

**ABERDEENSHIRE COUNCIL****LOCAL REVIEW BODY****WOODHILL HOUSE, ABERDEEN, FRIDAY 28 OCTOBER, 2016**

**Present:** Councillors S W Pratt (Chair), P W Bellarby, R Cassie, F C P Hood, P K Johnston, C H Nelson, C Shand and M Stewart.

**Apologies:** Councillor K Farquhar for LRB 345.

**Officers:** Planning Adviser (Mark Myles, Senior Solicitor – Governance (Fiona Stewart) and Senior Committee Officer (Frances Brown).

**1. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

In respect of declaration of members' interests as required by the Code of Conduct for members Councillor Hood declared an interest in Agenda Item 6, LRB 353 as the application site was within his ward and as such he would withdraw from proceedings when that Review was being determined.

**2. PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY**

In making decisions on the following items of business, the Committee **agreed**, in terms of Section 149 of the Equality Act, 2010:-

- (1) To have due regard to the need to:-
  - (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
  - (b) advance equality of opportunity between those who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
  - (c) foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- (2) Where an Equality Impact Assessment was provided, to consider its contents and take those into account when reaching their decision.

**3. SPREADSHEET HIGHLIGHTING RELEVANT POLICIES FOR EACH REVIEW**

The Local Review Body had before them and noted a spreadsheet which listed the policies which would be referred to in consideration of each of the reviews presented before them, as contained within the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan (2012).

**RECONVENED REVIEWS**

**4. LRB 345 – NOTICE OF REVIEW AGAINST REFUSAL OF FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR INSTALLATION OF WINDOWS AT 47-49 BROAD STREET, FRASERBURGH, AB43 9AE – REFERENCE: BB/APP/2015/2796**

Local Review Body: Councillors S W Pratt (Chair), R Cassie, F C P Hood, C H Nelson and C Shand.

Reference was made to the Minute of the Local Review Body meeting of 26 August, 2016 (Item 6) where the Local Review Body had agreed to defer consideration of the Notice of Review to allow them to follow further procedure by way of seeking additional information, namely (1) to obtain a copy of the CARS Grant Scheme; (2) to obtain a copy of the Fraserburgh

Conservation Guidance document and (3) to obtain a brochure publication which would present visual images of the type of uPVC windows which the applicant proposed to install at the property. The Local Review Body then resumed consideration of the Notice of Review which sought a review of the Appointed Officer's decision to Refuse Full Planning Permission for the Installation of Windows at 47-49 Broad Street, Fraserburgh, AB43 9AE – Reference: BB/APP/2015/2796.

It was reported that the Team Leader – Environment Team (North) had advised that the CARS Grant Scheme would not be up and running until the end of 2016 due to staff illness, however, she was able to confirm that the similar schemes would support:-

- the use or reuse of redundant historic buildings;
- the reinstatement of lost historic detail;
- best practice in building repair techniques and the use of appropriate sustainable materials;
- the scheme would cover the replacement windows where refurbishment was no longer possible;
- the scheme would not fund uPVC as that would not maintain historic detail; and
- the scheme would run for a period of 5 years until June 2021

It was further reported that a copy of the style of Everest uPVC casement windows was presented on Page 13 – 16 of the agenda papers and the Local Review Body then resumed consideration of the Notice of Review which sought a review of the Appointed Officer's decision to Refuse Full Planning Permission for the Installation of Windows at 47-49 Broad Street, Fraserburgh – Reference: BB/APP/2015/2796.

The Planning Adviser introduced the Notice of Review and provided the Local Review Body with an overview of the application as presented at the initial meeting of 26 August, 2016 and a recap of the Appointed Officer's reasons for refusal, namely:

- (1) The proposal is contrary to Policy 13: Protecting, Improving and Conserving the Historic Environment and the associated supplementary guidance SG Historic Environment 2: Conservation Areas of the adopted Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan, 2012, in that the proposed replacement windows do not respect the architectural, historic and visual qualities of the area that have given rise to the designated Fraserburgh Central Conservation Area.

The Chair then asked the Local Review Body to consider whether there was now sufficient information before them in order for members to consider the review without further procedure. The Local Review Body were in agreement that they had sufficient information before them and proceeded to determine the Notice of Review.

The Local Review Body then agreed that the main determining issue for the Notice of Review as presented before them was whether the proposed replacement windows would preserve the character and appearance of the Fraserburgh Conservation Area.

