PERTH AND KINROSS LOCAL REVIEW BODY

Minute of meeting of the Perth and Kinross Local Review Body held in the Council Chamber, 2 High Street, Perth on Tuesday 4 February 2020 at 10.30am.

Present: Councillors H Anderson, T Gray and I James.

In Attendance: D Harrison (Planning Adviser), C Elliott (Legal Adviser) and D Williams (Committee Officer) (all Corporate and Democratic Services).

Also Attending: C Brien and M Terava (Corporate and Democratic Services); members of the public, including agents and an applicant.

Councillor H Anderson, Convener, Presiding.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made in terms of the Councillors Code of Conduct.

2. MINUTES

The minute of meeting of the Local Review Body of 7 January 2020 (Arts. 1-3) was submitted and noted.

3. APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

(i) TCP/11/16(621)

Planning Application – 19/01313/IPL – Erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle), land 40 metres north east of The Old Piggery, Blairforge – Mr and Mrs McCleary

Members considered a Notice of Review seeking a review of the decision by the Appointed Officer to refuse erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle), land 40 metres north east of The Old Piggery, Blairforge.

The Planning Adviser displayed photographs of the site and described the proposal, and thereafter summarised the Appointed Officer's Report of Handling and the grounds set out in the Notice of Review.

Decision:

Resolved by unanimous decision that:

(i) having regard to the material before the Local Review Body and the comments from the Planning Adviser, sufficient information was before the Local Review Body to determine the matter without further procedure.

Thereafter, resolved by majority decision that:

- (ii) the Review application for erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle), land 40 metres north east of The Old Piggery, Blairforge, be granted subject to:
 - 1. The imposition of relevant terms, conditions and informatives.

Justification

Members considered that the proposal was in accordance with Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2 (2019) and the Council's Housing in the Countryside Guide 2014, and that the proposal for the erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) would not constitute ribbon development, and therefore should be allowed.

Note: Councillor Anderson dissented from the majority decision. He considered that the proposal constituted ribbon development and that the Appointed Officer's decision and reasons for refusal should be upheld, and permission for the erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) should be refused.

(ii) TCP/11/16(622)

Planning Application – 19/01690/FLL – Erection of a shed, 10 Kinmond Drive, Perth – Mr P Dix

Members considered a Notice of Review seeking a review of the decision by the Appointed Officer to refuse the erection of a shed, 10 Kinmond Drive, Perth.

The Planning Adviser displayed photographs of the site and described the proposal, and thereafter summarised the Appointed Officer's Report of Handling and the grounds set out in the Notice of Review.

Decision:

Resolved by unanimous decision that:

(i) having regard to the material before the Local Review Body and the comments from the Planning Adviser, sufficient information was before the Local Review Body to determine the matter without further procedure.

Thereafter, resolved by majority decision that:

- (ii) the Review application for the erection of a shed,10 Kinmond Drive, Perth, be granted subject to:
 - 1. The imposition of relevant terms, conditions and informatives.

Justification

Whilst accepting that the proposal was not in accordance with the Perth and Kinross Local Development Plan 2 (2019), members considered that the proposal would not have a

significant adverse impact upon the amenity of the house and the neighbouring area, and therefore should be allowed.

Note: Councillor Anderson dissented from the majority decision. He considered that the proposal would constitute a loss of amenity space and that the Appointed Officer's decision and reasons for refusal should be upheld, and permission for the erection of a shed should be refused

(iii) TCP/11/16(623)

Planning Application – 19/01253/FLL – Alterations and extension to dwellinghouse, 41 Coltward Holding, Campmuir, Blairgowrie – Mr and Mrs Burt

Members considered a Notice of Review seeking a review of the decision by the Appointed Officer to refuse alterations and extension to dwellinghouse, 41 Coltward Holding, Campmuir, Blairgowrie.

The Planning Adviser displayed photographs of the site and described the proposal, and thereafter summarised the Appointed Officer's Report of Handling and the grounds set out in the Notice of Review.

Decision:

Resolved by unanimous decision that:

(i) having regard to the material before the Local Review Body and the comments from the Planning Adviser, sufficient information was before the Local Review Body to determine the matter without further procedure.

Thereafter, resolved by majority decision that:

- (ii) the Review application alterations and extension to dwellinghouse, 41 Coltward Holding, Campmuir, Blairgowrie, be refused for the following reasons:
 - 1. The proposed development, by virtue of its raised wall-head, eaves and ridge levels, would result in a dominant and awkwardly unbalanced extension which is not sympathetic to the design, character, scale, form, proportions or massing of the host dwelling. Approval would therefore result in an adverse impact on visual amenity.
 - Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy 1A and 1B(c) of the Perth & Kinross Local Development Plan 2 (2019), which seek to ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the quality of the surrounding built and natural environment by respecting the character and amenity of the place.
 - 2. The proposal, by virtue of its shape, scale and proportions, would dominate and be unsympathetic to the existing building. Approval would therefore be contrary to the Draft Placemaking Technical Guidance Notes:

Householder Applications, which seek to deliver a satisfactory standard of development.

Justification

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

Note: Councillor I James dissented from the majority decision. He considered that the proposed extension would be suitable in relation to the original dwellinghouse, and considered that alterations and extension to dwellinghouse should be granted.

~~~~