

## The City of Edinburgh Planning Local Review Body (Panel 1)

10.00am, Wednesday 19 August 2020

**Present:** Councillors Mary Campbell, Gordon, Griffiths, Mitchell and Mowat.

### 1. Appointment of Convener

---

Councillor Mowat was appointed as Convener.

### 2. Minutes

---

To approve the minute of the Local Review Body (LRB Panel 1) of 24 June 2020 as a correct record.

### 3. Planning Local Review Body Procedure

---

#### Decision

To note the outline procedure for consideration of reviews.

(Reference – Local Review Body Procedure, submitted)

### 4. Request for Review – 9–21 Salamander Place, Edinburgh

---

Details were submitted of a request for a review for refusal of planning permission for 5 new parking places in lieu of parking and mews building structure (2 dwellings) forming part of Planning Consent for ref. 16/03356/PPP (as amended) at 9 – 21 Salamander Place, Edinburgh. Application No. 19/04487/FUL

This request for review was continued from the meeting of the Planning Local Review Body (Panel 1) of 24 June 2020 in order for a plan of the development in the wider area, including the adjacent site to the south and surrounding access, to be provided to members.

#### Assessment

At the meeting on 19 August 2020, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents only. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling, and the Site Plan and Salamander Place Development Brief

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were numbered 01,02a, Scheme 2, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 19/04487/FUL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it and agreed to determine the review using the information circulated.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the Edinburgh Local Development Plan.
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy DEL 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy DES 1 (Design Quality and Context)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy DES 2 (Co-ordinated Development))
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy DES 4 (Development Design - Impact on Setting)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy DES 5 (Development Design - Amenity)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy DES 7 (Layout Design)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy DES 8 (Public Realm and Landscape Design)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy ENV 3 (Listed Buildings - Setting)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy ENV 6 (Conservation Areas - Development)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy ENV 9 (Development of Sites of Archaeological Significance)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy ENV 21 (Flood Protection)
  - Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy TRA 4 (Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.
  - 'Edinburgh Design Guidance'
  - 'The Leith Conservation Area Character Appraisal'
  - 'Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas'
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.
- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

## **Conclusion**

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- When previously discussed, the LRB had asked to see development in the wider area, including the adjacent site to the south and surrounding access. Having had sight of the information, the Panel needed to determine if the grounds for refusal were justified.
- Although this was not an ideal development and failed to enhance the area, it was unnecessary to refuse it. The proposals represented a minor infringement of policy.
- This was a busy area with shops and although this was not a big development, the bin store on the frontage is not good. The site should be developed in accordance with the original PPP. It should be determined in accordance with the officer's recommendations.
- This was a difficult section of the road to develop, but there were better ways to enhance it. It was a wide area of pavement and could be used as an area of public open space.

There were no material reasons to overturn the recommendation; the proposals did not comply with policy.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, although there was sympathy for the proposal from one of the members, the LRB was of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

## **Decision**

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

## **Reasons for Refusal:**

1. The development was contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context), as it failed to enhance the existing townscape, or to contribute to its sense of place, at this edge of conservation area location and was damaging to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
2. The development was contrary to LDP Policies Del 3 (Edinburgh Waterfront) and Des 2 (Co-ordinated Development) as the design failed to accord with the proposals for the comprehensive development and regeneration of the wider area, as supported in the Edinburgh Waterfront Development Principles for Leith Waterfront (LDP reference EW1 c) and the scheme approved under the planning permission in principle (reference 16/03356/PPP); The resulting piecemeal development impacted negatively on the otherwise, well defined and cohesive network of streets and spaces being delivered in this new urban quarter.
3. The design and location of the refuse store was contrary to the provisions of LOP Policy Des 5 (Development Design - Amenity), as it had not been

sensitively integrated into the design for the overall public realm and impacted negatively on the surrounding townscape.

4. The development subject to this application was contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 4 (Design of Off-Street Car and Cycle Parking), as it would prevent the continuation of an active frontage on the public street and the related improvements to the appearance and vitality of the townscape, as proposed in the approved masterplan.
5. The development was contrary to the provisions of Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 6 (Conservation Areas- Development) as its piecemeal form and lack of defined frontage, failed to contribute positively to the character of the surrounding townscape and was therefore damaging to the setting of the Leith Conservation Area.

