

Have you agreed or are you discussing a Processing Agreement with the planning authority? Yes ☐ No ☒

Please provide a description of the advice you were given and who you received the advice from:

Name: Date: Ref No.:

6. Trees

Are there any trees on or adjacent to the application site? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please show on drawings any trees (including known protected trees) and their canopy spread as they relate to the proposed site and indicate if any are to be cut back or felled.

7. Changes to Vehicle Access and Parking

Are you proposing a new altered vehicle access to or from a public road? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please show in your drawings the position of any existing, altered or new access and explain the changes you propose to make. You should also show existing footpaths and note if there will be any impact on these.

Are you proposing any changes to public paths, public rights of way or affecting any public rights of access? Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please show on your drawings the position of any affected areas and explain the changes you propose to make, including arrangement for continuing or alternative public access.

How many vehicle parking spaces (garaging and open parking) currently exist on the application site?

5 minimum

How many vehicle parking spaces (garaging and open parking) do you propose on the site? (i.e. the total of existing and any new spaces or reduced number of spaces)

5 minimum

Please show on your drawings the position of existing and proposed parking spaces and identify if these are for the use of particular types of vehicles (e.g. parking for disabled people, coaches, HGV vehicles, etc.

8. Planning Service Employee/Elected Member Interest

Are you / the applicant / the applicant's spouse or partner, a member of staff within the planning service or an elected member of the planning authority? Yes ☐ No ☒

Or, are you / the applicant / the applicant's spouse or partner a close relative of a member of staff in the planning service or elected member of the planning authority? Yes ☐ No ☒

If you have answered yes please provide details:

DECLARATION

I, the applicant / agent certify that this is an application for planning permission and that accompanying plans/drawings and additional information are provided as part of this application. I hereby confirm that the information given in this form is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

I, the applicant/agent hereby certify that the attached Land Ownership Certificate has been completed ☒

I, the applicant/agent hereby certify that requisite notice has been given to other land owners and /or agricultural tenants Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒

Signature:

Name: Sandy Telfer

Date:

14 Jan. 2015

Any personal data that you have been asked to provide on this form will be held and processed in accordance with the requirements of the 1998 Data Protection Act.

LAND OWNERSHIP CERTIFICATES

Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997
Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland)
Regulations 2013

CERTIFICATE A, B, C, D OR CERTIFICATE E MUST BE COMPLETED BY ALL APPLICANTS

CERTIFICATE A

Certificate A is for use where the applicant is the only owner of the land to which the application relates and none of the land is agricultural land.

I hereby certify that -

- (1) No person other than the applicant was owner of any part of the land to which the application relates at the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the application. ☒
- (2) None of the land to which the application relates constitutes or forms part of agricultural land. ☒

Signed:

On behalf of:

Date:

CERTIFICATE B

Certificate B is for use where the applicant is not the owner or sole owner of the land to which the application relates and/or where the land is agricultural land and where all owners/agricultural tenants have been identified.

I hereby certify that -

- (1) I have served notice on every person other than myself who, at the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the application was owner of any part of the land to which the application relates. These persons are: ☐

Name	Address	Date of Service of Notice

- (2) None of the land to which the application relates constitutes or forms part of agricultural land ☐


or

- (3) The land or part of the land to which the application relates constitutes or forms part of agricultural land and I have served notice on every person other than myself who, at the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the application was an agricultural tenant. These persons are: ☐

Mapping
sourced from



Location Map




Produced 04/03/2013 from the Ordnance Survey
National Geographic Database and incorporating
surveyed revision available at this date. © Crown
Copyright 2013

Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without
the prior permission of Ordnance Survey

Ordnance Survey and the OS Symbol are registered
trademarks of Ordnance Survey, the national mapping
agency of Great Britain.

The representation of a road, track or path is no
evidence of a right of way.

The representation of features as lines is no evidence
of a property boundary.



Scale 1:1250


Supplied By: edinburgh copyshop

Serial number: 001104462



Plot Centre Coordinates: 293132, 716579





LOCATION MAP. 1:25000



SITE PLAN. 1:200

[illegible]



REVISED
PERTH AND KINROSS COUNCIL
DRAWING REF. 14/2005/5



Scale 1:500
 Drawn by: [Name]
 Checked by: [Name]
 Date: 14/05/05

Perth and Kinross Council
 Planning Department
 14/2005/5

Project Name	14/2005/5
Client	Perth and Kinross Council
Architect	Perth and Kinross Council
Engineer	Perth and Kinross Council
Surveyor	Perth and Kinross Council
Inspector	Perth and Kinross Council
Author	Perth and Kinross Council
Checker	Perth and Kinross Council
Scale	1:500
Date	14/05/05
Drawn by	[Name]
Checked by	[Name]
Date	14/05/05
Project Name	14/2005/5
Client	Perth and Kinross Council
Architect	Perth and Kinross Council
Engineer	Perth and Kinross Council
Surveyor	Perth and Kinross Council
Inspector	Perth and Kinross Council
Author	Perth and Kinross Council
Checker	Perth and Kinross Council
Scale	1:500
Date	14/05/05
Drawn by	[Name]
Checked by	[Name]
Date	14/05/05

01/03/14	15:50 A	12:30L	MYK25 B
----------	---------	--------	---------

DRAWING REF: 14/CC44.5/6



Part 2 Reasons for Refusal - Full Planning Permission

- 1 The proposal is contrary to Policy HE2: Listed Buildings, as the siting, design, scale and mass of the proposed extension adversely affects the buildings special interest, appearance and setting.
- 2 The proposal does not accord with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy 2010 (paragraph 113) where it specifically notes that there is a presumption against works that will adversely affect a listed building or its setting. The scale and mass of the proposals will be over dominant and compete directly with the existing Victorian extension and impacting on the listed building as a whole. New extensions should be subordinate to the host building and represent its place in the buildings development history.
- 3 The proposal does not accord with the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) 2011 and Historic Scotland's supplementary guidance Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions (Oct 2010), where it makes it clear that an addition or extension should play a subordinate role. It should not dominate the original building as a result of its scale or materials. An extension should be modestly scaled and skilfully sited. The proposed extension to the rear complete with box dormer infill does not play a subordinate role and instead dominates and consumes the rear elevation and due to its siting and proximity, competes with the existing well-proportioned late 19th century extension which is itself correctly subordinate to the original build.
- 4 The proposal does not accord with the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) 2011 and Historic Scotland's supplementary guidance Managing Change in the Historic Environment: External Walls (Oct 2010), where in para. 4.5 it states the formation of a new opening in a wall needs to be considered in light of the overall composition of the wall and assessed as to whether or not it would be consistent with the existing design. The cumulative effect of new openings should not harm the special interest of the building. Where the formation of a new opening is found to be consistent with the design of the wall, the minimum historic fabric should be removed and the opening should be detailed to match the existing openings. The proposed slappings are accumulatively harmful to the special character of the building and not to a scale or detail which match existing openings
5. The proposal is contrary to Policy PM1A: Placemaking because the density and overall scale of the proposal does not contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built environment
6. The proposal is contrary to Policy PM1B: Placemaking because the height, scale and mass of the whole proposal in the original application does not complement the property's surroundings or integrate sensitively with the rest of the building..

PERTH AND KINROSS COUNCIL

Mr And Mrs Medley

c/o APS

Stewart Anderson

Old Schoolhouse

Invergeldie

Glenlednock

Comrie

PH6 2LY

Pullar House

35 Kinnoull Street

PERTH

PH1 5GD

Date 18th June 2014

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT

Application Number: **14/00445/FLL**

I am directed by the Planning Authority under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts currently in force, to refuse your application registered on 18th March 2014 for permission for **Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse to form ancillary accommodation and installation of solar panels Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3 1LD** for the reasons undernoted.

Development Quality Manager

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy HE2: Listed Buildings, as the siting, design, scale and mass of the proposed extension adversely affects the buildings special interest, appearance and setting.
2. The proposal does not accord with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy 2010 (paragraph 113) where it specifically notes that there is a presumption against works that will adversely affect a listed building or its setting. The scale and mass of the proposals will be over dominant and compete directly with the existing Victorian extension and impacting on the listed building as a whole. New extensions should be subordinate to the host building and represent its place in the buildings development history.
3. The proposal does not accord with the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) 2011 and Historic Scotland's supplementary guidance Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions (Oct 2010), where it makes it clear that an addition or extension should play a subordinate role. It should not dominate the original building as a result of its scale or materials. An extension should be modestly scaled and skillfully sited. The proposed extension to the rear complete with box dormer infill does not play a subordinate role and instead dominates and consumes the rear elevation and due to its siting and proximity, competes with the existing well-proportioned late 19th century extension which is itself correctly subordinate to the original build.
4. The proposal does not accord with the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) 2011 and Historic Scotland's supplementary guidance Managing Change in the Historic Environment: External Walls (Oct 2010), where in para. 4.5 it states the formation of a new opening in a wall needs to be considered in light of the overall composition of the wall and assessed as to whether or not it would be consistent with the existing design. The cumulative effect of new openings should not harm the special interest of the building. Where the formation of a new opening is found to be consistent with the design of the wall, the minimum historic fabric should be removed and the opening should be detailed to match the existing openings. The proposed slappings are accumulatively harmful to the special character of the building and not to a scale or detail which match existing openings.

