

**MINUTES of MEETING of ARGYLL AND BUTE LOCAL REVIEW BODY held in the VIA
SKYPE
on THURSDAY, 28 MAY 2020**

Present: Councillor Rory Colville (Chair)
Councillor Robin Currie Councillor Lorna Douglas

Attending: Iain Jackson, Governance, Risk and Safety Manager (Adviser)
Lynsey Innis, Senior Committee Assistant (Minute Taker)

Members were asked to suspend Standing Order 5.4 – the Member who is presiding at the meeting must do so from the specified location for the meeting and cannot join by video conferencing.

The requisite two thirds of Members present agreed to suspend Standing Order 5.4 to enable discussion of reports on the Agenda.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence intimated.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (IF ANY)

There were no declarations of interest intimated.

3. CONSIDER NOTICE OF REVIEW REQUEST: DESIGN AND ERECTION OF GARAGE AT WYNDHAM, DRUMMORE ROAD, OBAN, PA34 4PG (20/0004/LRB)

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made. He explained that no person present would be entitled to speak other than the Members of the Local Review Body (LRB) and Mr Jackson who would provide procedural advice if required.

He advised that his first task would be to establish if the Members of the Local Review Body (LRB) felt that they had sufficient information before them to come to a decision on the Review.

Both Councillor Currie and Councillor Douglas agreed that they had. Councillor Colville advised that he also felt there was sufficient information to come to a decision on the Review.

The Chair, advised that while he had a great deal of sympathy for the application, he felt the defining matter was the size of the increase in the roof space. He advised that he felt an extension of the size in question was too much, and noted that the orientation of the building had also changed. He advised that given the location and the increase, he was inclined to support the officer's recommendations for refusal.

Councillor Currie advised that he was pleased to see a number of photos of the garage within the pack as they demonstrated the extent of the increase in the roof space. He advised that having noticed that planning permission had previously been granted in respect of the design and erection of the garage, he found it frustrating that the applicant had not adhered to the original planning permission. Councillor Currie said that while he was aware of other examples of steep roofs in the area, he felt that what had been presented and what had been built, looked out of character, and as such, he too was inclined to support the officer's recommendations for refusal.

Councillor Douglas advised that when looking at the plans, there had been such a huge difference in what had been approved originally. She advised that it seemed out of proportion with the surrounding area. She spoke of properties in the area with a similar roof space, but advised that these were set next to bigger houses and in an open space. She advised of the need to take cognisance of the objections received and the fact that what had been built was not as originally approved.

Councillor Colville moved that the review be refused on the grounds that the garage, by virtue of its height and orientation, is an incongruous, overbearing feature within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse detrimental to its setting and detrimental to the wider visual amenity of this primarily residential area within which it is located in terms of size, scale and design.

The proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policies LDP 3 and LDP 9 and SG 2, SG LDP ENV 13 and SG LDP ENV 14 which collectively seek to resist developments which dominate the existing building or surrounding area by way of size, scale, proportion or design and which have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the wider area.

Decision:

The Argyll and Bute Local Review Body, having considered the merits of the case de novo, unanimously agreed to refuse the appeal subject to the following reasons:-

Reason - The garage, by virtue of its height and orientation, is an incongruous, overbearing feature within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse detrimental to its setting and detrimental to the wider visual amenity of this primarily residential area within which it is located in terms of size, scale and design.

The proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policies LDP 3 and LDP 9 and SG 2, SG LDP ENV 13 and SG LDP ENV 14 which collectively seek to resist developments which dominate the existing building or surrounding area by way of size, scale, proportion or design and which have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the wider area.