(References – Local Review Body of 24 June 2020 (item 7); Local Review Body Decision Notice, Report of Handling and Notice of Review, submitted)

## **5. Request for Review – 21 Braid Hills Approach, Edinburgh**

---

Details were submitted of a request for a review for the refusal of planning permission for refusal of planning permission for the erection of garden room within garden space of house at 21 Braid Hills Approach, Edinburgh. Application No. 19/05116/FUL

### **Assessment**

At the meeting on 19 August 2020, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents and a site inspection. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were numbered 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, Scheme 1, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 19/05116/FUL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it and agreed to determine the review using the information circulated.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the Edinburgh Local Development Plan.  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context)  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 5 (Development Design – Amenity)  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 3 (Listed Buildings - Setting)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 10 (Development in the Green Belt and Countryside)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 11 (Special Landscape Areas)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 12 (Trees)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 3 (Development Design - Incorporating and Enhancing Existing and Potential Features)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 15 (Sites of Local Importance)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 16 (Species Protection)

Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 18 (Open Space Protection)

2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.

‘Guidance for Householders’

‘Development in the Countryside and Green Belt’

‘Edinburgh Design Guidance’

3) The procedure used to determine the application.

4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

## Conclusion

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- That the garden was a private garden but is designated as open space in the Local Development Plan.
- Representation on the proposed Local Development Plan might look at this issue. The proposed development was not in a conservation area and there were no TPO's on the site.
- Clarification was sought regarding the footprint of the building. It was confirmed that the applicant stated the building itself was 30 sqm, but the officer may have included the deck which could take it to 45 sqm.
- When choosing a property on a golf course, applicants would be aware of its green belt status. Additionally, the proposed building constituted more than a garden room.
- The proposals did not comply with Des 1 (Design Quality and Context) and ENV 10 (Development in the Green Belt and Countryside).
- Whether there was any evidence that the proposals were damaging to the appearance of area and would be detrimental to the landscape and quality of the

greenbelt. Additionally, it might be possible to impose a condition on tree protection.

- Ancillary developments were allowed in the greenbelt. However, this was quite a large ancillary building and on balance, the officer's recommendations should be upheld.
- There was some merit in the appeal, but not enough to overturn the decision.
- The report had possibly overstated the visibility issue. However, the most significant view of the castle to the city would be negatively impacted. This was a large blocky building, with significant areas of glazing, on a hill and the landscaping around the building could alter. This was garden ground with LDP designations and the officer had made the case for refusal sufficiently.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, although there was sympathy for the proposal, the LRB was of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

### **Decision**

To uphold the decision of the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

1. The mass and position of the proposed development would result in significant encroachment of the rural landscape adversely impacting upon the quality and character of the Green Belt. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policy Des 1, Policy Env 10 of the Edinburgh Local Development Plan and the non-statutory Guidance for Development in the Countryside and Green Belt.
2. The proposed development by virtue of its scale and visually prominent location would have a significant adverse impact on the scenic value and special character of the Braids, Liberton and Mortonhall Special Landscape Area. The proposal was therefore contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 1 and Env 11.
3. The scale and position of the proposed development would result in the loss of Open Space which would result in a significant impact on the quality and character of the local environment. The proposal was therefore contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 18.

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling and Notice of Review, submitted)

## **6. Request for Review – 30 Buckstone Avenue, Edinburgh**

---

Details were submitted of a request for a review for the refusal of planning permission for proposed first floor extension with new roof at 30 Buckstone Avenue, Edinburgh. Application No. 20/00446/FUL.

### **Assessment**

At the meeting on 19 August 2020, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an

assessment of the review documents only. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were numbered 01-05, Scheme 1, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 20/00446/FUL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it and agreed to determine the review using the information circulated.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the Edinburgh Local Development Plan.  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 12 (Alterations and Extensions)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.  
'Guidance for Householders'
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.
- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

## **Conclusion**

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- Clarification was sought regarding the set back from the road and the size of the plot. The Planning Advisor showed the location plan highlighting this information and confirming that the adjacent house was two-storeys.
- The examples given in the photos by the applicant were not relevant, as the area mostly consisted of bungalows. If there were more two-storey buildings, the proposals might be in keeping with character of area.
- That the view from the street, meant that the proposed extension would be very dominant.
- Confirmation was given that due to the position of the property overshadowing was not significant.
- There was sympathy for the applicant who was trying to create a family home, similar to the two-storey building next door.
- Des 12 should be flexibly interpreted. The applicant wanted to improve their home, but this area was largely homogenous, comprising mainly of bungalows. This application should be refused as planning policies were clear on the matter.

- There were dormer conversions and extensions in other bungalows in the area, meaning there was still scope to create a larger family home.
- It was not acceptable to convert a bungalow into a two-storey dwelling as it would not be subservient to the original property.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, although there was sympathy for the proposal, the LRB was of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

### **Decision**

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

### **Reasons for Refusal:**

The proposed scale and form was not compatible with the character of the existing building and failed to respect the character of the surrounding residential area. It would be contrary to LDP Policy Des 12 and the non-statutory Guidance for Householders.