5. The proposal is contrary to Policy PM1A: Placemaking, as the density and overall scale of the proposal does not contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built environment.
6. The proposal is contrary to Policy PM1B: Placemaking (b) and (c) as the height, scale and mass of the whole proposal does not complement its surroundings or integrate sensitively with the existing building.

Justification

The proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no material reasons which justify departing from the Development Plan.

Notes

The plans relating to this decision are listed below and are displayed on Perth and Kinross Council's website at www.pkc.gov.uk "Online Planning Applications" page

Plan Reference

14/00448/1

14/00448/2

14/00445/5

14/00445/6

14/00445/7

SCHEDULE PART 5

REVIEW DECISION NOTICE

Decision by Perth and Kinross Local Review Body (the PKLRB)

Site Address: Earnbank House, Kinkell, Strathallan, Auchterarder, PH2 1LD

Application for Review by Mr P Medley against decision by an appointed officer of Perth and Kinross Council.

Application Ref: 14/00445/FLL

Application Drawings: 14/00445/1 14/00445/2 14/00445/5 14/00445/6
14/00445/7

Date of Review Decision Notice – 13 November 2014

Decision

The PKLRB upholds the decision to refuse planning permission for the reasons given below and dismisses the review.

1 Introduction

1.1 The above application for review was considered by the PKLRB at a meeting held on 30 September 2014. The Review Body comprised Councillor M Lyle, Councillor H Anderson and Councillor J Giacomazzi.

1.2 The following persons were also present at the meeting:

C Elliott, Legal Adviser; D Harrison, Planning Adviser; and Y Oliver, Committee Officer.

Also attending:

C Brien (The Environment Service); A Heath (Chief Executive's Service); members of the public, including applicants/agents.

2 Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal is for alterations and extension to dwellinghouse to form ancillary accommodation and installation of solar panels, Earnbank House, Kinkell, Strathallan, Auchterarder, PH2 1LD. The application was refused consent in terms of a decision letter dated 18 June 2014.

3 Preliminaries

- 3.1 The PKLRB was provided with copies of the following documents:
- (i) the drawings specified above;
 - (ii) the Appointed Officer's Report of Handling;
 - (iii) the refusal notice dated 18 June 2014;
 - (iv) the Notice of Review and supporting documents;
 - (v) representations to the planning application.
- 3.2 The Planning Adviser described the proposals, the locality of the site, explained the reasons for refusal, and the grounds for the Notice of Review.
- 3.3 The PKLRB was shown projected photographs taken by the Planning Adviser, who had visited the site. These showed the application site from various angles.
- 3.4 Having regard to the material before them, the PKLRB resolved that the review of the decision to refuse could be determined without further procedure.

4 Findings and Conclusions

4.1 Having regard to the Development Plan and other material considerations set out in the Report of Handling and other papers before it, the PKLRB concluded by unanimous decision that the review application be refused. In the opinion of the PKLRB the scale and massing of the proposed rear extension, particularly the form and height of the flat roof dormer, has an over dominant effect on the rear elevation and on the building. In addition, the extensive slappings proposed are also considered to have a cumulative adverse effect on the building. Together, these adverse impacts are considered to apply in relation to the building in general as subject to a planning application and as a listed building. Accordingly, the review application is therefore refused for the following reasons:

- (1) The proposal is contrary to Perth and Kinross Council Local Development Plan 2014, Policy HE2: Listed Buildings, as the siting, design, scale and mass of the proposed extension adversely affects the building's special interest, appearance and setting.
- (2) The proposal does not accord with the requirements of Scottish Planning Policy 2014 (Paragraph 141) for listed buildings to be protected from works that would adversely affect them or their setting. The scale and mass of the proposals will be over dominant and compete directly with the existing Victorian extension and impacting on the listed building as a whole. New extensions should be subordinate to the host building.
- (3) The proposal does not accord with the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) 2011 and Historic Scotland's supplementary guidance Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Extensions (Oct 2010), where it makes it clear that an addition or extension should play a subordinate role. It should not dominate the original building as a result of its scale or materials. An extension should be modestly scaled and skilfully sited. The proposed extension to the rear complete with box dormer infill does not play a subordinate role and instead dominates and obscures the rear elevation and, due to its siting and proximity, competes with the existing well-proportioned late 19th century extension which is itself correctly subordinate to the original build.
- (4) The proposal does not accord with the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP) 2011 and Historic Scotland's supplementary guidance Managing

Change in the Historic Environment: External Walls (Oct 2010), where in para. 4.5 it states the formation of a new opening in a wall needs to be considered in light of the overall composition of the wall and assessed as to whether or not it would be consistent with the existing design. The cumulative effect of new openings should not harm the special interest of the building. Where the formation of a new opening is found to be consistent with the design of the wall, the minimum historic fabric should be removed and the opening should be detailed to match the existing openings. The proposed slappings are accumulatively harmful to the special character of the building and not to a scale or detail which match existing openings.

- (5) The proposal is contrary to Perth and Kinross Council Local Development Plan 2014, Policy PM1A: Placemaking, as the overall scale of the proposal does not contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built environment.
- (6) The proposal is contrary to Perth and Kinross Council Local Development Plan 2014, Policy PM1B: Placemaking (b) and (c) as the height, scale and mass of the whole proposal does not complement its surroundings or integrate sensitively with the existing building.

Justification

The proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan and there are no material reasons which justify departing from the Development Plan.

- 4.2 The Review Application was accordingly dismissed.

Gillian Taylor

Clerk to the Local Review Body

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997

Notification to be sent to applicant on determination by the Planning Authority of an application following a review conducted under Section 43A(8)

Notice Under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Schemes of Delegation and Local Review Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013.

- 1 If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the planning authority to refuse permission or approval required by a condition in respect of the proposed development, or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, the applicant may question the validity of that decision by making an application to the Court of Session. An application to the Court of Session must be made within 6 weeks of the date of the decision notice.

- 2 If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, the owner of the land may serve on the planning authority a purchase notice requiring the purchase of the owner of the land's interest in the land in accordance with Part V of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

McPherson, Katie

From: Telfer, Sandy
Sent: 18 December 2014 12:22
To: McPherson, Katie
Subject: FW: 14/00445/FLL - Earnbank House, Strathallan

Sandy Telfer
Partner

T +44 131 242 5094
F +44 131 242 5523
M +44 7968 558866
E sandy.telfer@dlapiper.com



DLA Piper Scotland LLP
www.dlapiper.com

From: Nick Brian [<mailto:NBrian@pkc.gov.uk>]
Sent: 14 November 2014 09:16
To: Telfer, Sandy
Cc: Geoff Fogg; Christine Brien
Subject: RE: 14/00445/FLL - Earnbank House, Strathallan

Sandy

After further discussion with my Legal Services colleagues I can confirm that this application will not be reconsidered by the Local Review Body. However, I would be prepared to accept a further application as a resubmission of the same proposal, given the circumstances, particularly in relation to the recent DPEA decision on the related Listed Building application.

I trust that this clarifies the position for you

Kind regards

Nick

Nick Brian
Development Quality Manager
Planning & Regeneration
Perth & Kinross Council
Pullar House
35 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5GD

☎ 01738 475351
☎ 01738 475310
✉ nbrian@pkc.gov.uk

From: Telfer, Sandy [mailto:Sandy.Telfer@dlapiper.com]
Sent: 11 November 2014 15:29
To: Nick Brian
Subject: RE: Earnbank House, Strathallan

Nick

I fully appreciate that you will be busy on other matters but I'd appreciate a reply to the points that I raised with you in my undernoted email.

This decision, as I am sure you will appreciate, has had a huge and worrying impact on my clients.

Regards

Sandy

Sandy Telfer
Partner

T +44 131 242 5094
F +44 131 242 5523
M +44 7968 558856
E sandy.telfer@dlapiper.com



DLA Piper Scotland LLP
www.dlapiper.com

From: Telfer, Sandy
Sent: 03 November 2014 16:54
To: Nick Brian
Subject: Earnbank House, Strathallan

Nick

I am instructed by Mr & Mrs Smedley.

I am advised by my clients' planning consultant, Robin Matthews of PPCA that you have confirmed to him verbally on the telephone (as Mr Mathews understood the terms of your conversation) that the LRB's review of my clients' application:

(a) was conducted, in accordance with the views of the Scottish Government, by means of a full consideration of the application afresh rather than solely a review of the appointed officer's decision, and

(b) did not take account of the terms of the Reporter's decision to uphold my clients' LBC application, despite the fact that its members were made aware of the fact that the decision letter had been already formally issued.

I should be grateful if you would confirm whether the foregoing understanding does indeed properly reflect the Council's position.

I also understand that a formal decision letter has still to be issued by the Council. That being the case, it strikes me that it would be still open to the LRB to re-visit its decision in the light of the Reporter's findings on the listed building matters - those findings being themselves a relevant material consideration which they ought to have taken into account ahead of its members' determination of the review request. Can you please confirm, therefore, whether or not the LRB on behalf of the Council might be prepared to defer the publication of its decision letter pending the holding of a further hearing by the LRB to consider both the terms of the Reporter's decision and further submissions from the applicants' agents regarding the implication of that successful LBC appeal decision in terms of the Council's consideration of the related planning application. I would anticipate that these submissions would also address the issue of the creation of an adverse precedent which I understand is the concern of some of your officers.