During discussion the Local Review Body noted from the photo montages and the applicant's supporting statement that uPVC windows were not considered an uncommon feature within the wider Conservation Area and particular reference was made to immediately adjoining property to the south upper floor windows.

During discussion the Local Review Body recognised that the policy and also the Conservation Area Appraisal would look for replacement windows to match the originals.

The Local Review Body took cognisance of the information received from the Environment Service which had highlighted that the applicant's joiner had confirmed that there was still

potential for the windows to be repaired, albeit that would be a very costly exercise. It was acknowledged that as the proposed CARS grant scheme (which was not yet in operation) would only cover replacement of windows where refurbishment was no longer possible it became apparent to the Local Review Body that as refurbishment of the windows was still considered feasible and as such the proposal would not qualify for any grant assistance.

The Local Review Body were in agreement that the existing windows were in a very poor condition and due to the numbers involved they were minded that it would be unreasonable to insist on the replacement windows being timber like for like.

The Local Review Body noted that the property could be considered as distinctive (but not a listed building) and was located on one of the principal streets within the town centre of Fraserburgh. The area was generally characterised by shop fronts and a mix of various forms of street furniture, signs and car parking all of which contributed to a relatively cluttered street scene.

The Local Review Body were unanimous in their view that on balance the replacement of all of the windows above the shopfront was in their view considered to be an enhancement to the building and the Conservation Area as a whole and the proposed white uPVC replacement windows would be a positive improvement on what already exists especially when considering the wider context and the fact that uPVC was already a prominent material within the Conservation Area. The Local Review Body agreed if the replacement windows were of a traditional style and design then they would not have a detrimental impact on the character or integrity of the Conservation Area and would therefore be in accordance with Policy 13 and Supplementary Guidance Historic Environment 2 of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2012.

The Local Review agreed that there should be a condition imposed to ensure full details of the replacement white uPVC windows (including their style, design and opening method) be submitted and agreed with the Planning Service in advance of installation.

After due consideration, the Local Review Body **agreed** to Uphold the Notice of Review and Reverse the determination reviewed by it and GRANT Full Planning Permission subject to appropriate conditions which would ensure that the proposed windows would reflect the style, design and opening mechanisms of the existing windows.

**5. LRB 348 – NOTICE OF REVIEW AGAINST REFUSAL OF FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR INSTALLATION OF 2 NO. REPLACEMENT UPVC DOORS AT 19 MID STREET, CAIRNBULG, ABERDEENSHIRE, AB43 8WJ – REFERENCE: BB/APP/2016/1364**

Local Review Body: Councillors S W Pratt (Chair), P W Bellarby, R Cassie, F C P Hood and P K Johnston.

Reference was made to the Minute of the Local Review Body meeting of 30 September, 2016 (Item 4) where the Local Review Body had agreed to defer consideration of the Notice of Review to allow them to follow further procedure by way of seeking additional information, namely (1) to request a copy of the Cairnbulg Conservation Area guidance document from the Environmental Service and (2) to request a copy of a brochure which contains the style of door which the applicant proposes to install. The Local Review Body then resumed consideration of the Notice of Review which sought a review of the Appointed Officer's decision to Refuse Full Planning Permission for the Installation of 2 No. Replacement Doors at 19 Mid Street, Cairnbulg, Aberdeenshire, AB43 8WJ – Reference: BB/APP/2016/1364.

It was reported that while a copy of the Cairnbulg Conservation Area guidance document had been requested, the Planning Service had advised that there was no specific guidance for

Cairnbulg/Inverallochy Conservation Areas since the Banff and Buchan District Council days and any decisions made are taken using the current Local Plan policies.

It was further reported that the applicant had provided a copy of the brochure which presented the style of door which the applicant wished to install as presented on Page 23 of the agenda papers.

The Planning Adviser introduced the Notice of Review and provided the Local Review Body with an overview of the application as presented at the initial meeting of 30 September, 2016 and a recap of the Appointed Officer's reasons for refusal, namely:

- (1) The proposal is contrary to the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2012, in particular Policy 13: Protecting, Improving and Conserving the Historic Environment, and SG Historic Environment 2: Conservation Areas, in that the development, due to the proposed design and materials, would have a detrimental effect on the architectural, historic and visual qualities of the area that gave rise to Cairnbulg's designation as a Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area, contrary to Historic Environment Scotland Policy Statement (June 2016) and Historic Environment Scotland's guidance – Managing Change in the Historic Environment Document – Doorways.
- (2) The proposal is contrary to the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2012, in particular Policy 8: Layout, Siting and Design of New Development and SG LSD2: Layout, Siting and Design of New Development, as the proposal fails to demonstrate appropriate design.

