



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

**THURSDAY 15 JUNE 2023
VIA THE DIGITAL MEETINGS SYSTEM**

Committee Members Present:

Councillor D Collins (Chair)
Councillor S McIntosh
Councillor J McMillan

Advisers to the Local Review Body:

Mr C Grilli, Legal Adviser to the LRB
Mr M Mackowiak, Planning Adviser to the LRB

Clerk:

Ms F Currie, Committees Officer

Apologies:

None

Declarations of Interest

None

Introductory Statement by the Legal Adviser

The Legal Adviser outlined the procedure for the Local Review Body to reach a decision on the planning applications before it and reminded them that further advice would be provided on procedure, should they conclude they did not have enough information to determine an application today.

The Legal Adviser then invited nominations to chair the meeting. Councillors McMillan and McIntosh indicated that they would be content for Councillor Collins to chair the Local Review Body (LRB) on this occasion.

1. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 22/01125/P: ERECTION OF GARDEN ROOM AND FORMATION OF DECKED AREA (RETROSPECTIVE) 14 RHODES COTTAGES, LIME GROVE, NORTH BERWICK EH39 5NL

The Chair invited the Planning Adviser, who had had no involvement in the original decision, to present a summary of the planning policy considerations in this case.

The Planning Adviser informed Members that the first case related to application no. 22/01125/P: a review of the decision to refuse retrospective planning permission for the erection of garden room and formation of decked area at 14 Rhodes Cottages, Lime Grove, North Berwick. He provided details of the site and surroundings, confirming that although the property was not within a conservation area, it was however listed as being of special architectural or historic interest (Category B) as part of a group of properties at 7-14 Rhodes Farm Cottages. He then outlined the size and specification of the garden room and decked area referred to in the application.

The Planning Adviser stated that when the application was considered the development plan for East Lothian consisted of the approved South East Scotland and Strategic Development Plan (SESplan) and the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan (LDP) 2018. There were no relevant policies of the approved SESplan relevant to the determination of this application. However, policies CH1 (Listed Buildings), and DP2 (Design) of the LDP 2018 were relevant to the determination of the application. Also material to its determination was Section 59 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997, Scottish Ministers' policy on the historic environment as given in The Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS): April 2019 and Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) 2014. However, he reminded members that the SPP 2014 now no longer applied due to the approval of the National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) on the 13th February 2023.

He then reviewed the planning case officer's report of handling which had accurately summarised five objections received to this application. The main grounds of objection were:

- (i) The garden room was too large and overwhelmed the garden and the adjacent cottage. The design of the garden room had no relationship with the vernacular architecture of the B listed cottages;
- (ii) The difference in ground levels meant the decking sat at a higher level and would allow for overlooking;
- (iii) The garden room was in open view from the Glen Golf Course and obscured the view of the end of the cottage;
- (iv) The garden room cut out light to the communal path;

- (v) It had been built to use as a holiday let;
- (vi) The building blocked light into neighbouring windows.

In his report, the case officer had noted that the building did not have a bathroom or kitchen and as such could not be used as separate accommodation to the house at present. Furthermore, the use of the garden room as a holiday let would require planning permission. Any application submitted would be assessed and determined on its own merits in accordance with the development plan unless material planning considerations indicated otherwise. After conducting a thorough planning assessment, the case officer concluded that the proposal did not comply with Policy CH1 (Listed Buildings) and Policy DP2 (Design) of the adopted LDP. Planning permission was therefore refused for the reasons set out in the original decision notice and the Planning Adviser outlined these reasons to members.

He then reiterated his earlier point that the SPP 2014 no longer applied following the approval of the NPF4 in February 2023. As a result, NPF4 Policy 7 Historic Assets and Places was now relevant to the determination of this application. Policy 7a, stated that development proposals with a potentially significant impact on historic assets or places would be accompanied by an assessment which was based on an understanding of the cultural significance of the historic asset and/or place. The assessment should identify the likely visual or physical impact of any proposals for change, including cumulative effects and provide a sound basis for managing the impacts of change. Proposals should also be informed by national policy and guidance on managing change in the historic environment, and information held within Historic Environment Records. The Planning Adviser concluded that there was no incompatibility between Policy 7 of NPF4 and Policy CH1 (Listed Buildings) of the current LDP.