If that deferral proposal is not acceptable to the Council, could you please confirm whether or not for the purposes of S39 of the 1997 Act the Council would be prepared to confirm that the DPEA decision in respect of the LBC appeal

constitutes a significant change in the surrounding material considerations thereby allowing a fresh application to be tabled.

As you will I hope appreciate, I am seeking a means of having the implications of the Reporter's decision taken into account by the Council with the least possible amount of legal formality (and thus expense for both parties) ie without the need for a statutory challenge accompanied by a request for a protective expenses order.

I appreciate that you will doubtless feel the need to take legal advice on the deferral and S39 points that I have raised but I should be grateful if you would confirm meantime whether or not Robin has properly understood the Council's position as regards the matters referred to at (a) and (b) above.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards

Sandy

Sandy Telfer

Partner

T +44 131 242 5094

F +44 131 242 5523

M +44 7968 558866

E sandy.telfer@dlapiper.com



DLA Piper Scotland LLP
www.dlapiper.com

This email is from DLA Piper Scotland LLP. The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential to the intended recipient. They may not be disclosed to or used by or copied in any way by anyone other than the intended recipient. If this e mail is received in error, please contact DLA Piper Scotland LLP on +44 (0) 8700 111111 quoting the name of the sender and the email address to which it has been sent and then delete it. Please note that neither DLA Piper Scotland LLP nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments. DLA Piper Scotland LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in Scotland (registered number SO300365), which provides services from offices in Scotland. A list of members is open for inspection at its registered office and principal place of business Rutland Square, Edinburgh, EH1 2AA. Partner denotes member of a limited liability partnership. DLA Piper Scotland LLP is regulated by the Law Society of Scotland and is part of DLA Piper, a global law firm, operating through various separate and distinct legal entities. For further information, please refer to www.dlapiper.com.

Securing the future... - Improving services - Enhancing quality of life - Making best use of public resources.

The information in this email is solely for the intended recipients.

If you are not an intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, or distribute its contents or use them in any way: please advise the sender immediately and delete this email.

Perth & Kinross Council, Live Active Leisure Limited and TACTRAN do not warrant that this email or any attachments are virus-free and does not accept any liability for any loss or damage resulting from any virus infection. Perth & Kinross Council may monitor or examine any emails received by its email system.

The information contained in this email may not be the views of Perth & Kinross Council, Live Active Leisure Limited or TACTRAN. It is possible for email to be falsified and the sender cannot be held responsible for the integrity of the information contained in it.

Requests to Perth & Kinross Council under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act should be directed to the Freedom of Information Team - email: foi@pkc.gov.uk


General enquiries to Perth & Kinross Council should be made to enquiries@pkc.gov.uk or 01738 475000.

General enquiries to Live Active Leisure Limited should be made to enquiries@liveactive.co.uk or 01738 454600.

General enquiries to TACTRAN should be made to info@tactran.gov.uk or 01738 475775.

Securing the future... - Improving services - Enhancing quality of life - Making best use of public resources.

SCHEDULE PART 7




Produced 04/06/2013 from the Ordnance Survey National Geographic Database and incorporating surveyed revision available at this date. © Crown Copyright 2013

Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without the prior permission of Ordnance Survey

Ordnance Survey and the OS Symbol are registered trademarks of Ordnance Survey, the national mapping agency of Great Britain.

The representation of a road, track or path is no evidence of a right of way.

The representation of features as lines is no evidence of a property boundary.




Scale 1:1250

Supplied By: edinburgh copyshop

Serial number: 001104462

Plot Centre Coordinates: 293132, 716579




0 5 Metres 10 15

SITE PLAN 1:200



0 0.5 1 Kilometres 2 3

LOCATION MAP 1:25000






APS

Old Earbank, Long Mile, Glendoch, County Wick, Ireland
 Project: 0194 07901
 After and extend house to provide additional accommodation on ground and upper floors.

Client: Sean & Paddy McElroy,
 Earbank House, Kinich Bridge,
 PH13 TLU.

Site Plan and Location Map

140374 1:200 & 1:25000 MKB02



Abstract: The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of a 12-week training program on the performance of a simulated firefighting task. The subjects were 12 male firefighters who were assigned to either a control group or a training group. The training group performed a 12-week training program consisting of aerobic and anaerobic exercises. The control group performed no training. The results showed that the training group had significantly better performance than the control group in all three tasks. The training program was effective in improving the performance of the simulated firefighting task.

Scale: 1:1000

Drawing
1410042515

1. NAME OF THE COMPANY
 2. ADDRESS
 3. CITY
 4. STATE
 5. ZIP
 6. TELEPHONE
 7. FAX
 8. E-MAIL
 9. WEBSITE
 10. INDUSTRY
 11. PRODUCTS
 12. SERVICES
 13. MARKETING STRATEGY
 14. COMPETITORS
 15. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
 16. OTHER INFORMATION
 17. DATE
 18. SIGNATURE
 19. TITLE
 20. COMPANY

UPPER FLOOR.

EAST ELEVATION.

NORTH ELEVATION.

WEST ELEVENTH.

SOUTH ELEVATION.

NORTH ELEVATION WITH SCREENING.



GROUND FLOOR.

Drawing
- 14/0044516

1. <u>Organization</u> 2. <u>Address</u> 3. <u>City</u> 4. <u>State</u> 5. <u>Zip</u> 6. <u>Telephone</u> 7. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 8. <u>Position</u> 9. <u>Organization</u> 10. <u>Address</u> 11. <u>City</u> 12. <u>State</u> 13. <u>Zip</u> 14. <u>Telephone</u> 15. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 16. <u>Position</u> 17. <u>Organization</u> 18. <u>Address</u> 19. <u>City</u> 20. <u>State</u> 21. <u>Zip</u> 22. <u>Telephone</u> 23. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 24. <u>Position</u> 25. <u>Organization</u> 26. <u>Address</u> 27. <u>City</u> 28. <u>State</u> 29. <u>Zip</u> 30. <u>Telephone</u> 31. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 32. <u>Position</u> 33. <u>Organization</u> 34. <u>Address</u> 35. <u>City</u> 36. <u>State</u> 37. <u>Zip</u> 38. <u>Telephone</u> 39. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 40. <u>Position</u> 41. <u>Organization</u> 42. <u>Address</u> 43. <u>City</u> 44. <u>State</u> 45. <u>Zip</u> 46. <u>Telephone</u> 47. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 48. <u>Position</u> 49. <u>Organization</u> 50. <u>Address</u> 51. <u>City</u> 52. <u>State</u> 53. <u>Zip</u> 54. <u>Telephone</u> 55. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 56. <u>Position</u> 57. <u>Organization</u> 58. <u>Address</u> 59. <u>City</u> 60. <u>State</u> 61. <u>Zip</u> 62. <u>Telephone</u> 63. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 64. <u>Position</u> 65. <u>Organization</u> 66. <u>Address</u> 67. <u>City</u> 68. <u>State</u> 69. <u>Zip</u> 70. <u>Telephone</u> 71. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 72. <u>Position</u> 73. <u>Organization</u> 74. <u>Address</u> 75. <u>City</u> 76. <u>State</u> 77. <u>Zip</u> 78. <u>Telephone</u> 79. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 80. <u>Position</u> 81. <u>Organization</u> 82. <u>Address</u> 83. <u>City</u> 84. <u>State</u> 85. <u>Zip</u> 86. <u>Telephone</u> 87. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 88. <u>Position</u> 89. <u>Organization</u> 90. <u>Address</u> 91. <u>City</u> 92. <u>State</u> 93. <u>Zip</u> 94. <u>Telephone</u> 95. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 96. <u>Position</u> 97. <u>Organization</u> 98. <u>Address</u> 99. <u>City</u> 100. <u>State</u> 101. <u>Zip</u> 102. <u>Telephone</u> 103. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 104. <u>Position</u> 105. <u>Organization</u> 106. <u>Address</u> 107. <u>City</u> 108. <u>State</u> 109. <u>Zip</u> 110. <u>Telephone</u> 111. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 112. <u>Position</u> 113. <u>Organization</u> 114. <u>Address</u> 115. <u>City</u> 116. <u>State</u> 117. <u>Zip</u> 118. <u>Telephone</u> 119. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 120. <u>Position</u> 121. <u>Organization</u> 122. <u>Address</u> 123. <u>City</u> 124. <u>State</u> 125. <u>Zip</u> 126. <u>Telephone</u> 127. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 128. <u>Position</u> 129. <u>Organization</u> 130. <u>Address</u> 131. <u>City</u> 132. <u>State</u> 133. <u>Zip</u> 134. <u>Telephone</u> 135. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 136. <u>Position</u> 137. <u>Organization</u> 138. <u>Address</u> 139. <u>City</u> 140. <u>State</u> 141. <u>Zip</u> 142. <u>Telephone</u> 143. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 144. <u>Position</u> 145. <u>Organization</u> 146. <u>Address</u> 147. <u>City</u> 148. <u>State</u> 149. <u>Zip</u> 150. <u>Telephone</u> 151. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 152. <u>Position</u> 153. <u>Organization</u> 154. <u>Address</u> 155. <u>City</u> 156. <u>State</u> 157. <u>Zip</u> 158. <u>Telephone</u> 159. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 160. <u>Position</u> 161. <u>Organization</u> 162. <u>Address</u> 163. <u>City</u> 164. <u>State</u> 165. <u>Zip</u> 166. <u>Telephone</u> 167. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 168. <u>Position</u> 169. <u>Organization</u> 170. <u>Address</u> 171. <u>City</u> 172. <u>State</u> 173. <u>Zip</u> 174. <u>Telephone</u> 175. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 176. <u>Position</u> 177. <u>Organization</u> 178. <u>Address</u> 179. <u>City</u> 180. <u>State</u> 181. <u>Zip</u> 182. <u>Telephone</u> 183. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 184. <u>Position</u> 185. <u>Organization</u> 186. <u>Address</u> 187. <u>City</u> 188. <u>State</u> 189. <u>Zip</u> 190. <u>Telephone</u> 191. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 192. <u>Position</u> 193. <u>Organization</u> 194. <u>Address</u> 195. <u>City</u> 196. <u>State</u> 197. <u>Zip</u> 198. <u>Telephone</u> 199. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 200. <u>Position</u> 201. <u>Organization</u> 202. <u>Address</u> 203. <u>City</u> 204. <u>State</u> 205. <u>Zip</u> 206. <u>Telephone</u> 207. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 208. <u>Position</u> 209. <u>Organization</u> 210. <u>Address</u> 211. <u>City</u> 212. <u>State</u> 213. <u>Zip</u> 214. <u>Telephone</u> 215. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 216. <u>Position</u> 217. <u>Organization</u> 218. <u>Address</u> 219. <u>City</u> 220. <u>State</u> 221. <u>Zip</u> 222. <u>Telephone</u> 223. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 224. <u>Position</u> 225. <u>Organization</u> 226. <u>Address</u> 227. <u>City</u> 228. <u>State</u> 229. <u>Zip</u> 230. <u>Telephone</u> 231. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 232. <u>Position</u> 233. <u>Organization</u> 234. <u>Address</u> 235. <u>City</u> 236. <u>State</u> 237. <u>Zip</u> 238. <u>Telephone</u> 239. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 240. <u>Position</u> 241. <u>Organization</u> 242. <u>Address</u> 243. <u>City</u> 244. <u>State</u> 245. <u>Zip</u> 246. <u>Telephone</u> 247. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 248. <u>Position</u> 249. <u>Organization</u> 250. <u>Address</u> 251. <u>City</u> 252. <u>State</u> 253. <u>Zip</u> 254. <u>Telephone</u> 255. <u>Person to be contacted</u> 256. <u>Position</u>