The Chair then asked the Local Review Body to consider whether there was now sufficient information before them in order for members to consider the review without further procedure. The Local Review Body were in agreement that they had sufficient information before them and proceeded to determine the Notice of Review.

The Local Review Body then agreed that the main determining issue for the Notice of Review as presented before them was whether the proposed replacement doors by virtue of their appearance, design and finish would preserve the character and appearance of the Cairnbulg Conservation Area.

The Local Review Body noted that uPVC doors and metal doors were prevalent within the wider Conservation Area and they also noted from information contained within the Report of Handling that the existing doors were not original and were not of any historical importance (albeit they are constructed of timber).

During discussion, the Local Review Body recognised that in the absence of any specific Conservation Area Appraisal Guidance, the pattern of development evident throughout the Conservation Area was the character that would be expected to be preserved. It was agreed that as there was no detailed information available on the replacement doors or on finishing materials they could only consider the general development plan policies along with the Historic Environment Scotland Guidance on Managing Change in the Historic Environment – Doorways.

The Local Review Body took the view that while timber replacement doors would normally be expected, it would be unreasonable to insist on timber doors due to the location of the property which was so exposed to harsh coastal weather conditions and regular flooding resulting in the existing doors being in extremely poor condition.

When considering the appearance of the door the Local Review Body were minded that the proposed glazing panels within the doors could not be used as a reason for refusal (as per

paragraphs 4.4 – 4.6 of the Historic Environment Scotland Guidance) and on the grounds that uPVC was already a prevalent material within the Conservation Area and as such the proposed replacement doors would not have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area and the proposal was therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy 13 and Supplementary Guidance Historic Environment 2 of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2012.

After due consideration, the Local Review Body **agreed** to Uphold the Notice of Review and Reverse the determination reviewed by it and GRANT Full Planning Permission subject to a condition which would ensure that the applicant would install the Lorimer PVCup Doors as specified on Page 38 of the agenda papers.

## **NEW REVIEWS**

### **6. LRB 353 – NOTICE OF REVIEW AGAINST REFUSAL OF FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR ERECTION OF BUILDING FOR CLASS 6 (STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION) USE AT LAND AT HILL OF COTTOWN, KINTORE – REFERENCE: G/APP/2015/3715**

Local Review Body: Councillors S W Pratt (Chair), R Cassie, G J Clark, P K Johnston and M Stewart.

There had been submitted a Notice of Review and supporting documents by the agent which sought a review of the Appointed Officer's decision to Refuse Full Planning Permission for the Erection of a Building Class 6 (Storage and Distribution) Use at Land at Hill of Cottown, Kintore – Reference: G/APP/2015/3715.

The Planning Adviser introduced the Notice of Review and advised the Local Review Body that in terms of review procedure the applicant had requested a review of the documents as presented before them and no further procedure. The Planning Adviser then provided the Local Review Body with the background to the applicant's case along with a series of slides and photomontages of the site and surrounding area.

The Planning Adviser ended his presentation by reporting that no valid representations had been received during the consultation period.

Further to consultation undertaken it was reported that Contaminated Land had commented that information about past use of the site had been submitted under previous applications and they were satisfied that no further information was required; Environmental Health did not object to the application but had advised that conditions relating to hours of operation and use of commercial vehicles would be required to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties; the Flood Prevention had commented that the service was satisfied with the measures proposed to deal with surface water drainage and the level of flood risk associated with the application site, however, they had requested that conditions are attached to request surface soakaway calculations and confirmation of an infiltration rate requiring suitable porosity and a condition to ensure surface water drainage was carried out in accordance with the approved plans and draining proposals; Roads Development has commented that the existing access onto the public road was adequate to accommodate the development; SEPA had confirmed that the application site lies outwith the SEPA flood risk are and they have no objection on flood risk grounds and they had advised that the applicant contact the Aberdeenshire Council Flood Prevention Unit and Scottish Water did not object to the proposal and had confirmed that the Invercarnie Water Treatment Works currently has sufficient capacity for the proposed development.

The Local Review Body then considered the Appointed Officer's reasons for refusal, namely:-

- (1) The proposed development to erect building for class 6 (storage and distribution) use does not comply with Policy 3 Development in the Countryside, SG RD1: Housing and Business Development in the Countryside in that Part A of RD1: Housing and Business Development in the Countryside precludes employment development other than in specific circumstances that do not apply to this proposal. The proposal does not therefore accord with the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2012 and no other material considerations have been identified that indicate the application should be supported.