The Planning Adviser then summarised the submission provided by the applicant which aimed to address the main objections to this application. The applicant stated:

1. The garden room was only marginally bigger than the room that was previously there. The area of decking had not increased at all.
2. The garden room did not obscure the view of the end of the cottages. Indeed from the 2nd fairway on the golf course the only building that obscured the view of the cottages was one built by the applicant's next door neighbour.
3. The garden room was in keeping with the building the applicant demolished and various other buildings within the Rhodes Cottages neighbouring buildings.
4. The garden room did not affect any light going into the applicant's neighbour's windows.
5. The garden room was never built to be a holiday let and will never be used as such. It is a seating area for leisure use of the owners of the cottage.
6. The trees were never cut back to enable construction. The applicant trimmed the trees recently in conjunction with their neighbours to cut back on pigeon droppings in the garden.
7. No one had used the room as yet and there would never be rowdy behaviour or unpleasant smells as had been suggested.
8. When the cottage was purchased it was in a state of disrepair and the garden room and associated decking were not fit for purpose. The applicant apologised for not seeking planning, stating that it was an oversight on their part. The applicant's builders did not realise planning was required due to the size of the outbuilding and that they were replacing what was already there with something similar in size.

9. There were a number of garden rooms/buildings within the Rhodes Cottages neighbouring buildings which were of a similar form and structure plus the garden room was not in a Conservation Area.
10. The applicant indicates that they have invested a considerable amount in building this garden room and associated landscaping which has been considerably improved and would respectfully suggest that you reconsider the decision taken by East Lothian Council Planning.
11. The garden room height is 2500mm and has an area less than 30 sq. m. in line with Planning guidelines.

The Planning Adviser concluded his presentation by summarising the further representation against the planning appeal, which had raised similar points to those previously summarised in the case officer report. He also reminded members that they had the option of seeking further information, if necessary.

The Planning Adviser responded to questions from Members. He confirmed that the garden room appeared to be higher than the 2.5 metres stated by the applicant. However, regardless of its size, it would require planning permission as the cottage was a Listed Building and the garden room would not be covered by permitted development rights. He advised that he had been unable to locate any planning applications for similar structures on neighbouring properties and that there had been numerous objections to this planning application. Replying to a question from the Chair, the Planning Adviser said that any application must be considered on its own merits due to the adjacent Listed Building, and he would not wish to speculate on the likely size of structure that might be permissible on this site.

The Chair asked her colleagues to confirm that they had attended the site visit and if they were satisfied that they had sufficient information before them to determine the application. They confirmed this to be the case.

The Chair then invited Members to give their views on the application.

Councillor McIntosh said that the site visit had been very helpful in viewing the garden room against the setting of the Listed Buildings and their architecture. She found the garden room to be unsympathetic to the surrounding built environment and quite dominant; particularly when its height was compared to the height and slope of the roofs of the cottages. She considered it to be harmful to the architectural heritage of the Listed Buildings.

Councillor McMillan echoed his colleague's remarks and noted the very detailed report and reasons for refusal, all of which were emphasised when viewing the site. He commented on the location and character of the cottages and said that, in his view, the garden room was completely out of keeping with its surroundings. He noted the objections raised and that the applicant's submission gave no clear reason why the garden room should be considered suitable within this site. After reviewing all of the evidence, he concluded that the planning case officer had been right to refuse this application.

The Chair agreed with both her colleagues. She said that the size and scale of the garden room was inappropriate and did not fit with the architecture of the cottages. She also noted that during the site visit it had been clear that the structure blocked light to the neighbouring cottage windows and garden. Furthermore, the raised decking area would allow overlooking and would result in a loss of privacy for neighbours. While not used as a holiday let itself, she noted that the garden room was available for use by anyone

staying at the cottage and this would result in strangers looking into the neighbouring garden. She therefore agreed with the officer's original decision to refuse planning permission.

The members of the LRB confirmed their decision via roll call vote and agreed that the reasons for refusal were as set out in the original decision notice.