[illegible]

Drawing H/00445/7

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

Earnbank House
Kinkell Bridge
Perthshire
PH3 1LD

Alterations and Extension to create a Barrier Free Family Home



25th May 2014

APS

The Old Schoolhouse
Invergeldie,
Glenlednock,
Comrie,
Perthshire,
PH6 2LY

INDEX

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 1.1 Site location and description
- 1.2 Earnbank House
- 1.3 History

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Medley family and their home
- 2.2 Description of Brief

3.0 DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- 3.1 Planning Guidance and Pre-Application Discussions
- 3.2 Consultation with Historic Scotland

4.0 DESIGN CRITERIA AND SOLUTION

- 4.1 Key issues
- 4.2 Demolition of existing lean-to extension
- 4.3 Extension by replication
- 4.4 Subsistence and subordination
- 4.5 Preservation of historic fabric (original house)
- 4.6 Preservation of historic fabric (Victorian extension)
- 4.7 Garden room
- 4.8 Veranda
- 4.9 Materials
- 4.10 Front elevation and symmetry issues
- 4.11 Sustainability
- 4.12 Accessible barrier free design
- 4.13 Community consultation
- 4.14 Recording
- 4.15 Conclusion

5.0 SUMMARY

6.0 ADDITIONAL PHOTOGRAPHS

Note - The Design and Access Statement should be read in conjunction with:

- 1. Occupational Therapy Report by Rhona Macleod-Garrad dated 19/5/2014.
- 2. Drawings MKB02, MKB05B and MKB25B.
- 3. Photo Appraisals 1 & 2.

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

1.1 Site location and description

Earnbank House is located on the south side of the River Earn close to Kin kell Bridge. It is situated in secluded garden ground extending to approximately 0.28 hectares and has open views to the south over rolling fields and farmland.

1.2 Earnbank House

The house is stone built with a pitched and slated roof. The original part of the building dates from about 1830 and a later extension was probably added between 1860 and 1885. A further small extension was added, after demolition of an earlier lean-to structure, at some point in the last century. The building is B listed.

The main part of the house is a handsome building, late Georgian, still with original windows and doors on its principal (north) elevation. The Victorian extension on the south elevation is not as original and windows have been added and altered at various times. An attic conversion of that extension was carried out in the nineteen seventies to add a study and bedroom above the kitchen. These rooms can only be accessed by way of a second staircase from the kitchen and not from the upper floor of the main part of the house.



Earnbank House from the north.



Rear extensions.

A striking feature of the house is the front elevation. Restrained and elegant around a central doorway it presents a harmonious symmetry in all aspects; window pattern, wall proportion, and chimney stacks.

1.3 History

So far as can be determined Earnbank House was originally built as the home for the factor of the surrounding estate.

There is evidence that it originally had a substantial lean-to or flat roofed extension containing kitchen and scullery in the area where the small extension now sits.

The Victorian extension was possibly constructed for use as an estate office and store. Peculiarly, until the nineteen seventies, it had only one ground floor window and no stair access to the loft area on the upper floor. The opening from the west reception room in the main house is not original.


2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 The Medley family and their home


The Medley family have owned and occupied Earnbank House for about forty years. They now have need of more space and an altered layout principally because [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] the house in its present form has many limitations. On the ground floor alone these include:


- The ground floor is not on one level and has internal steps between the kitchen & reception room and the kitchen & rear hall.
- Entry from the hall to the kitchen/ dining room is cramped and awkward, mainly because it is constrained by the second stair.
- The openings from the main part of the house to the rear extensions are too narrow for [REDACTED]
- The only bathroom in the house is on the ground floor, off the rear hall, in an area noted above as difficult to access.
- The bathroom is totally unsuitable for [REDACTED]
- One of the reception rooms is in permanent use as a therapy room and also as [REDACTED] emergency bedroom.



Narrow hallway.



In the kitchen.




The bathroom door.


The upper floor too has limitations. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] the main points that need to be addressed are:

- There is no bathroom or shower room on the upper floor.
- The third bedroom, [REDACTED] was originally a bathroom and is very small – too small for continued use.
- The fourth bedroom cannot be accessed from the main upper floor, requires a secondary stair, and feels “detached” from the rest of the house.



An awkward turn.



A tight fit!

Taking all of these weaknesses into consideration it can be seen clearly that the Medley family have a pressing need for more space and for a more [REDACTED] friendly" home.

2.2 Description of Brief

The brief is to provide a four bedroom family home that is accessible by all of the family, with sufficient space for [REDACTED] to live as much of an independent and unassisted life as possible. Specific requirements are therefore:

- To provide a level access ground floor with a layout suitable for unassisted living [REDACTED]
- To provide an spacious, accessible kitchen/dining/living area, with access to a garden room to take advantage of outlook to the south and west, and with the potential to incorporate doors directly to the garden.
- To provide a veranda or porch adjacent to a parking area to give covered access in all weather.
- To provide an additional bedroom on the upper floor to allow both young children to have separate bedrooms on the same floor as their parents.
- To provide appropriate bathroom facilities.

In view of the age and state of the property there is also a considerable amount of renovation, repair and upgrading work that needs to be carried. The proposed scheme will incorporate:

- A program of works for the restoration and repair of the existing building fabric including roof repairs and re-slating, repair and repainting of rainwater goods, re-pointing of stonework and repair of windows.
- Measures to improve the overall thermal performance of the house.

3.0 DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Given the requirements identified in the brief it is clear that the design will have to provide additional space as well as specifying alterations to improve access with in the original house.

A fundamental aspect of the design is the need to determine where that additional space can be added, and to what extent the present structure can be altered, and still remain predominantly compliant with the requirements of Historic Scotland.

The design process, has taken place in tandem with consultation with PKC Planning and Historic Scotland. It has shown that the most acceptable solution is to demolish the small lean-to extension to the rear. The lean-to, as noted earlier, is the most recent addition to Earnbank House and is also the least attractive part of the building. Demolition will provide part of the space necessary.

3.1 Basic principles of the design

The chosen solution is for demolition of an unattractive rear extension, construction of a new extension to replicate the Victorian extension, and an additional complimentary garden room extension on the west side which will be screened by existing garden walls and shrubs.

3.2 Planning Guidance and Pre-Application Discussions

Two pre-application enquiries have been made and these have provided detailed and useful criticism.

- (13/00553/PREAPP – 27th July 2013) - The first enquiry showed, as noted above, that there would likely be support for demolition of the small extension at the rear in order to free up space for a new extension.
- (14/00035/PREAPP – 16th January 2014) - The feedback received from the second enquiry was very specific and was particularly helpful in developing and refining the detail of the design. The final design has been adjusted to comply with the criteria set out at that stage.
- (14/00445/FLL – 18th March 2014) – Further feedback, particularly regarding loss of fabric in the main house, has also helped to inform the final design.

3.2 Consultation with Historic Scotland

Consultation and discussion has also taken place with Historic Scotland. Their comment and guidance has been central to the final design, both in broad principle and also with regard to detail.

