

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

ABERDEEN, 8 June 2022. Minute of Meeting of the LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL. Present:- Councillor Henrickson, Chairperson; and Councillors Allard and Thomson.

The agenda, reports and recording associated with this meeting can be viewed [here](#).

449 GREAT WESTERN ROAD - CHANGE OF USE FROM CLASS 10 (NON-RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONS) TO CLASS 9 (HOUSES), REMOVAL OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, INSTALLATION OF NEW WINDOWS AND BI-FOLD DOORS, REPLACEMENT WINDOWS, FORMATION OF REPLACEMENT STEPS WITH WALL AND BALUSTRADE AND ERECTION OF DOMESTIC DOUBLE GARAGE AND DRIVEWAY TO REAR - 211117/DPP

1. The Local Review Body (LRB) of Aberdeen City Council met on this day to review the decision taken by an appointed officer under the Council's Scheme of Delegation to refuse the application for the change of use from class 10 (non-residential institutions) to class 9 (houses), removal of single storey rear extension, installation of new windows and bi-fold doors, replacement windows, formation of replacement steps with wall and balustrade and erection of domestic double garage and driveway to rear of 499 Great Western Road, Aberdeen, Planning Reference number 211117/DPP.

Councillor Henrickson as Chair, gave a brief outline of the business to be undertaken, advising that the LRB would be addressed by the Assistant Clerk, Mr Mark Masson with regards to the procedure to be followed and thereafter, by Ms Lucy Greene who would be acting as the Planning Adviser to the Body in the following case under consideration this day.

The Chairperson stated that although the Planning Adviser was employed by the planning authority, she had not been involved in any way with the consideration or determination of the application under review and was present to provide factual information and guidance to the Body only. He emphasised that the officer would not be asked to express any view on the proposed application.

The Local Review Body was then addressed by Mr Masson, Assistant Clerk in regard to the procedure to be followed, at which time reference was made to the procedure note circulated with the papers calling the meeting and to more general aspects relating to the procedure.

In relation to the application, the LRB had before it (1) a delegated report by the Appointed Officer, Aberdeen City Council; (2) an application dated 2 August 2021; (3) the decision notice dated 9 February 2022; (4) links to the plans showing the proposal and planning policies referred to in the delegated report; (5) the Notice of Review submitted by the applicant; (6) consultee responses submitted by the Roads Development Team and Waste Services Team (ACC); and (7) one letter of representation.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

The LRB was then addressed by Ms Greene who advised that the review had been submitted with all necessary information within the time limit of three months following the decision of the appointed officer.

Ms Greene then described the site advising that it was located on Great Western Road, close to the junction with Anderson Drive and within the Great Western Road Conservation Area. The adjacent site had been extended and subdivided into flats. The building was a traditional, two storey, semi-detached granite property, most recently used as a pre-school nursery. The building fronted north onto Great Western Road. 447 Great Western Road had been divided into flatted properties, which was located to the east; and a rear service lane was located to the south. To the rear along the eastern mutual boundary, there was a single storey annex with a projection of 6 metres between it and the western boundary was a modern conservatory. The ground floor level of the property was situated approximately 2 metres higher than garden level. The rear garden was bound by a 1.8 to 3.2 metre high granite boundary wall on the eastern and western boundaries, and by a 1.8 metre high timber fence on the southern boundary. At the far end of the site, there was a 100sqm area of hardstanding currently used for car parking.

In terms of the appellant's proposal, Ms Greene indicated that planning permission was sought for the change of use from Class 10 (non-residential institutions) to Class 9 (houses); the removal of a single storey rear extension; the installation of new windows and bi-fold doors; the replacement of windows; the formation of replacement steps with wall and balustrade; and the erection of a domestic double garage and driveway. The existing conservatory would be removed and a terraced patio area would be created, infilling the area between the western mutual boundary and the single storey annex. On the southern boundary, the patio would be retained and enclosed by a 2 metre high wall and 1.1 metre high balustrade. 11 new steps would then lead down to the remaining garden ground. It was proposed to install a projecting bay window on the lower rear elevation, which would be exposed once the conservatory was removed. It would measure 2.6 metres in width and 4.4 metres in height, including a thick aluminium frame on all sides, coloured grey. It was proposed to retain the wall of the conservatory along the west boundary. It was proposed to extensively glaze the southern and western elevations of the rear annex through the installation of 4 metre wide bi-folding doors on the west elevation and a full height corner window which would wrap round the west and south elevations. Finishing materials included aluminium and coloured grey. On its north elevation, the existing secondary entrance would be replaced with a 0.9 metre wide full height window, finished with aluminium coloured grey which showed the 2.6 metre wide by 4.4 metre high projecting windows and the similar style glazing to the annex. The proposed framing material was powder coated aluminium.