Decision

The ELLRB agreed, unanimously, to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the original decision notice.

2. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 22/01120/P: ERECTION OF 1 HOUSE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND WEST OF HOPRIG MAINS FARMHOUSE, GLADSMUIR, MACMERRY, EAST LOTHIAN

The Chair noted the absence of a report from the rural and agricultural adviser, as highlighted by the planning officer, and asked members if they were minded to consider the application without this information.

Councillor McMillan asked if the Planning Adviser could confirm whether the report had been received. He said that having read the papers and visited the site, he was not sure that he could make a determination on the application without this important external evidence. He expressed his regret that this report was not yet available and suggested that efforts be made to secure this significant piece of evidence within the next 10 days.

The Planning Adviser informed members that the Council's Planning Service Manager had contacted the consultant who had confirmed that their report would be submitted within the next couple of weeks and, in any case, by the end of June. The Planning Adviser stated that, in his view, this report was required not just to consider the application but also to respond to earlier comments made by applicant's agent, who questioned the previous report prepared by the rural and agricultural adviser. He suggested that the applicant should have the opportunity to review the report, as well as the LRB members reviewing it as part of their further consideration of the application

The Legal Adviser informed the LRB members that, if they did not consider themselves able to make a determination today, the application should be adjourned pending receipt of the report. The date of the reconvened meeting would be set once the report was received and the applicant would be notified of today's outcome and the future meeting date. He added that, once the report had been received, the LRB members could consider whether, and how, the applicant should be given the opportunity to make further representation. This option was within the discretion of the LRB.

The Chair agreed that 10 days for receipt of the rural and agricultural consultant report seemed a reasonable timescale, and proposed the adjournment of the application pending receipt of this information.

Councillor McMillan welcomed the procedural advice from the Legal Adviser. He said it was incumbent on the consultant to provide their report as soon as possible, and that LRB reconvene as soon as possible.

Councillor McIntosh agreed with the proposal to adjourn pending receipt of the consultant's report.

In reply to a question from the Clerk, the Legal Adviser confirmed that the timing of the reconvened meeting would be subject to the applicant being given the opportunity to review the report.

The members of the LRB agreed to adjourn the application pending receipt of the report by the rural and agricultural adviser. The LRB would reconvene on a date to be agreed. This decision was confirmed by roll call vote.

Decision

The ELLRB agreed, unanimously, to adjourn the application pending receipt of the report by the rural and agricultural adviser.

3. PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 22/01201/P: ERECTION OF 1 HOUSE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT LAND ADJACENT TO FORMER WILLOW RISE, STENTON, EAST LoTHIAN

The Chair invited the Planning Adviser, who had had no involvement in the original decision, to present a summary of the planning policy considerations in this case.

The Planning Adviser informed members that the second case related to application no. 22/01201/P: a review of the decision to refuse planning permission for the erection of 1 house and associated works on the land adjacent to former Willow Rise, Whittingehame. The application site was located to the east of Whittingehame House – a category A Listed Building - and was within the Whittingehame House Designed Landscape. The application was submitted on 18th November 2022 and the decision to refuse it was issued on 20th January 2023.

He noted that the planning case officer's report of handling had accurately described the site, its surroundings, and the proposed house with its associated infrastructure. The case officer had also set out the planning history of the adjoining site which was known as Willow Rise (formerly the Old Schoolmasters House). The Planning Adviser provided a detailed summary of that site's planning history, including previous applications and an enforcement investigation. He advised that in June 2020, planning permission was refused for application 20/00169/P - the erection of 1 house, triple garage and associated work on the site of the former Old School Master's House (now known as Willow Rise), Whittingehame. This refusal was appealed to the Scottish Government and, in January 2021, the appeal was allowed and planning permission was granted for the proposed house and associated works. In making the decision, the Reporter had acknowledged that the proposed house did not accord with Policy DC3 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018, as there was not a house on the site at the time the application was made. However, the fact that there had previously been a house on the site and therefore the site was a brownfield site together with the benefit of removing unsightly structures from the site which was within a designed landscape were sufficient material considerations that justified overturning the refusal of planning permission. The works on the consented house had since commenced and the planning permission remained live.