- The decision to replicate the Victorian extension with the proposed new build appears, by consensus, to be the most appropriate way forward. The reasoning being that by following this course the symmetry of the principal (north) elevation will, to some extent, be applied to the rear.
- The original listing document mentions the "broad-eaved roof" and that detail will be adopted for the whole of the proposed new build structure.
- The listing also makes mention of the "original glazing" so that the new windows, where appropriate, will follow the style and proportion of the original.

4.0 DESIGN CRITERIA AND SOLUTION

4.1 Key Issues – The key issues in terms of position and appearance that must inform the design of extensions to listed buildings are clearly stated by Historic Scotland. Extensions:

- must protect the character and appearance of the building;
- should be subordinate in scale and form;
- should be located on a secondary elevation;
- must be designed in a high quality manner using appropriate materials.

These criteria determine that the proposed extension will have to be sited to the rear of the building and that the existing small lean-to extension will need to be demolished to provide the necessary space.

4.2 Demolition of existing lean-to extension – As stated above PKC Planning has agreed that demolition of the small lean-to is an acceptable option and that they will be:

"unlikely to object to the removal of the existing lean to extension on the south elevation" (14/00035/PREAPP)

4.3 Extension by replication – As noted earlier the new extension will replicate the existing and its design follows the guidance set out by Historic Scotland. Scale and massing are identical. The Historic Scotland publication *Extensions*, section 3.4, states that:

"Replication is where new work is designed specifically to match the original building and does so in all respects, not only in the use of materials in the same style. The dimensions and finish of the materials used, and details such as colouring, pointing, tooling, window proportion and profile, roof pitch and slate, must all be accurately modelled on the existing building or they will not sit comfortably beside the original."


4.4 Subservience and subordination – As the new extension will exactly replicate the original it will avoid any tendency to dominate and will remain subservient to the principal and original house. The new extension fully and exactly complies with Historic Scotland guidance, *Extensions*, section 4.1, which states that:

- An addition or extension should play a subordinate role. It should not dominate the original building as a result of its scale, materials or location, and should not overlay principal elevations.
- Where an extension is built beside a principal elevation it should generally be lower than, and set back behind, that facade.
- An extension that would unbalance a symmetrical elevation and threaten the original design concept should be avoided.

The proposed extension is not large and will increase the overall footprint of Earnbank House by less than 20%.



Extension effectively screened.



The old replicated in the new.

Sitting alongside the Victorian original, the new extension will provide a very compact solution to the requirement for additional space on both ground and upper floors. On reflection, it is hard to conceive of a more compact arrangement as virtually the entire internal volume is utilised.

4.5 Preservation of historic building fabric (original house) – The proposed design will ensure that within the principal and original part of the house the necessity for alteration is kept to a minimum. The alterations that are necessary are all dictated by access issues and will be:

- Widening of the existing opening from the ground floor hall to the new extension. [redacted] The change is relatively small, adding 260mm, and will not be obvious.)
- Creating a doorway from the east reception room to the new shower room. [redacted] The proposed doorway could be removed relatively easily at a future date and the room returned to its original state.)
- Removing an upstairs toilet in order to create an opening from the upper hall to the new extension. (The upper rear part of the house is only accessible at present by way of the secondary stair from the kitchen. The proposed opening will be 880mm wide.)
- Installation of a Velux rooflight above the stair. (Essential for natural light in stairwell and hallways – it replaces the existing south window.)

4.6 Preservation of historic building fabric (Victorian extension) – The special circumstances relating to this proposal have already made clear the need for a barrier free living space at ground floor level. Under normal circumstances the new ground floor areas could be accessed from the Victorian extension by openings of a modest width. In this case the need for the kitchen, dining and living spaces to be integrated physically, visually, and aurally dictates minimal obstruction. This will result in the loss of a section of the east wall of the present extension. The loss will be internal and will not be visible from outside.

On the upper floor there will be alteration of the east pitch of the roof but that is unavoidable if there is to be useable space in that upper rear area. Once again that change will not be visible from any public viewpoint because it will be masked by the south gables. It will only be visible from the garden or field directly south of the house, all of which is private land.

4.7 Garden room – The garden room will add useful living space to the ground floor and will take advantage of south and west views on sunny days. Doors can be added in place of the windows to give level threshold access to a deck or patio in the garden. The garden room will be sheltered on its north side by the existing high, ivy covered garden wall and planter that project from the west gable of Earnbank House. The wall will also act to mask the structure when seen from the public road to the north and will help to minimise the visual impact on the principal elevation.

The submitted design draws on advice received from PKC Planning which stated:

"The proposed garden room may be acceptable however a lighter touch in the connection with the existing house would be recommended, perhaps with a more obvious separation from the main house. The large slapping in the west elevation is not likely to be supported. A slapping more the size of the existing kitchen window may be more appropriate." (14/00035/PREAPP)

The design has been altered exactly in accordance with that advice. It is intended that the garden room should be seen as a complimentary addition rather than as a replication. The minimalist design style with timber cladding, flat roof and large windows, will make a clear statement that it is an addition.

4.8 Veranda – The veranda is important and will provide "all weather" cover for setting down and wheelchair access. The existing driveway leads directly to the setting down point.



The veranda eaves line will help promote the impression of a single storey extension. (Photomontage)

The veranda will have an additional benefit in so far as the low eaves line will help promote a "single storey" feel, particularly when viewed from the south east or from

the road at Kinkell Bridge. The eaves will be constructed to match the "broad eaves" detail on the original roof.

4.9 Materials – The proposed extension will use appropriate material for all external finishes. Roof – natural slate with zinc and lead; walls – natural stone; garden room walls – locally sourced larch; windows and doors – timber; rainwater goods – cast iron.

4.10 Front elevation and symmetry – The existing ivy covered garden wall projecting from the west gable of Earbank House will screen the garden room very effectively.



The ivy covered garden wall will screen the garden room very effectively.

The veranda on the east side will be a relatively light and open structure and will be partly screened by existing shrubbery on the east gable. There is no viewpoint, from which both sides of the facade will be visible, that might make symmetry an issue of concern.

4.11 Sustainability – The proposals are sustainable in a holistic sense:

Inclusion – The proposal will provide an accessible and barrier free house.

Insulation – Increased insulation and higher u-values will help to reduce energy consumption.

Materials – Nationally sourced materials will be used thus reducing transportation. Timber will be responsibly sourced from managed forests.

Renewables – Solar panels will be used for domestic hot water and space heating. Solar PV will be added if the budget allows.

Passive ventilation – Opening windows on both sides during summer brings in cool air. A "stack effect" will be formed in the

stairwell which will draw hot air up through the roofspace to exhaust through a solar flue.

Natural daylight – Large south facing windows will maximise daylight and reduce the need for artificial light. Rooflights on the upper floor will supplement the smaller windows and provide four times more light than vertical windows. This too will reduce the energy demand.

Water consumption – Low flush cisterns and water efficient taps will be used.

4.12 Accessible barrier free design – The design has been informed by BS 8300 and the Wheelchair Housing Design Guide. Particular features include:

- Linear access into house direct from setting down point.
- Improved access to original part of house.
- Accessible kitchen design for inclusivity and adaptability.
- Statutory ground floor toilet and shower room design.
- Flush threshold detailing.
- Physiotherapy spaces.
- Wheelchair storage.

4.13 Community consultation – The Medleys have spoken to their two closest neighbours who are both enthusiastic in their support for the proposals. (One family has lodged a note of support with PKC.)

4.14 Recording – Given that the proposed extension will result in some unavoidable loss of fabric, it is intended that the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland's (RCAHMS) will be given the opportunity to record the historic structure prior to works commencing. This is in line with Historic Scotland guidance, *Extensions*, section 9.1, which states that:

"RCAHMS is always pleased to consider recording changes to historic structures whenever the opportunity arises."

4.15 Conclusion – All design involves compromise. The proposed design will provide a barrier free home with extended accommodation while at the same time remaining in broad compliance with Historic Scotland requirements. It will ensure that all that is best in Earnbank House is restored and preserved.

By confining all new construction to the rear the design will leave the principal and original structure undisturbed. There will be no visible change to the exterior of the original and main part of the house.

5.0 SUMMARY

The proposed design will ensure a barrier free house. It will provide a ground floor living space that is easily accessible from the original part of the house and an additional bedroom and bathroom on the upper floor. These changes will bring about a welcome and necessary improvement in the quality of daily life for the whole of the Medley family.

At the same time the design will respect the historic nature and setting of the house and will preserve and enhance its character. It will do this by removing a redundant and unattractive element and replacing it with one that is more sympathetic in appearance and which will be finished in materials that are a better match for the original.



Earnbank House from the south east showing the proposed extension at the rear. (Photomontage)

The comprehensive programme of external repairs that is to be carried out in tandem with the new works will result in a full restoration of the original house and ensure the good maintenance and condition of Earnbank House.



6.0 ADDITIONAL PHOTOGRAPHS



Coming into the house.



Kitchen ramp.



Not enough space!



At the back door.



Kitchen again.



Bathroom squeeze.



In the kitchen.



These corners!



Therapy room.

CHECKED IN

AS
RW

Lynsey Black

From: publicaccess@pkc.gov.uk
Sent: 04 February 2015 14:26
To: TES Planning - Generic Email Account
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 15/00083/FLL

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 2:35 PM on 04 Feb 2015 from Mrs Heidi Whitelock.