She indicated that the appointed officer's reasons for refusal stated in the decision notice was as follows:-

- Enlarged bay windows and openings in annexe did not relate to existing building or context;

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

- The features mentioned above were highly visible modern interventions;
- The features did not preserve the Conservation Area

Ms Greene outlined the key points from the appellant's Notice of Review as follows:-

- The proposal would return property to residential use supported by Policy H1;
- New openings are to the rear in line with Replacement Windows Supplementary Guidance and Technical Advice Note on Materials, therefore complied with Policy D1;
- No impact features of historic interest, in relation to the Conservation Area designation, with works not visible from public viewpoints in Conservation Area;
- There would be appropriate re-use of a granite building and would result in more granite being exposed, in compliance with Policy D5;
- Design informed by clear understanding of significance and complies with Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HEPS);
- Efficient reuse of site for residential use, rather than greenfield site and was of good quality design, being therefore a sustainable development; and
- It was consistent with other proposals in the Conservation Area and included a decision at 427 Great Western Road (170934/DPP).

In terms of consultee responses, Ms Greene advised that there were no objections, from either the Roads Team, Waste Team or Community Council and one neutral objection had been received which related to showing dimensions for the garage.

Ms Greene advised that the applicant had expressed the view that the review could be considered without the need of any further procedure.

At this point in the proceedings, the LRB considered whether they had sufficient information before them to proceed to determine the review.

The Chairperson and Councillors Allard and Thomson all indicated in turn that they each had enough information before them and therefore agreed that the review under consideration should be determined without any further procedure.

In terms of relevant policy considerations, Ms Greene referred to the following in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017:-

- Policy H1: Relates to New Residential Developments;
- Policy D4: Historic Environment;
- D1: Quality Placemaking by Design;
- D5: Our Granite Heritage;
- T2: Managing the Transport Impact of Development;
- T3: Sustainable and Active Travel;
- T5: Noise; and
- R6: Waste Management Requirements for New Development.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

Ms Greene responded to questions from members in relation to the rear elevation and its visibility from the road and provided clarity in relation to policy D4 in terms of preservation and enhancement.

The Chairperson and Councillors Allard and Thomson each advised in turn and by a majority of 2 to 1 agreed to uphold the appointed officer's decision to refuse planning permission.

Councillors Allard and Thomson agreed with the appointed officer's decision to refuse the application.

The Chairperson indicated that he believed that in this instance, and on balance, he was comfortable with the proposed development as it would be an improvement to what currently was there, the view from various locations would be acceptable and it did not impinge on the character of the conservation area and surrounding properties.

In coming to their decision, the Local Review Body had regard to the provisions of the development plan as required by Sections 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) and other material considerations in so far as these were pertinent to the determination of the application.

More specifically, the reasons on which the Local Review Body based this decision were as follows:-

The enlargement of the existing bay opening and installation of new openings on the annexe fail to relate to the existing building or wholly take account of the surrounding context, in that they would result in excessive, modern interventions which would dominate the rear elevation of this traditional property, which is highly visible from a public viewpoint. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design) and H1 (Residential Areas) of the adopted Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017; the Supplementary Guidance: 'The Householder Development Guide'; and Policies D1, D2 and H1 of the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2020.

The proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Great Western Road Conservation Area in line with the legislative requirements of Scottish Planning Policy and Historic Environment Policy Scotland and would therefore also fail to address the requirements of Policies D4 (Historic Environment) and D5 (Our Granite Heritage) of the adopted Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017 and Policies D6, D7 and D8 of the Proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2020.