The Planning Adviser explained that the application under consideration – 22/01201/P - had been made by the same applicant that submitted planning application 20/00169/P. The site boundary partially overlapped the south boundary of the site, the subject of planning permission 20/00169/P, in two small areas. However, the house and triple garage were located out with the boundary of the current application site. The proposed house would be located approx. 70 meters away from the north eastern corner of the

site that was approved in 2021. The site of application 22/01201/P was considerably larger than the site of application 20/000169/P and measured approximately 193m in depth (east to west) and 131m in width at it widest. The site narrowed to 21.5m on the west boundary where it met the road.

He then turned to the relevant planning policies as outlined in the case officer's report of handling, namely: Policies DC1 (Rural Diversification), DC3 (Replacement Dwelling in the Countryside), DC4 (New Build Housing in the Countryside), DC5 (Housing as Enabling Development), DC9 (Special Landscape Areas), CH1 (Listed Buildings), CH6 (Garden and Designed Landscapes), DP2 (Design), T2 (General Transport Impact), NH7: Protecting Soils, NH8 (Trees and Development) and NH10: SUDS of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018. Section 59 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 and the Scottish Government's policy on development affecting a listed building given in Scottish Planning Policy: June 2014. The case officer also considered the HES guidance: Managing Change 'Setting' as relevant in the determination of the application, along with the Special Landscape Areas SPG of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018.

In his original report, the case officer had acknowledged that Revised Draft National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) had been published by the Scottish Government on 8th November 2022, and that it must be approved by the Scottish Parliament before it could be adopted by Scottish Ministers. The existing National Planning Framework 3 and Scottish Planning Policy 2014 would remain in place until NPF4 had been adopted by Scottish Ministers. The Planning Adviser reminded members that NPF4 was adopted on 13th February 2023. However, this application had been refused on 20th January 2023; prior to the commencement of NPF4.

In his report, the planning case officer had summarised 16 letters in support of the application and one comment received from a member of the public. He had also included a detailed summary of comments submitted by Historic Environment Scotland (HES) who were the statutory consultees for category A listed buildings. The HES submission had raised a number of concerns about the harmful impacts of the proposed new house on the historic parkland and the setting of the category A listed Whittingehame House. Consequently, HES had objected to the application considering it to be harmful to the setting of Whittingehame House; and having a significant adverse impact on the Whittingehame Inventory garden and designed landscape.

The Planning Adviser confirmed that the application had been refused for the reasons set out in the decision notice and he outlined these reasons for members.

He then summarised the very detailed appeal submission provided by the applicant. This submission highlighted that the applicant disagreed with the reasons for refusal of planning permission. It also stated that the application was processed without due consideration of all the available evidence and was unbalanced in terms of material considerations. The submission stated that the Council had used SPP 2014 as its reference point in relation to the adopted Local Development Plan 2018 policies, and as a material consideration in its own right as part of this decision. However, transitional arrangements issued by the Chief Planner confirmed that SPP 2014 was no longer Scottish Planning Policy, and its provisions were therefore nullified. The applicant also noted that the Council had taken no account of NPF4.

For clarity, the Planning Adviser highlighted that the Chief Planner's letter stated "NPF3 and SPP 2014 will no longer represent Scottish Ministers' planning policy and should not therefore form the basis for, or be a consideration to be taken into account, when determining planning applications on or after 13th February."

The applicant's submission went on to provide a rebuttal of all 7 reasons for refusal. The applicant also referred to NPF4 and a number of its policies which, in his opinion, the proposal complied with. The planning case officer had also provided a further assessment of NPF4. The Planning Adviser summarised the arguments put forward by both the applicant and case officer in relation to the key policies highlighted, which were:

- Policy 9 - Brownfield, Vacant and Derelict Land
- Policy 17 - Rural Homes
- Policy 29 - Rural Development
- Policy 4 – Natural Places
- Policy 5 – Soils
- Policy 6 – Forestry, Woodland and Trees

It noted that the applicant had not addressed Policy 7 – Historic Assets and Places.

The applicant's submission also included additional letters of support from three companies involved in the previous work on the site. These letters included further information regarding the sequence of the historic work on the site of the Old Schoolmasters House, ground condition and drainage on the said site, and quality of agricultural land on the site.