Application Summary

Address: Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3 1LD

Proposal: Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

Case Officer: No case officer assigned

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Heidi Whitelock

Email:

Address:

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I would really like to add a comment of support to this planning application as there is a human element to this that the normal planning process does not consider. I know the Medley Family well and believe that this planning application will massively improve their family situation.

I understand there are planning regulations in place but the Medley's are only wanting to change the back of the house, which is not on public view therefore not impacting the visual amenity. It is designed to be in keeping as it replicates the existing back extension and is less than 20% increase in footprint. I urge you to re-consider this application in a positive light as this extension will have a hugely positive impact on the everyday life of this supportive, caring

family. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] If you did not approve this application and the Medleys were forced to move elsewhere [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. I urge you to reconsider and let the Medley's live [REDACTED] in their home that has been in their family for 36 years.

* redact

SUPPORT

Tracy McManamon

From: Jer Heughan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 06 February 2015 14:33
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Statement of Support for 15/00083/FLL Earnbank House

To whom it may concern.

We would like to submit this statement of support for our neighbours.


Being familiar with the plans for Earnbank House, we are once again writing a letter of SUPPORT for the proposed extension to this house. We have known the house and family for many years. We believe the extension is in keeping with the original house and in no way detracts from its historical interest. All the changes are being made to the rear of the house, which will have little, if no impact to either us or passers by. The size of the extension is relatively small and does not seem to dominate its surroundings. As well as extending, there will be a lot of work done to restore the existing house which is needed to improve and maintain it.

[REDACTED]

Regards

Jer and Donald Heughan

[REDACTED]



redact re

SUPPORT

Tracy McManamon

From: Laila Bilimoria [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 February 2015 12:31
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: 15/00083/FLL - Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse Earnbank House

To whom it may concern

I recently heard of a further application for planning for Earnbank House, and felt compelled to write to you.

[REDACTED]


I see no reason other than narrow mindedness for you to refuse this application.

[REDACTED]

I urge you to look at the bigger picture with compassion for this case [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] will cause no harm to anyone and will allow the family to stay in their home and remain a valued part of our community.

Yours faithfully

Laila Bilimoria



(Redact)
Tracy McManamon

SUPPORT

From: DAWN ROBERTSON [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 February 2015 12:09
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Letter of Support: 15/00083/FLL

Dear Sir/ Madam

I wish to offer a Letter of Support in respect of the Medley family's Planning Application: 15/00083/FLL.


My own family has resided in the village of Muthill for over 100 years and Mr & Mrs Medley's home is therefore well known to me. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] It is my understanding that any renovations will be sympathetic to the character of the property and will allow them to restore their listed building to its former glory.

[REDACTED]
I believe that this is a very valid and worthy application and urge the council to offer its full support to the family by granting their Planning Application.

Yours faithfully

Dawn Robertson
[REDACTED]



Redacted

Support

Tracy McManamon

From: Ailsa Mooney <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 09 February 2015 13:43
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Letter of support

To whom it may concern:

I would like to formally support the application 15/00083/FLL regarding the proposal to change the layout and extension of this family's home.

If this application is granted and I very much believe it should be, the community benefits from a listed building being maintained (continue to be lived in after being in the family for 36 years) and preserved (the changes are to the back and not visible to the general population)

[REDACTED] can grow up in his family home, continue to put down roots and develop strong social links within a community that he belongs to, and is an integral and positive part of.

I urge the council to fully support this application.

Ailsa Mooney
[REDACTED]

Received by Council

10 FEB 2015

Support


Tracy McManamon

From: JAMES <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 09 February 2015 18:07
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Cc: Sam Medley
Subject: 15/00083/FLL

I wish to support the above Application submitted by Mr and Mrs Medley for work at Earnbank House Kinkell Bridge.

From my point of view no adverse consequences will result and I am in favour of the Application being approved.

James R Mowat



Robert ..

15/00083/PLC.

SUPPORT

Tracy McManamon

From: robert coombs [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 February 2015 19:56
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: RE: Application support

SCANNED

Good evening,

My address is

[REDACTED]



Regards

Robert

From: DevelopmentManagement@pkc.gov.uk
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Application support
Date: Mon, 9 Feb 2015 10:34:16 +0000

Dear Mr Coombs

To enable us to register your comments we will need your full postal address including postcode.

Regards

Tracy McManamon
Senior Support Assistant
Planning and Regeneration
35 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5GD

Telephone 01738 475334

From: robert coombs [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 February 2015 23:28
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Application support

Dear sir/madam,

I am writing this e-mail in support of the building application submitted by Sam Medley reference number 15/00083/FLL.

We have known this family for a number of years, [REDACTED]

The application does not impact on the look of the house from the front of the property but merely adds less than 20% floor area to the back of the property. The alterations are not intended to add value to the house but to allow the family to carry on living in their house. The extension will be in keeping with the existing back of the property.

[REDACTED]

This would really mean a lot to this family and make a little boys life a lot easier and happier.

Yours Sincerely

Robert Coombs

Securing the future... - Improving services - Enhancing quality of life - Making best use of public resources.

The information in this email is solely for the intended recipients.

If you are not an intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, or distribute its contents or use them in any way: please advise the sender immediately and delete this email.

Perth & Kinross Council, Live Active Leisure Limited and TACTRAN do not warrant that this email or any attachments are virus-free and does not accept any liability for any loss or damage resulting from any virus infection. Perth & Kinross Council may monitor or examine any emails received by its email system.

The information contained in this email may not be the views of Perth & Kinross Council, Live Active Leisure Limited or TACTRAN. It is possible for email to be falsified and the sender cannot be held responsible for the integrity of the information contained in it.

Requests to Perth & Kinross Council under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act should be directed to the Freedom of Information Team - email: foi@pkc.gov.uk

General enquiries to Perth & Kinross Council should be made to enquiries@pkc.gov.uk or 01738 475000.

General enquiries to Live Active Leisure Limited should be made to enquiries@liveactive.co.uk or 01738 454600.

General enquiries to TACTRAN should be made to info@tactran.gov.uk or 01738 475775.

Securing the future... - Improving services - Enhancing quality of life - Making best use of public resources.

Green.

CHECKED IN

Kirsty Graham

From: publicaccess@pkc.gov.uk
Sent: 11 February 2015 15:50
To: TES Planning - Generic Email Account
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 15/00083/FLL

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:00 PM on 11 Feb 2015 from Mr Terence Jones.

Application Summary

Address: Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3 1LD

Proposal: Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

Case Officer: No case officer assigned

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Terence Jones

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application


Reasons for comment:

Comments: As grandparents, we are well aware that life is becoming increasingly difficult for the family to live with the present layout of Earnbank House [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] There is no doubt that the provision of the additional bedrooms and a proper bathroom on the first floor is imperative, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] There are no bathroom facilities in this area either. It is also essential that the ability to provide for a bedroom and associated wet room, appropriately configured on the ground floor. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] We note that the problem regarding Listed Building Consent has been resolved, and that Scottish Heritage has given approval for the proposed plans to be implemented. [REDACTED]




9th February 2015

Perth & Kinross Council
Pullar House
35 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5GD

17 FEB 2015

Dear Sir or Madam

**REF: 15/00083/FLL – ALTERATIONS & EXTENSION TO DWELLINGHOUSE
AT EARNBANK HOUSE, KINKELL, STRATHALLAN, AUCHTERARDER PH3 1LD**

LETTER OF SUPPORT

With reference to the above planning application, we wish to write a letter of support for the works proposed.


We understand that Listed Building consent has been received from the Scottish Government, as the Medleys plan to keep the character of the house, renovating and improving the building for the future.

Most importantly, the work is only going to alter the *back* of the house and therefore will not be visible from the public road. Their extension is going to make the rear of the house more symmetrical (replicating the existing extension) and is less than a 20% increase in the footprint of the house.


We would ask that you consider the above points when making your decision regarding this planning application.

Yours sincerely


Iain & Kirsten Dewar

Kirsty Graham

From: publicaccess@pkc.gov.uk
Sent: 18 February 2015 15:38
To: TES Planning - Generic Email Account
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 15/00083/FLL

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 3:47 PM on 18 Feb 2015 from Mrs J Kipps.

Application Summary

Address: Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3 1LD

Proposal: Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

Case Officer: No case officer assigned

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mrs J Kipps

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I support this planning application for the following reasons: - The plans are sympathetic to the character of the property. - It is an opportunity to restore the property to its former glory so they too can pass it down to future generations. - If planning isn't granted the family will be forced to leave the area [REDACTED]

Kirsty Graham

Support

RW.

From: Alexander Clark [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 February 2015 17:14
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Planning reference number is 15/00083/FLL - Letter of Support

Dear Sir / Madam,

Ref: Planning reference number is 15/00083/FLL - Letter of Support

I am writing to you to express support for the Medley family seeking planning permission to adapt their house, as per the above reference. The development would be largely out of sight and not mar the landscape in an area where few overlook the property anyway.

By enabling them to adapt their house they will be able to cater appropriately for the serious changing needs of their disabled son, Alex.


On the other hand, if they are refused permission then they would incur additional costs as a result of having to move and kit out the next house. This seems unreasonable and a great burden to bear when Alex is already struggling.

I respectfully request that this be taken into account and that permission be granted.