Taking the above into account and following on from the evaluation under policy and guidance, it is considered that there are no material planning considerations of sufficient weight that would warrant approval of the application in this instance.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

68 RUBISLAW DEN SOUTH - INSTALLATION OF REPLACEMENT WINDOWS, ERECTION OF OUTBUILDINGS, FORMATION OF STEPS, HANDRAILS, HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, ERECTION OF REAR FENCE, AND ASSOCIATED WORKS (PARTLY RETROSPECTIVE) - 211549/DPP

2. The LRB then considered the second request for a review to evaluate the decision taken by an appointed officer under the Council's Scheme of Delegation to refuse the application for the installation of replacement windows, erection of outbuildings, formation of steps, handrails, hard and soft landscaping, erection of rear fence, and associated works (partly retrospective) at 68 Rubislaw Den South, Aberdeen, Planning Reference number 211549/DPP.

The Chairperson advised that Ms Lucy Greene would again be acting as the Planning Adviser to the Body in the following case under consideration this day and reiterated that although the Planning Adviser was employed by the planning authority, she had not been involved in any way with the consideration or determination of the application under review and was present to provide factual information and guidance to the Body only. He emphasised that the officer would not be asked to express any view on the proposed application.

In relation to the application, the LRB had before it (1) a delegated report by the Appointed Officer, Aberdeen City Council (ACC); (2) the original application dated 29 October 2021; (3) the decision notice dated 24 January 2022; (4) links to the plans showing the proposal and planning policies referred to in the delegated report; (5) the Notice of Review submitted by the applicant's agent; and (6) four letters of representation.

The LRB was then addressed by Ms Greene who advised that the review had been submitted with all necessary information within the time limit of three months following the decision of the appointed officer.

Ms Greene then described the site advising that it was located on Rubislaw Den South close to the junction with Anderson Drive. The application was approved and included works within the rear garden area, building walls, gazebo and landscaping. As the applicant had pedestrian access only from the front, they had agreed with number 70 to take access via their garden and through the granite rubble wall. The site was located within the Albyn Place/Rubislaw Conservation Area, with the boundary being the edge of the road. The property was Category C listed and subdivided into two flats, with the application premises being the upper section. A listed building consent was submitted for the works covered by the planning application and was approved subject to the same condition which was the subject of the review as follows:-

Within 3 months of the grant of this consent the granite wall located along the western boundary shall be reinstated to its original condition and as detailed on Drawing No: D93 15 A. Reason: To ensure the timeous and appropriate restoration of the site and in the interests of preserving granite on site and providing a suitable level of private amenity for neighbouring properties; therefore, ensuring compliance with Policies D1

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

(Quality Placemaking by Design), D5 (Our Granite Heritage) and H1 (Residential Areas) of the Aberdeen City Local Development Plan.

Ms Greene outlined the key points from the appellant's Notice of Review as follows:-

- that the application was approved on 24 January 2022, 3 months for reinstatement of wall run from that date;
- the applicant sought to extend the date for reinstatement;
- the opening through wall was the only feasible access;
- that the applicant intended to fully reinstate wall; and
- that the applicant sought the timescale of 8 months from approval (24 September 2022)

Ms Greene advised that there were no comments submitted from the Community Council, nor any other consultee responses and that there was one objection, which included that the communal wall be knocked down without the correct permission or notice.

Ms Greene advised that the applicant had expressed the view that no further procedure was required.

The Chairperson and Councillors Allard and Thomson all indicated in turn that they each had enough information before them and therefore agreed that the review under consideration should be determined without any further procedure.

In terms of relevant policy considerations, Ms Greene referred to the following in the Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017:-

- The site was situated within a residential area where policy H1 was relevant. This allowed for approval of residential related proposals in principle, subject to a number of criteria, one of which related to the character and amenity of the area;
- Policy D4 – sought to preserve the character of the conservation area, of which walls are an important feature; and
- Policy D5 – sought the retention of granite features.

Ms Greene responded to questions from members in relation to the reinstatement time scale for works.

The Chairperson and Councillors Allard and Thomson each advised in turn and unanimously agreed to vary the appointed officer's earlier decision and to therefore grant planning permission conditionally.

In coming to their decision, the Local Review Body had regard to the provisions of the development plan as required by Sections 25 and 37 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) and other material considerations in so far as these were pertinent to the determination of the application.