The Planning Adviser concluded his summary of the case by outlining the revised reasons for refusal set out in the planning case officer's additional statement. The original seven reasons for refusal, with the exception of condition 5, were considered appropriate and had been amended to take account of now adopted NPF4 policies where appropriate. The original reason 5, relating to prime agricultural land, was replaced with a reason relating to NPF4 Policy 5 Soils. Reasons 8-10 were in addition and required in relation to NPF4 Policy 3 (Biodiversity), Policy 13 (Sustainable transport part b), Policy 15 Local Living and 20 minute neighbourhoods and Policy 16 Quality homes, part F.

The Planning Adviser also reminded members that they had the option of seeking further information.

The Planning Adviser responded to questions from Councillor McIntosh. He confirmed that the planning permission for application 20/00169/P on the adjacent site remained live and, should this application be granted, there was the possibility of having two houses with 2 triple garages on these sites. He added that there was no mechanism to revoke the previous planning permission and confirmed that the replacement of a previous dwelling related to application 20/00169/P and not the application before the LRB today.

Replying to a question from Councillor McMillan, the Legal Adviser confirmed that it was for the LRB members to decide whether they required any additional representations. The statement by the applicant 'reserving the right' was, in the view of the Legal Adviser, to cover himself should he be asked to provide further information. The Legal Adviser reminded the LRB members that the information they must use to reach their decision on the application was the information that was available to the planning officer at the time of his decision, subject to any material changes that may have occurred in the interim; the adoption of NPF4 was one such example. However, he pointed to the Planning Adviser's presentation which had included a detailed review of the impacts of NPF4. He reiterated that it was for the LRB members to be satisfied that they had sufficient information to determine the application.

The Chair asked her colleagues to confirm that they had attended the site visit and if they were satisfied that they had sufficient information before them to determine the application. They confirmed this to be the case.

The Chair then invited Members to give their views on the application.

Councillor McMillan said that members had been presented with a large amount of evidence, of which the site visit had been a key part. He disagreed with the applicant's assessment of the policies within NPF4 as they related to community need and sustainable, viable development. He noted the references, in both the planning officer's and applicant's submissions, to local characteristics and said that these had been demonstrated very clearly during the site visit and were worth protecting. He expressed disappointment that planning permission had been granted for the other site but noted that the house on that site would be less prominent and less visible. He agreed with the views of Historic Environment Scotland (HES) that allowing a new build, modern house in this location would destroy the historic and local characteristics of the site and surroundings, and that what was proposed was simply not in the right place. He was satisfied that the terms of NPF4 had been fully considered, and he fully supported the officer's refusal of planning permission.

Councillor McIntosh agreed with Councillor McMillan. She had found the site visit constructive in showing the characteristics of both sites. She noted the pastoral character of the location and the idyllic views, as well as important heritage which, in her view, should be preserved. She said that due weight should be given to the comments and objections raised by HES, particularly in relation to potential damage to the roots of the historic trees. She considered that the applicant's only justification - that this proposal constituted a replacement dwelling - did not stand up to logic, as there was already permission for a replacement build on the adjacent site and preparatory work had begun. For these and other reasons, she supported the planning officer's decision.

The Chair said that her comments would relate mainly to aspects of NPF4. She was of the view that there had never been a dwelling on the proposed site and therefore what was proposed was a new build rather than a replacement. Furthermore, the location of the site was agricultural land and since the 1940s had been used to grow cereals and to graze livestock. She noted that the eucalyptus trees, only 4 of which remained from planting in the 1880s, had adapted to their surroundings over time and had been given their own genus. Such unique trees required protection; the plans to put a driveway over the roots would crush them and destroy the trees. She considered that the proposals within the application were not complementary to the existing architecture of Whittingehame House; and that the site itself was in the countryside rather than part of a settlement. For all these reasons and those stated by colleagues, she supported the planning officer's refusal of the application.

The members of the LRB confirmed their decision via roll call vote. They also confirmed that the reasons for refusal should be those contained in the original decision notice, as amended by the Planning Adviser.

