

27 Albert Terrace,  
ABERDEEN  
AB10 1XY



15<sup>th</sup> October 2014

Martin Allan Esq.  
Assistant Clerk to the Local Review Body,  
Aberdeen City Council,  
Corporate Governance,  
Town House,  
Broad Street,  
ABERDEEN.  
AB10 1AQ

Dear Sir

**28 Albert Terrace, Aberdeen. Planning Application 140833**  
**Removal of 2 Dormer Windows; Construction of New Dormer Window**  
**Applicant Mr. D Davidson per Fitzgerald Associates.**

Thank you for your letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> October 2014 concerning an application for review by Elected Members.

When considering that review would the reviewing members consider the following representations :-

1. The reasons for the appeal are essentially that the Local and National Policies prevent a “contemporary approach” to design. They concede that the proposal does not in any way comply with local policies but request that such policies should not apply to this application. This argument is no different from a driver caught doing 30mph on Union Street (where the speed limit is 20mph) agreeing that he was speeding but arguing that the speed limit should be 30mph for him because 20mph impedes his progress.
2. The appellant seeks to rely on “historic” box dormers. There is no representation as to whether or not these dormers complied with permissions extant at the time of their construction. The application should be determined on the basis on current policy and should ignore historic situations. Extending the above analogy, to do otherwise would be like arguing that the 30mph driver committed no offence “because the limit used to be 30mph” or perhaps because others similarly speeding have not been charged.
3. The Councils Planning Officers have stated that the proposal is “highly detrimental to the character of the Category B Listed Building” (and therefore contrary to Scottish Planning Policy, Scottish Historic Environment Policy and the Local Development Plan). In other words this is not a borderline case The Councils Officers are saying that this is clearly and definitely in breach of policies and the appellant does not appear to disagree. Consequently the Officers will be undermined and Policies discredited if the appeal is allowed.
4. The Appellant makes reference to “the already approved ground floor extension” That approval was achieved by agreement and negotiation with the Planning Officials and part of that Agreement was to give up the single box dormer which was part of the original application. In other words if the applicant had not agreed not to build the box dormer planning permission for the ground floor proposal would not have been granted. It seems unfair and unreasonable that the applicant can “do a deal” with planning officers accept the good bits of that deal and then go back on his word about not building the box dormers, but that would be the effect of granting the appeal.

Yours sincerely

Sandra & Laurence Tough