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

More specifically, the reasons on which the Local Review Body based this decision were as follows:-

The variation to the condition would result in the proposals maintaining the listed building's original character and setting and would preserve the character and appearance of the Albyn Place and Rubislaw Conservation Area in line with legislative requirements, Scottish Planning Policy and Historic Environment Policy for Scotland. The proposal therefore accords with Policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design), D4 (Historic Environment), D5 (Our Granite Heritage) and H1 (Residential Areas) of the current Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2017; the Supplementary Guidance: 'The Householder Development Guide' and 'The Repair and Replacement of Windows and Doors'; and Policies D1, D2, D6, D7, D8 and H1 of the proposed Aberdeen Local Development Plan 2020.

CONDITION

Within 8 months of the date of approval of the planning permission (24.01.22), the granite wall located along the western boundary shall be reinstated to its original condition and as detailed on Drawing No. D93 15A.

Reason: To ensure the timeous and appropriate restoration of the site and in the interests of preserving granite on site and providing a suitable level of private amenity for neighbouring properties; therefore, ensuring compliance with Policies D1 (Quality Placemaking by Design), D5 (Our Granite Heritage) and H1 (Residential Areas) of the Aberdeen City Local Development Plan 2017.

HIGHPOINT, 242 NORTH DEESIDE ROAD - ERECTION OF 14 RESIDENTIAL FLATS OVER 3 AND 4 STOREYS, 1 SHOP UNIT AND SUBDIVISION OF EXISTING FLAT TO FORM 2 FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE - 211791/DPP

3. The LRB then considered the third request for a review against the non-determination of an application for full planning permission for the erection of 14 residential flats over 3 and 4 storeys, 1 shop unit and subdivision of existing flat to form 2 flats with associated infrastructure at 242 North Deeside Road, Aberdeen, Planning Reference number 211791/DPP.

The Chairperson advised that Ms Lucy Greene would again be acting as the Planning Adviser to the Body in the following case under consideration this day and reiterated that although the Planning Adviser was employed by the planning authority, she had not been involved in any way with the consideration or determination of the application under review and was present to provide factual information and guidance to the Body only. She emphasised that the officer would not be asked to express any view on the proposed application.

In relation to the application, the LRB had before it (1) a delegated report by the Appointed Officer, Aberdeen City Council; (2) an application dated 20 December 2021; (3) links to the plans showing the proposal and planning policies referred to in the delegated report; (4) the Notice of Review submitted by the applicant; (5) consultee

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

responses submitted by Roads Development Management Team, Environmental Health, Waste Recycling Team, Contaminated Land Team, Housing Team and Developer Obligations Team (all ACC), Scottish Water, Police Scotland, Dee District Salmon Fishery Board, North East Scotland Biological Records Centre and Culter Community Council; and (6) three letters of representation.

The LRB was then addressed by Ms Greene who advised that an appeal against non-determination would take place where there had not been a decision made on an application during the statutory period of 2 months following validation of the application. In this case a request for an extension of this period was declined. The request for review had been correctly submitted with all necessary information within the time limit following the end of the statutory period.

Ms Greene explained that whilst no new matters had been raised in the review submissions, a case officer report had been submitted. A period of 14 days was provided for interested parties to comment on the report. Comments were received from the applicant and also from the Community Council. The applicant also commented on the Community Council's submission.

Ms Greene then described the site advising that it was located on the north side of North Deeside Road, Peterculter, at the western end of its neighbourhood centre and at the gateway to the countryside. There was a mix of uses in the area including retail, public houses, a restaurant and a hot food takeaway. The site was currently occupied by a vacant traditional granite single storey building attached to a 1.5-storey granite building with a class 2 unit (beauty salon) on the ground floor and residential flat above. This flat was accessed via an external stair located at the rear of the building. The site also included a small car park, a large, corrugated roofed shed/outbuilding and small timber shed to the rear. Part of the rear of the site appeared to have been used as a commercial car wash. There was a significant change in levels up to the rear of the site of around 3m. The fringes of the car park/site access were defined by granite rubble walls. The site was bounded to the west by a retail unit (Spar and Post Office) located within a traditional single story/one and a half storey granite fronted building. This unit had no ancillary car parking or delivery area. To the north of the site was a modern detached house set in large, wooded grounds. The house had a private driveway access extending along the east edge of the site. There were mature trees beyond the northern and eastern fringes of the site which has a moderate southerly aspect. Further east are 4-storey flats set well back from the street front. On the opposite side of the street were single storey and 1½ storey granite buildings.

