



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
LOCAL REVIEW BODY**

**THURSDAY 24 APRIL 2014  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HOUSE, HADDINGTON**

---

**Committee Members Present:**

Councillor J McMillan (Chair)  
Councillor J McNeil  
Councillor J Williamson  
Councillor J Gillies

**Advisers to the Local Review Body:**

Mr P McLean, Planning Adviser to the LRB  
Mrs M Ferguson, Legal Adviser/Clerk to the LRB

**Others Present**

None

**Committee Clerk:**

Mrs F Stewart

**Declarations of Interest**

None

**Apologies**

Councillor W Innes

Councillor McMillan, who had been elected to chair today's East Lothian Local Review Body (ELLRB), welcomed all present to the meeting.

It was recorded that Councillor McNeil was attending the meeting in place of Councillor Innes.

**1. REVIEW AGAINST DECISION (REFUSAL)  
PLANNING APPLICATION No: 13/00747/P – EXTENSION TO HOUSE AT  
6 CARLAVEROCK CRESCENT, TRANENT**

The Legal Adviser stated that the LRB was meeting today to review the above application which had been refused by the Appointed Officer. She advised that a site visit had been carried out prior to the meeting and that Members had been provided with written papers, including a submission from the Case Officer and review documents from the applicant. After hearing a statement from the Planning Adviser summarising the planning policy issues, Members would decide if they had sufficient information to reach a decision today. If they did not, the matter would be adjourned for further written representations or for a hearing session. Should Members decide they had sufficient information before them, the matter would be discussed and a decision reached on whether to uphold or overturn the decision of the Appointed Officer. It was open to Members to grant the application in its entirety, grant it subject to conditions or to refuse it.

The Chair invited the Planning Adviser to present a summary of the planning policy considerations in this case.

The Planning Adviser stated that the application was seeking permission for a single storey, flat roofed extension on the rear of the house and advised that the Planning Act required decisions on planning applications to be taken in accordance with development plan policy unless material considerations indicated otherwise. In terms of the Local Plan, the site was within a predominantly residential area, designated under policy ENV1. SESplan policy 1B expected Local Development Plans to have regard to the need for high quality design and policy DP6 required extensions to be in keeping with the existing house and integrated into its surroundings. The application had been refused by the Appointed Officer on the basis that both the extension's flat roofed form and its finish of external facing brick would not be in keeping with the mono pitched form or rendered walls of the existing house, the terrace it is a part of, or the surrounding area. The application was therefore considered contrary to the relevant development plan policies. The Case Officer had considered the development acceptable in terms of privacy, daylight and sunlight impacts on neighbouring properties. The applicant's request for a review argued that the proposed design incorporates aspects of the original garage roofs and would blend in with the conservatories and extensions in the surrounding area. Photographs were provided by the applicant showing examples of houses in the area with conservatories or extensions which did not feature a mono pitched roof, and it was stated that original garages in the area had flat roofs. No consultations had been carried out on the application by the case officer and no representations had been received.

The Chair advised that it was now for Members to decide if they had sufficient information to determine the application and the Members agreed unanimously that they had sufficient information to proceed with the application today.

Councillor McNeil stated that it was clear to him from the proposed design of the extension that the applicants wished to enhance their property. He had noted the reasons for the Council's refusal of planning permission and stated that he did not agree that the proposed extension would have an adverse impact on the streetscape. In his view, the streetscape had already been changed by the range of extensions and conservatories that were present. In addition, he believed that the impact of the proposed extension would be less significant as it would be positioned to the rear of the property. He was concerned, however, that the facing brick to be used would not complement the existing render. He therefore would vote to overturn the decision of the Appointed Officer, subject to a Condition governing the external finish of the extension.

Councillor Gillies had observed a number of similar extensions in the applicants' neighbourhood and had concluded that the proposed extension would not look out of place in its setting.

On the site visit, Councillor Williamson had seen a wide range of styles in the area, with examples of both dual and mono pitched roofs. In his view, therefore, the proposed extension would not look inappropriate in its setting and he would have no objection to the proposals.

The Chair referred to planning policy DP6 of the adopted East Lothian Local Plan which states that '*all alterations and extensions must be well integrated into their surroundings and be in keeping with the original building*'. The Chair stated that he knew this locality well and considered that the proposed extension was proportionate in size and scale for its surroundings. However, he agreed with paragraph 4 of policy DP6 that the extension should be finished externally in materials which would complement the original building and he did not consider that the proposed red brick finish would complement the existing render. He would therefore vote to overturn the decision of the Appointed Officer to refuse the application providing that a Condition was attached relating to the external finish.

Members discussed the external finish of the extension in detail and studied photographs of other extensions in the area. They also sought guidance from the Planning Adviser who stated that it was open to Members to add a Condition that the walls should be finished in render, or alternatively a Condition that a sample of the facing brick was submitted for approval before work began, and that this should be complementary to the existing render, should they agree to overturn the decision to refuse.

## **Decision**

The LRB agreed to overturn the Appointed Officer's decision to refuse the application, subject to the following Condition:

1. Development shall not begin until a sample of the material to be used on the external wall surface of the proposed extension, which shall complement the existing render of the walls of the original dwelling house, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out using the approved material or such alternative as may be agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the extension matches the external appearance of the existing building and thereby maintains the visual quality of the area.

The Legal adviser stated that a Decision Notice would be issued within 21 days.