Yours faithfully,

Alexander Clark

[REDACTED]



Kirsty Graham

From: publicaccess@pkc.gov.uk
Sent: 23 February 2015 19:40
To: TES Planning - Generic Email Account
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 15/00083/FLL

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 7:50 PM on 23 Feb 2015 from Mrs annemarie dunn.

Application Summary

Address: Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3
1LD

Proposal: Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Richard Welch

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mrs annemarie dunn

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Mr Medley's family has lived in this house for 2 generations and he would like nothing more than to bring up his young family in the same house. While they want to retain the character of the house more than any 3rd party because it is a home they love, they need to update it to meet the requirements of modern family living [REDACTED]

They have worked very hard to accommodate all of these needs and have absolutely limited their alterations as far as they can with these objectives in mind. They have sought advice and endeavoured to meet the planning regulations for this area. Their changes will not adversely affect the look of the building from the road.

[REDACTED] This is a sympathetic plan to alter a building of character [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I expect and hope that this application will be supported.

REDACT

ON

Tracy McManamon

2nd From Same Household

From: Catherine Armstrong [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2015 14:46
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Re: Support for the Medley Family's Planning Application

Dear Ms McManamon


My address is as follows:



Kind regards

Catherine Armstrong

Sent from my iPad



> On 24 Feb 2015, at 14:01, Development Management - Generic Email Account
<DevelopmentManagement@pkc.gov.uk> wrote:

>
> Dear Ms Armstrong
>
> To enable us to register your comments please provide your full postal address including postcode.
>
> Regards
>
>
> Tracy McManamon
> Senior Support Assistant
> Planning and Development
> 35 Kinnoull Street
> Perth
> PH1 5GD
>
> Telephone 01738 475334
>
>
>
>
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Catherine Armstrong [REDACTED]
> Sent: 24 February 2015 12:25
> To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
> Subject: Support for the Medley Family's Planning Application
>

> Good afternoon

> I wish to express my support for the planning application, reference number 15/00083/FLL, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

> Kind regards

>

> Catherine Armstrong

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

>

> Securing the future... - Improving services - Enhancing quality of

> life - Making best use of public resources.

>

> The information in this email is solely for the intended recipients.

>

> If you are not an intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, or

> distribute its contents or use them in any way; please advise the

> sender immediately and delete this email.

>

> Perth & Kinross Council, Live Active Leisure Limited and TACTRAN do

> not warrant that this email or any attachments are virus-free and does

> not accept any liability for any loss or damage resulting from any

> virus infection. Perth & Kinross Council may monitor or examine any

> emails received by its email system.

>

> The information contained in this email may not be the views of Perth

> & Kinross Council, Live Active Leisure Limited or TACTRAN.

> It is possible for email to be falsified and the sender cannot be held

> responsible for the integrity of the information contained in it.

>

> Requests to Perth & Kinross Council under the Freedom of Information

> (Scotland) Act should be directed to the Freedom of Information Team -

> email: foi@pkc.gov.uk

>

> General enquiries to Perth & Kinross Council should be made to

> enquiries@pkc.gov.uk or 01738 475000.

SUPPORT

REDACT

JW

Tracy McManamon

From: Neil Armstrong [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2015 2:15:00
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: 15/00083/FLL - Letter of Support

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my support for the planning permission requested by Mr & Mrs Medley (15/00083/FLL), whom I know through my children's primary school. Firstly I would like to mention that I appreciate the challenges you face when completing your public duties of enforcing planning regulations and that this case is probably more challenging than most. However, I sincerely hope that your department is willing to act compassionately and reconsider the original decision to deny approval, especially since the impact to other members of the public and the historical heritage of the building appears to be insignificant compared to the negative impact it will have on [REDACTED].

Yours faithfully,

Neil Armstrong
[REDACTED]

25 FEB 2015

Kirsty Graham

From: publicaccess@pkc.gov.uk
Sent: 25 February 2015 23:03
To: TES Planning - Generic Email Account
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 15/00083/FLL

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 11:13 PM on 25 Feb 2015 from Miss Lynne McArdle.

Application Summary

Address: Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3
1LD

Proposal: Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Richard Welch

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Miss Lynne McArdle

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

**Commenter
Type:** Member of Public


Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning
Application

**Reasons
for
comment:**

Comments: Please find below a copy of my emailed letter of support submitted to the board for document inclusion (allowing for format here with regard to highlighting etc.). Address & contact details as registered, 7th February 2015 To whom it may concern, RE: Planning reference number 15/00083/FLL Letter of Support I am writing in support of this planning application with the hope that further public opinion may assist the panel representing Perth & Kinross Council in reaching agreement with the Scottish Government's appointed Reporter by granting permission immediately. Living in the centre of the UNESCO World Heritage Site that is Edinburgh's New Town, one frequently sees the ongoing struggle faced by planners in seeking to preserve historical character whilst simultaneously maintaining quality of life for residents and future generations. Preserving the environmental culture is a delicate balance which can only be managed successfully through the sustainable adaptation of our ageing buildings. All over Scotland, entirely wonderful buildings of historic interest are left to crumble and ruin because the

initiative, finance or situation did not allow for adaptation. Our old buildings take more and more looking after as they age and owners should be encouraged and supported in this pursuit as much as possible. Having considered the plans and accompanying pictures provided with this application, I am in total agreement with the Scottish Ministers' Reporter who has granted listed building consent. The addition to the back of the house in no way interrupts the classic Georgian style of the front and in actual fact corrects the perceived aesthetic flaw of the irregular Victorian addition by restoring balance and symmetry to the building. It is really quite beautiful, the design creates the required private living environment cleverly without affecting the historic value of the building. Given that the building's listed status does not conflict with the plans, it would seem that there remain several material reasons to support permission being granted. The opportunity has been taken to add solar panels thereby reducing the building's environmental impact – a goal we are all striving for. The plans include repairing and preserving this ageing building so that it can continue to be passed down through generations of the Medley family. Preserving our heritage realistically means supporting families who do this. Neighbouring properties are in support of these plans. These plans have come about primarily to support and accommodate the access needs of a family dealing with a severe disability. The Scottish Government takes this matter extremely seriously and planning procedure has evolved to reflect this. Developers realise that new builds should have ground level toilet and bedroom facilities where possible and doorway measurements reflect the need for wheelchair access. Since listed building permission is granted, the plan's design to make an inaccessible home into an accessible high quality and inclusive environment should be considered of paramount importance.

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2013/12/9882/5>
Planning Series Circular 3/2013: Development Management Procedures Design Statements and Design and Access Statements (Regulation 13) 3.15 All applicants, together with developers, architects, designers and agents, should consider design as an integral part of the development process. Scottish Ministers recognise the need to deliver high quality and inclusive environments that can be used by everyone, regardless of age, gender or disability. In addition to their duties as public bodies under equalities legislation, Scottish Ministers and planning authorities must perform their functions under the 1997 Act in a manner which encourages equal opportunities and, in particular, the observance of the equal opportunities requirements. Planning's important role in the delivery of well-designed, inclusive environments is emphasised in the design series of Planning Advice Notes.



[REDACTED]

Let us not forget that this is a private family home, one which is being carefully protected and nurtured as a building of interest to be passed down through generations. There is little to be gained from trying to preserve a decaying building which is inaccessible to occupants and no longer fit for purpose. Far better to support this family, praise them for their efforts and help deliver a high quality inclusive environment that can be used by everyone [REDACTED]. It is admirable that Perth and Kinross Council planning department dedicate such care to the protection of our heritage. The Reporter's findings commend the plans and provide evidence to satisfy the panel's listed building concerns (specifically with regard to policy HE2), that the proposed alterations do not adversely affect the building's special interest and are appropriate to the building's character, appearance and setting. The Reporter shows clearly that the plans are in accordance with the Perth & Kinross Council Local Development Plan and policy HE2 quite clearly states that plans of this nature should be encouraged and enabled; Perth & Kinross Council Local Development Plan 2014 Policy HE2: Listed Buildings There is a presumption in favour of the retention and sympathetic restoration, correct maintenance and sensitive management of listed buildings to enable them to remain in active use, and any proposed alterations or adaptations to help sustain or enhance a building's beneficial use should not adversely affect its special interest. Encouragement will be given to proposals to improve the energy efficiency of listed buildings within Perth and Kinross, providing such improvements do not impact detrimentally on the special interest of the building. Enabling development may be acceptable where it can be shown to be the only means of retaining a listed building. The layout, design, materials, scale, siting and use of any development which will affect a listed building or its setting should be appropriate to the building's character, appearance and setting. There are several material reasons in favour of the application, all of which

are supported by policy PM1B, specifically as highlighted below; Perth & Kinross Council Local Development Plan 2014 Policy PM1B All proposals should meet all the following placemaking criteria: (a) Create a sense of identity by developing a coherent structure of streets, spaces, and buildings, safely accessible from its surroundings. (b) Consider and respect site topography and any surrounding important landmarks, views or skylines, as well as the wider landscape character of the area. (c) The design and density should complement its surroundings in terms of appearance, height, scale, massing, materials, finishes and colours. (d) Respect an existing building line where appropriate, or establish one where none exists. Access, uses, and orientation of principal elevations should reinforce the street or open space. (e) All buildings, streets, and spaces (including green spaces) should create safe, accessible, inclusive places for people, which are easily navigable, particularly on foot, bicycle and public transport. (f) Buildings and spaces should be designed with future adaptability in mind wherever possible. (g) Existing buildings, structures and natural features that contribute to the local townscape should be retained and sensitively integrated into proposals. (h) Incorporate green infrastructure into new developments and make connections where possible to green networks. I fully support the applicant in asking that the panel find in agreement with the Reporter appointed by the Scottish Ministers and grant this planning application forthwith in accordance with the Perth & Kinross Council Local Development Plan 2014 and The Scottish Government's inclusive planning policy. Thank you for taking the time to read this, please feel free to contact me if I can be of further assistance. Yours sincerely Miss L. McArdle

Kirsty Graham

From: publicaccess@pkc.gov.uk
Sent: 25 February 2015 22:22
To: TES Planning - Generic Email Account
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 15/00083/FLL

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 10:31 PM on 25 Feb 2015 from Mr Simon Cole.