Ms Greene outlined the Case Officer's reason for refusal in the report of handling as follows:-

- There was insufficient information - detailed cross sections and sun shadow analysis on properties to north; transport statement and clarity on servicing arrangements; and additional bat survey;
- Loss of Residential Amenity;
- Overdevelopment;

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

- Design Quality;
- Adverse Impact on Peterculter Neighbourhood Centre;
- Road Safety (Access); and
- Sustainable Development.

In terms of the applicant's case, Ms Greene advised that this was outlined in full within their Notice of Review documents, but could be summarised as follows:-

- Scale and density – precedent had been set by buildings adjacent;
- Impact on retail centre – proposed retail space size had been maximised and customer parking would increase;
- Residential Amenity – adjacent house to north was at higher level and report included shadow cast analysis;
- Daylight acceptable to proposed flats;
- Access – Roads Service did not object;
- Parking – residents would use public transport, there was also a car park diagonally opposite;
- Bin store was only marginally outside travel distance standard;
- Landscaping was generous;
- Tree impact was acceptable and planting was proposed;
- Additional bat survey could be conditioned;
- Proposed will comply with low and zero carbon policy, highly insulated and with air source heat pumps;
- Crime – car park would be overlooked and movement sensor lights installed; and
- Proposal complied with various other policies.

In terms of consultee responses, Ms Greene made reference to the following:-

- Aberdeen City Council (ACC) Roads Development Management Team – No objection, they noted that the site was located in the outer city and did not lie within an area with any form of controlled parking measures. 18 parking spaces would be provided, which was considered to be acceptable, due to provision of cycle parking, proximity to public transport and walking distance to local amenities. Spaces were acceptable in dimensions. Regarding the proposed vehicle access, bus stop provision re-location could be conditioned. They considered that cycle access/connectivity and access to public transport to be acceptable;
- ACC Environmental Health – No objection, they advised that the proposed development was located adjacent to the busy North Deeside Road (A93), therefore the proposal was likely to be impacted by road traffic noise. Additionally, the proposed commercial unit and other commercial businesses nearby may impact on the proposal. They noted that a Noise Impact Assessment had been submitted and requested that suitable noise mitigation measures be implemented (measures relate to windows and acoustic vents);
- ACC Waste and Recycling – Request that a swept analysis be provided from the developer to ensure waste collection vehicles could safely manoeuvre around the development, noting that initial advice provided at pre-application stage was

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

that refuse storage should be provided within 15m of the site access to avoid the need for refuse vehicles to enter/turn within the site. Proposals were for bin store to be located to the rear of the proposed retail unit, only very slightly over the recommended 10m walking distance;

- ACC Schools Estates Team – Advised that there was adequate capacity in relation to both primary and secondary school provision;
- ACC Housing – No objection. Advised that the Aberdeen Local Development Plan Policy H5 required a 25% affordable housing contribution from all housing developments of 5 units or more which equated to 3.5 units. For developments of less than 20 units the provision of affordable housing may be on-site, off-site or commuted payments. If the developer intended to provide Low-Cost Home Ownership as an affordable housing contribution, they should enter into early discussions with the Housing Strategy Team regarding this as demand for this type of affordable housing had reduced;
- ACC Developer Obligations – Advised that contributions were required regarding core path network (£3,900), healthcare facilities (£6,001) and open space (£1,903) in addition to provision of affordable housing;
- ACC Contaminated Land Team – No objection. The Site Investigation submitted in support of Application Reference: 211791/DPP the development had been reviewed and its conclusions and recommendations were accepted. Based on the available information there was no obvious risk to the proposed development. They did not recommend that any further intrusive works were required;
- Scottish Water – No objection. The proposed development would be fed from Invercarnie Water Treatment Works (River Dee). Unfortunately, Scottish Water was unable to confirm water supply capacity. They advised that there was currently sufficient capacity for a foul only connection in the Nigg Wastewater Treatment works to service the development. They also advised that for reasons of sustainability and to protect their customers from potential future sewer flooding, Scottish Water would not accept any surface water connections into their combined sewer system;
- Police Scotland – Provided a detailed comment regarding the proposed design solution. They advised that vehicular and pedestrian routes should be designed to ensure that they were visually open and direct. Any footpaths should be straight, wide and well-lit to promote feelings of safety and security for pedestrians as well as discouraging anti-social behaviour. Indicated that the footpaths should also be free of potential hiding places for miscreants and should follow the pedestrian's preferred route through the development. Car parking areas should be within view of active rooms such as kitchens and living rooms (bedrooms and bathrooms were not considered as active rooms);
- Dee District Salmon Fishery Board – No objection. They advised that there did not seem to be the potential for a significant impact upon the River Dee SAC or the watercourses from which it was made up, in relation to the proposed development. They requested that the developer adheres to SEPA's pollution prevention guidelines should the application be successful;

