

**MINUTES of MEETING of ARGYLL AND BUTE LOCAL REVIEW BODY held BY SKYPE  
on TUESDAY, 8 DECEMBER 2020**

**Present:** Councillor David Kinniburgh (Chair)

Councillor Mary-Jean Devon

Councillor Richard Trail

**Attending:** Iain Jackson, Governance, Risk and Safety Manager (Adviser)  
Fiona McCallum, Committee Services Officer (Minutes)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. CONSIDER NOTICE OF REVIEW REQUEST: TIGH NA TORRAN, LOCHGAIR,  
LOCHGILPHEAD (REF: 20/0013/LRB)**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. 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 LRB felt that they had sufficient information before them to come to a decision on the Review.

Councillor Trail advised that he would normally like to see the site and its surroundings but in this case he thought that some good photographs had been provided, not only of the house, but the surrounding houses too which, to his mind, gave a good impression of what the house would look like. He said he did not think a site visit would add anything to his understanding of the case and he confirmed that he had enough information before him to come to a decision.

Councillor Devon confirmed that she too felt she had enough information before her which, she said, had been well documented with good photographs.

Councillor Trail advised that this all seemed to revolve around Supplementary Guidance in the Local Development Plan in respect of the suitable siting of extensions. He commented that looking at the plans and elevations of the proposed development he came to the same conclusion as the Planning Officer that this was an inappropriate development. He said that he thought the front elevation would be completely spoiled by the "sticking out piece". He confirmed that he was minded to go with the Planning Officer's recommendation of refusal.

Councillor Devon commented that she was saddened that the Applicant and Planners had been unable to reach an agreement. She confirmed that she felt the scale and massing of the proposed development would be out of keeping with what planning were trying to achieve. She advised that on this occasion she would agree with the Planning recommendation.

Councillor Kinniburgh said that he tended to agree with his fellow Councillors. He commented that it all hinged around the east elevation of the house and that he thought that all other aspects of the proposed development were satisfactory to the Planning Officer. He said it was obvious that it was the east elevation that was causing concern due to the amount which would protrude from the original building. He said he tended to agree with the Planning Officer in this respect. He advised that he had noted that the Planning Officer had given two reasons for refusal. He pointed out that reason 2 referred to the failure to demonstrate adequate provision of parking and turning of 3 no. vehicles within the application site. He advised that he had noted from the paperwork submitted by the Roads Officer that this requirement would have been achieved, so should no longer be a reason for refusal.

Councillor Kinniburgh advised, that like Councillor Devon, he was disappointed that the Applicant had not seen fit to maintain a dialogue with the Planners. He said that it appeared to him from reading the report that they were just about to get there and have something which may possibly have been acceptable to both parties. He confirmed that he agreed with reason for refusal number 1:

By reason of siting, scale, massing, form, material finishes and detailed design, the proposed development will not reflect the character of the existing house, but will result in an overly dominant extension relative to the existing property and as such will have an unduly detrimental impact upon local visual amenity contrary to Local Development Plan policy LDP 9 and Supplementary Guidance on Sustainable siting and Design Principles.

The Chair formally moved that the Application be refused and this was seconded by Councillor Trial and also supported by Councillor Devon.

## **Decision**

The Argyll and Bute Local Review Body, having considered the merits of the case de novo, unanimously agreed to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

By reason of siting, scale, massing, form, material finishes and detailed design, the proposed development will not reflect the character of the existing house, but will result in an overly dominant extension relative to the existing property and as such will have an unduly detrimental impact upon local visual amenity contrary to Local Development Plan policy LDP 9 and Supplementary Guidance on Sustainable siting and Design Principles.

(Reference: Notice of Review and Supporting Documentation and comments from Interested Parties, submitted)