Application Summary

Address: Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3 1LD

Proposal: Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

Case Officer: Richard Welch

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Simon Cole

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I strongly support the proposed alterations to Earnbank House for several reasons. Firstly the proposed alterations do not impact on the main character of the house. In any case the changes are at the back of the house (which cannot be seen from any public land or area) and so there is no impact on the visual amenity. The increase in footprint is also small. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] It seems morally wrong, and incredibly short sighted and inflexible, to not allow these alterations, given the reason for them, and the minimal visual and structural impact they will have. I actually find it an oppressive feeling to think that we would live in a regulatory environment where common sense and practical alterations, which are not being done for personal gain, would be denied. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] For these reasons I strongly support the proposed alterations.

Resnet


Support

RW

Tracy McManamon

From: Hilda's Email [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2015 15:29
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Re: Planning Permission, 15/00083/F11

Mrs Hilda Bain,
[REDACTED]



From: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 1:06 PM
To: 'Hilda's Email'
Subject: RE: Planning Permission, 15/00083/F11

Dear Ms Bain

To enable us to register your comments we will need your full postal address including postcode.

Regards

Tracy McManamon
Senior Support Assistant
Planning and Development
35 Kinnoull Street
Perth
PH1 5GD

Telephone 01738 475334

From: Hilda's Email [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 February 2015 15:29
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Planning Permission, 15/00083/F11

Dear Sirs,

Letter of support, application for planning Permission, 15/00083/F11, Mr and Mrs P. Medley, Earn bank, Kinkell Bridge, Auchterarder.

I write to support the above application, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The present front aspect of the house would remain intact and all the renovations and additional building would be at the back and I understand that listed building consent has been obtained.

These traditional houses, although pleasingly symmetrical are not suitable in lay out for modern living [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I ask you to give weight to my letter when considering all the facts before you.

Yours Faithfully,

Hilda Bain (Mrs.)

Securing the future... - Improving services - Enhancing quality of life - Making best use of public resources. The information in this email is solely for the intended recipients. If you are not an intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, or distribute its contents or use them in any way: please advise the sender immediately and delete this email. Perth & Kinross Council, Live Active Leisure Limited and TACTRAN do not warrant that this email or any attachments are virus-free and does not accept any liability for any loss or damage resulting from any virus infection. Perth & Kinross Council may monitor or examine any emails received by its email system. The information contained in this email may not be the views of Perth & Kinross Council, Live Active Leisure Limited or TACTRAN. It is possible for email to be falsified and the sender cannot be held responsible for the integrity of the information contained in it. Requests to Perth & Kinross Council under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act should be directed to the Freedom of Information Team - email: foi@pkc.gov.uk General enquiries to Perth & Kinross Council should be made to enquiries@pkc.gov.uk or 01738 475000. General enquiries to Live Active Leisure Limited should be made to enquiries@liveactive.co.uk or 01738 454600. General enquiries to TACTRAN should be made to

REDACT PAGE 2 (LETTER) SUPPORT

RW

Tracy McManamon

From: sarah Carter [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2015 21:19
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Cc: Sam Medley
Subject: Letter of support 15/00083/FLL
Attachments: Blank 7.pdf

Please find attached a letter of support for the above planning application.
Yours sincerely
Dr S Carter

Sent from my iPad



Dr Sarah Carter




SENSITIVE


25th February

Dear planning committee

PLANNING APPLICATION EARNBANK HOUSE, KINKELL BRIDGE, AUCHTERARDER,
PH3 1LD
APPLICATION 15/00083/FLL

I am writing in support of the above planning application.





Yours sincerely

Dr Sarah Carter

Green
CHECKED IN

Kirsty Graham

From: publicaccess@pkc.gov.uk
Sent: 13 February 2015 12:14
To: TES Planning - Generic Email Account
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 15/00083/FLL

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 12:23 PM on 13 Feb 2015 from Mrs Sarah Mackintosh.

Application Summary

Address: Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3
1LD

Proposal: Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse

Case Officer: No case officer assigned

[Click for further Information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sarah Mackintosh

Email:

Address:

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I support this planning application because I have seen the plans and they are in-keeping with the character of the house. In fact one would hardly be able to see the changes from the road. The house itself needs renovation if has been within the family for many years, and they love it. Speaking from experience all old houses need to be loved so that they can be kept for future generations. But those living in them, need to be able to make them work for modern living and for their family, whilst retaining their original character and charm - and this in my opinion is that they are doing.

it would be morally wrong to block the family from making these changes - especially because they are planning to make these changes in a manner which will only compliment and enhance the existing building.

From: publicaccess@pkc.gov.uk
Sent: 26 February 2015 16:46
To: TES Planning - Generic Email Account
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 15/00083/FLL

Comments were submitted at 4:56 PM on 26 Feb 2015 from Mrs Wendy Goddard.

Address: Earnbank House Kinkell Strathallan Auchterarder PH3
1LD

Case Officer: Richard Welch

[Click for further information](#)

Name: Mrs Wendy Goddard

Address:

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I understand that Mr and Mrs Medley have made an application to make alterations to their family home to [REDACTED] continue to live there, and would like to offer my full support on their behalf. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I would respectfully ask
that the Planning Department do their upmost to support
this family who would benefit so enormously by making
the alterations needed [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

* REDACT

SUPPORT

RW

Tracy McManamon

From: Chic Medley <chic@chicmedley.plus.com>
Sent: 27 February 2015 14:05
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Application 15/00083/FLL - a letter of support

- 2 MAR 2015

I would like to add a note of support for this application.

'Earnbank House' was our family home from my early twenties, and is now owned by my brother's family.

To me it seems as though there are two aspects to this application, firstly the changes proposed to the house as a listed building, and secondly the need for the Medley family to update the practical way the house 'works' as a home, [REDACTED]

Regarding the changes as a listed building, this is not the first time that relatively major alterations have been proposed. I had always believed that the earliest part of the house is Georgian, with a later Victorian extension to the rear elevation. It is clear that further additions were made to the rear of the house probably in the 60s - with no serious attempt to blend these into the existing architecture - but also my parents had investigated the possibility of extending the building to the rear, which would have removed that part of the building, and added to the later Victorian addition in what was at the time a modern contemporary style. I am not sure why these did not go ahead, but as far as I remember it was not due to planning issues.

These drawings were not radical by any means, but I was impressed to see that the current application proposing changes to the rear of the building, differ in that they have made a genuine - and I believe successful - attempt to keep the fundamental character already suggested by the Victorian extension.

Importantly, if my reading of the drawings is correct, the Georgian front elevation will not be changed, and from the road the house will be virtually indistinguishable from its current form.

[REDACTED]

In the history of Earnbank House there have already been additions to the building. This is not untypical of any house as its use and needs change. As Listed Building Consent has already been granted, why should the Medleys not be also able to make alterations to suit their changing needs? To me this is an important part of a building's history and if well thought out, should not be considered detrimental.

I commend them for their diligence and persistence, and I hope that the Council will favourably consider their application to improve their home, and allow them to add to its history.

Regards,

Charles and Nicola Medley

REDUCT

SUPPORT

RW✓


Tracy McManamon

From: Christian Stewart - [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 February 2015 15:20
To: Development Management - Generic Email Account
Subject: Letter of Support for 15/00083/FLL
Attachments: Sam & Pip Letter of Support.pdf

Dear Sirs

Please find attached our letter of support for the planning application 15/00083/FLL.

Christian & Kimberley Stewart



27 February 2015

Planning & Environment,
Perth & Kinross Council,
Pillar House,
35 Kinnoull Street,
PERTH,
PH1 5GD

Dear Sirs,

Letter of Support - Planning Reference 15/00083/FLL

We write in support of the planning application reference 15/00083/FLL in regard to alterations and extension to Earnbank House, Kinkell, Strathallan, Auchterarder PH3 1LD.

We believe very strongly that this application should be granted for a number of reasons.

Design & Architecture

The alterations and extension will help preserve this beautiful house, making it practical for modern living and the specific needs of the Medley family. This will allow the building to continue to be lived in and enhance the likelihood that an important example of its type will remain fit for purpose for generations to come.

Amenity

We travel across Kinkell Bridge every day and are of the opinion that the alterations and extension will not be detrimental in any way to the public view of the building or the amenity of the site. The changes will not be visible from the road and will leave intact the elegant frontage. Indeed, the works as planned should improve the overall appearance of the house.

Need

[REDACTED]

We therefore wholeheartedly support the above planning application and hope to see consent granted.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Christian & Kimberley Stewart