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

- North East Scotland Biological Records Centre – No species records related to the site. They advised that protected species (e.g. red squirrel) were present nearby; and
- Culter Community Council – Objected on overdevelopment and car parking concerns. They considered that the scale and design of the proposal would be inappropriate to its context. They expressed concerns regarding potential conflict with policy regarding affordable housing (H5) and low energy development need (R7).

Ms Greene advised that Culter Community Council had submitted a further representation on the following basis:-

- Flats were not needed;
- The scheme was an overdevelopment, there was an excessive number of units and limited green space;
- There was a loss of parking to public and an increase in demand for parking; and
- Affordable housing and Low and Zero Carbon should be conditioned if minded to approve the application.

She explained that the applicant had made a further statement following receipt of the Community Council's comments, including:-

- There was a need for a range of houses in the area – 16 flats would meet a local need;
- Houses would remove opportunity for retail unit;
- Retail unit would enhance the village;
- That this was a brownfield site and well connected by public transport, walking and cycling routes;
- Proposed Plan examination may result in need for more housing sites;
- In terms of context the Gordon Arms Hotel flats to east were precedent;
- Buildings rise from 3 at frontage to 4 storey at rear, similar to the CO-OP site;
- Existing parking on site was 3 spaces at discretion of owner. Proposed parking would be available to the public;
- Agreed that affordable housing was in line with policy and Low and Zero Carbon could be conditioned;
- That there would be contributions towards open space off site and trees and landscaping on site;
- No impact on bats and other interests; and
- There would be economic development and employment benefits.

In terms of other feedback, Ms Greene advised that there were three representations received (two objections and one in support). The matters raised were summarised as follows:-

- Inaccurate information submitted (shadow analysis/public transport information);
- Excessive scale of development/height of building;
- Insufficient evidence of carbon reduction requirements;
- Inadequate Electrical Vehicle charging provision;

LOCAL REVIEW BODY OF ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL

8 June 2022

- Inadequate on-site car parking provision;
- Reduction of car parking provision on North Deeside Road;
- Overlooking/loss of privacy to adjacent residential premises/garden ground;
- Loss of sunlight to adjacent residential premises;
- Adverse impact on adjacent residential property due to noise and lighting associated with proposed car park;
- Loss of views from adjacent residential property to west;
- The owner of the adjacent property to the south welcomed the proposal as it would result in redevelopment of a run-down eyesore and the provision of new retail and residential accommodation would be a positive addition to the village.

Ms Greene advised that the applicant had expressed the view that a site visit should be undertaken.

At this point in the proceedings, the LRB considered whether they had sufficient information before them to proceed to determine the review.

Councillor Allard advised that he had enough information before him and that the review under consideration should be determined without any further procedure. The Chairperson and Councillor Thomson in turn requested that a site visit be undertaken prior to determining the review, therefore the LRB agreed by a majority of 2 to 1 that a site visit be held prior to determining the review.

The review under consideration was therefore adjourned for a site visit to be conducted on 15 June 2022 at 11.00am with a meeting to consider the review being held remotely at 2.00pm.

- **COUNCILLOR DELL HENRICKSON, Chairperson**