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling and Notice of Review, submitted)

## **7. Request for Review – 23 Easter Currie Terrace, Edinburgh**

---

Details were submitted of a request for a review for the refusal of planning permission for attic conversion and alterations to rear elevation at 23 Easter Currie Terrace, Edinburgh. Application No. 19/05674/FUL

### **Assessment**

At the meeting on 19 August 2020, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents only. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were numbered 01, 02, 03, Scheme 1, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 19/05674/FUL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it and agreed to determine the review using the information circulated.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the Edinburgh Local Development Plan.  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 12 (Alterations and Extensions)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.  
'Guidance for Householders'
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.

- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

## **Conclusion**

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- Clarification was sought on the height of the dormer and whether it would be seen above the ridge of the existing roof. The Planning Advisor confirmed that the dormer was below the overall ridge height, but the proposed alterations may be visible from the street from a side view.
- That this was an unimaginative extension, in addition to the existing extension and there was concern regarding overdevelopment and Policy Des 12 applied. There was no reason to overturn the officer's recommendations.
- There was sympathy with the applicant, but the guidance stated that dormers should not impede visibility of the roof.
- Although this was a rear view, this was an oppressively large dormer and should be refused.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, although there was sympathy for the proposal, the LRB was of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

## **Decision**

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

### **Reasons for Refusal:**

1. The proposed dormer was contrary to Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 12 on extensions and alterations as its scale, form and materials would adversely impact on the character and appearance of the existing building and neighbourhood character.
2. The proposed dormer was contrary to the non-statutory Guidance for Householders as its scale, form and materials would adversely impact on the character and appearance of the existing building and neighbourhood character.

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling and Notice of Review, submitted)

## **8. Request for Review – 3 Eltringham Grove, Edinburgh**

---

Details were submitted of a request for a review for the refusal of planning permission for demolition of an existing detached bungalow and garage and construction of two new detached dwellings with new driveway to the rear and associated parking at 3 Eltringham Grove, Edinburgh. Application No. 19/03249/FUL

## Assessment

At the meeting on 19 August 2020, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents and a site inspection. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were numbered 01 - 14, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 19/03249/FUL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it and agreed to determine the review using the information circulated.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the Edinburgh Local Development Plan.  
  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context)  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 5 (Development Design – Amenity)  
  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 3 (Private Green Space in Housing Development)  
  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Hou 4 (Housing Density)  
  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 2 (Private Car Parking)  
  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Tra 3 (Private Cycle Parking)  
  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 21 (Flood Protection)  
  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Policy Hou 1 (Housing Development)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines.  
‘Edinburgh Design Guidance’
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.
- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

## Conclusion

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- Considering the reasons for refusal, the applicant had agreed to reduce parking to one space per dwelling.

- That in the immediate and surrounding area, there had been significant new development already, therefore the proposed development would be in keeping with the character of the area and was not contrary to Policy Des 1 (Design Quality and Context).
- The proposed development was unlike the other dwellings in the area and would impact on green space. According to development policies, there were no reasons to overturn the officer's recommendations. Additionally, there would be issues with bin collection.
- Green space was not an issue. The surrounding area had changed already with a large development on the south side. Therefore, the policies which has been previously applied were no longer applicable. The application should be approved, subject to the reduction in parking to one space per house.
- Whether this was contrary to Policy Des 1 as this was area where there had been significant change. It was difficult to apply this to what was not a uniform area.
- Whether this was contrary to Policy Hou 4 (Housing Density). The density in this area was difficult to establish given the existing level of redevelopment.
- That it would be necessary to condition waste management strategy, if the officer's recommendations were overturned.
- This was a mixed site with a number of different types of houses in this area and the proposed development would be a good use of the site.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, the LRB determined that the proposal was not contrary to the following LDP policies:

1. Des 1 and the Edinburgh Design Guidance as it would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
2. Hou 4 as the density of development on the site would not damage the character of the surrounding area.
3. Hou 1 as the principle of housing on this site was already established and the proposals are compatible with the relevant policies of the LDP.

It therefore overturned the decision of the Chief Planning Officer and granted planning permission.

### **Decision**

To not uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer and to grant planning permission subject to:

### **The following condition and informatives:**

#### **Condition**

Notwithstanding the submitted site layout details, a further site layout plan reducing the car parking to one space per dwelling should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority before work was commenced on site.

**Reason:**

In order to ensure that the level of off-street parking complies with policy.