Decision

The ELLRB agreed, unanimously, to dismiss the appeal and to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below:

1. The application site is greenfield land in a natural state, is not allocated for development in the LPD nor is it supported by policies in the LDP. There is no building on this site and there has never been a dwelling on this site therefore there can be no

replacement dwelling. As no case has been made for the proposed house to meet an agriculture, horticulture or forestry need. No other operational need has been advanced to justify the erection of a house on the application site in this countryside location, the proposal is not for enabling development and is not a replacement dwelling in the countryside therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies DC1, DC3 and DC4 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 and NPF4 policies Policy 9 Brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings part b) and all parts of Policy 17 Rural homes.

2. The proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the historic interest of the parkland which forms an integral part of the setting of the category A listed Whittingehame House. As a form of development that would be harmful to the setting of the Category A Listed building the proposed house, triple garage and associated works is contrary to section 59 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1997, Policy CH1: Listed Buildings of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018, NPF4 Policy 7 c) and Historic Environment Scotland Managing Change in the Historic Environment guidance notes relating to 'Setting'.

3. The proposal would have a significant negative impact on the Inventory Garden and designed landscape and the parkland setting of the house. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy CH6: Gardens and Designed Landscapes of the adopted Development East Lothian Local Plan 2018 and NPF4 Policy 7 i).

4. The proposal would harm the parkland landscape character of the area and conflicts with guidelines within the Statement of Importance for Whittingehame to Deuchrie Special Landscape Area (SLA 8). The development is not located to minimise the adverse impacts on the landscape and there are no public benefits which outweigh this consideration. The loss of 1.75ha of countryside to residential use will unacceptably harm the natural environment. The proposed development, by nature of its location within Whittingehame to Deuchrie Special Landscape Area, its siting, design, materials and size would harm the estate and the wider landscape. There are no social, environmental or economic benefits which outweigh this conclusion. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DC9: Special Landscape Areas and Policy DP1: Landscape Character of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 and NPF4 Policy 4 Natural Places parts a) and d).

5. Policy NPF4 Policy 5 a) supports development which is in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy by first avoiding and then minimising the amount of disturbance to soils on undeveloped land. The mitigation hierarchy requires development to avoid, minimise, restore and offset the impact on soil. The proposal develops the whole site, does not include any restoration or offsetting of impact, and is therefore contrary to NPF4 Policy 5 Soils part a).

6. The current proposed driveway route is unacceptable in respect of adverse impact on trees as it will lead to damage to their roots leading to damage to their health and structural stability and ultimately the historic parkland trees would be lost. The proposal is contrary to Policies NH8: Trees and Development of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 and NPF4 Policy 6 Forestry, woodland and trees part b).

7. The overall appearance of the house is of a large modern house designed without reference to its historic context. This design would be more appropriate within a modern housing estate and fails to understand the context of the designed landscape and the built structures within the Whittingehame estate. In this context the proposed house is inappropriate to its setting and out of keeping with its surroundings contrary to Policies

DP1 and DP2 of the adopted East Lothian Local Development Plan 2018 and Policy 14 Design, quality and place a), b) and c).

8. The proposal does not accord with a number of spatial and environmental policies within the LDP and NPF4 and is not a sustainable form of development or in a suitable location to mitigate the climate impact. The proposal would significantly harm the natural environment and is contrary to NPF4 policy 1 and NPF4 policy 2 a).

9. The proposal includes a large house, large garaging and extensive driveway and roundabout and proposes to change the use of the entire 1.75ha of greenfield to residential use. The proposal is contrary to NPF4 policy 3 which requires biodiversity enhancements and a nature based solution amongst other considerations.

10. The application site is outwith the existing settlements and is not served by a public road, segregated cycle route or adopted footway. NPF4 and the LDP seek to locate new dwellings in locations which encourage local living and interconnectivity, active travel to local services including public transport. The occupants and visitors to the dwelling will be reliant upon vehicular access and this is not in accordance with Policy 13 Sustainable transport part b), Policy 15 Local Living and 20 minute neighbourhoods and Policy 16 Quality homes part f)

Signed

Councillor Donna Collins
Chair of Local Review Body (Planning)