**Informatives**

- (a) The development hereby permitted should be commenced no later than the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.
- (b) No development should take place on the site until a 'Notice of Initiation of Development' had been submitted to the Council stating the intended date on which the development is to commence. Failure to do so constituted a breach of planning control under section 123(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.
- (c) As soon as practicable upon the completion of the development of the site, as authorised in the associated grant of permission, a Notice of Completion of Development must be given in writing to the Council.
- (d) Prior to the commencement of works on site the applicant must agree a recycling and waste management strategy with the Waste Management team - [waste@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:waste@edinburgh.gov.uk)

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling and Notice of Review, submitted)

**Dissent**

Councillor Gordon requested that his dissent be recorded in respect of this item.

## **9. Request for Review – 3(2F1) Gillespie Place, Edinburgh**

---

Details were submitted of a request for a review for the refusal of planning permission to replace the existing single glazed sash and case timber windows with double glazed uPVC windows at 3(2F1) Gillespie Place, Edinburgh. Application No. 20/00940/FUL.

**Assessment**

At the meeting on 19 August 2020, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents only. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were numbered 1-5, Scheme 1, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 20/00940/FUL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it and agreed to determine the review using the information circulated.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the Edinburgh Local Development Plan.  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 12 (Alterations and Extensions)  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 6 (Conservation Areas - Development)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines  
'Guidance for Householders'  
'Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas'  
'The Marchmont, Meadows and Bruntsfield Conservation Area Character Appraisal'
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.
- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

### **Conclusion**

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- That as the proposed window in the front elevation of the dwelling matched the existing fenestration pattern it was acceptable, but not the one at the rear. Therefore, it might be possible to agree to a split decision.
- Whether applications for listed buildings or within conservation areas which were refused were signposted to the Energy Savings Trust to apply for grants for alterations.
- This proposal was not on a listed building, however, the guidance was very clear for conservation areas, UPVC windows were not acceptable.
- It was not normal practice to grant UPVC windows in a conservation area. In conservation areas, UPVC windows should be replaced by wood, and the existing fenestration pattern should be matched.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, although there was sympathy for part of the proposal, the LRB was of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

### **Decision**

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

### **Reasons for Refusal:**

The proposal was contrary to LDP policies Des12 and Env6, and failed to comply with the non-statutory Guidance for Householders, and Listed Buildings and

Conservation Areas, as the design and materials proposed were not compatible with the character of the existing building, and failed to preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of the conservation area.

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling and Notice of Review, submitted)

## **10. Request for Review – 40 Summerside Place, Edinburgh**

---

Details were submitted of a request for a review for the refusal of planning permission for the current timber sash and case single glazed windows to be upgraded to double glazed uPVC sash and case windows and the rear door to be upgraded to a uPVC double glazed door at 40 Summerside Place, Edinburgh.

Application No. 20/00014/FUL

### **Assessment**

At the meeting on 19 August 2020, the LRB had been provided with copies of the notice of review, including a request that the review proceed on the basis of an assessment of the review documents only. The LRB had also been provided with copies of the decision notice and the report of handling.

The LRB heard from the Planning Adviser who summarised the issues raised and presented the drawings of the development and responded to further questions.

The plans used to determine the application were numbered 01-05, Scheme 1, being the drawings shown under the application reference number 20/00014/FUL on the Council's Planning and Building Standards Online Services.

The LRB, having considered these documents, felt that they had sufficient information before it and agreed to determine the review using the information circulated.

The LRB in their deliberations on the matter, considered the following:

- 1) The development plan, including the relevant policies of the Edinburgh Local Development Plan.  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 12 (Alterations and Extensions)  
Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Env 6 (Conservation Areas - Development)
- 2) Relevant Non-Statutory Guidelines  
'Guidance for Householders'  
'Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas'  
'The Victoria Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal'
- 3) The procedure used to determine the application.
- 4) The reasons for refusal and the arguments put forward in the request for a review.

### **Conclusion**

The LRB considered all the arguments put before it in respect of the proposed planning application and discussion took place in relation to the following issues:

- There were other buildings in this area with UPVC windows.
- However, this proposal was in a conservation area, where UPVC windows were not acceptable and therefore this application should be refused.

Having taken all the above matters into consideration, the LRB was of the opinion that no material considerations had been presented in the request for a review which would lead it to overturn the determination by the Chief Planning Officer.

### **Decision**

To uphold the decision by the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

### **Reasons for Refusal:**

The proposal was not of an acceptable form and design, would be detrimental to character and appearance of the conservation area and did not comply with Local Development Plan Policies Des 12 or Env 06, with the non-statutory guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas or with the Victoria Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

(References – Decision Notice, Report of Handling and Notice of Review, submitted)