The Local Review Body considered that the relevant policies as contained within the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan (2012) were: Policy 3: Development in the Countryside and SG Rural Development 1: Housing and Business Development in the Countryside; Policy 8: Layout, Siting and Design of New Development and SG LSD2: Layout, Siting and Design of New Development and Policy 12: Landscape Conservation and SG Landscape 1: Landscape Character. Other material considerations were: Aberdeenshire Planning Advice 13/2012: Housing and Business Development in the Countryside and Greenbelt.

The Chair then asked the Local Review Body to consider whether there was now sufficient information before them in order for members to consider the review without further procedure.

During discussion, the Local Review Body made reference to the Appointed Officer's Report of Handling, in particular Page 50 of the agenda papers which had highlighted that previous attempts to get Hill of Cottown area designated for business use / expansion through the local development plan had not succeeded and the report for the 2012 Local Development Plan had concluded that an allocation was not appropriate and proposals should be assessed against Policies 1 and 3 of the existing Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan, 2012.

The Local Review Body highlighted that there was an emerging 2016 Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan, 2012 and they queried whether land within the Aberdeen Housing Market Area (AHMA) for the site would change as part of the emerging Local Development Plan and whether any submissions had been received during the consultation period for the new Local Development Plan to have the site allocated for industrial/employment purposes.

After due consideration, the Local Review Body **agreed** to DEFER consideration of the Notice of Review to allow further procedure by way of seeking additional information from the Planning Service Policy Planning Team on the allocation of the site in the 2016 emerging Local Development Plan and whether it would be allocated as industrial/business class use and whether any representations had been received during the consultation period for change of use.

**7. LRB 354 – NOTICE OF REVIEW AGAINST REFUSAL OF FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND TO FORM CAMPING AND CARAVAN SITE; ERECTION OF TOILET AND SHOWER BLOCK AND SITING OF RECEPTION OFFICE AT BIRKENHILL FARM, FORDYCE, ABERDEENSHIRE, AB45 2XQ – REFERENCE: APP/2015/3771**

Local Review Body: Councillors S W Pratt (Chair), R Cassie, G J Clark, P K Johnston and M Stewart.

There had been submitted a Notice of Review and supporting documents by the applicant which sought a review of the Appointed Officer's decision to Refuse Full Planning Permission for the Use of Agricultural Land to Form Camping and Caravan Site; Erection of Toilet and Shower Block and Siting of Reception Office at Birkenhill Farm, Fordyce, Aberdeenshire, AB45 2XQ – Reference: APP/2015/3771.

The Planning Adviser introduced the Notice of Review and advised the Local Review Body that in terms of review procedure the applicant had further written submissions; a site inspection and a review of the documents as presented before them. The Planning Adviser then provided the Local Review Body with the background to the applicant's case along with a series of slides and photomontages of the site and surrounding area.

The Planning Adviser ended his presentation by reporting that 11 valid letters of representation had been received (1 in support and 10 objections), which did not include multiple representations from the same household (3 letters in total) and the material planning issues raised within those representations were:-

### Objections

- Impact on road network;
- Increased traffic;
- Sufficient tourist facilities in the surrounding area;
- Not in keeping with the character of the area;
- Not compatible with surrounding agricultural uses;
- Impact on drainage, flooding and water supply to surrounding area;
- Lack of screening;
- Overlooking to Viewfield Farm;
- Noise pollution;
- Impact on biodiversity – Fordyce Burn; and
- Impact on character of Conservation Area - Fordyce

### Support

- Provision of tourist facilities and economic benefit to wider area

It was reported one representation was received in response to the Notice of Review from one of the objectors as presented on Page 183 of the agenda papers and that response reiterated comments made on their original submission.

Further to consultations undertaken it was reported that Developer Obligations had requested developer obligations due to the nature and scale of the proposed development; Environmental Health had objected to the proposal as there was insufficient information provided with regards to private water supply and their preference would be that a public water supply was used; Planning Policy had highlighted key consideration in the determination of the application were Policy 1, SG Bus 4: Tourist Facilities and Accommodation and Policy 3, SG RD1: Housing and Business Development in the Countryside and it was highlighted that the proposal lies within the Regeneration priority area and Roads Development had no objection to the proposal subject to conditions.

The Local Review Body then considered the Appointed Officer's reasons for refusal, namely:-

- (1) Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal can be adequately serviced. Specifically, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate compliance with Policy 9 and SG DC 3: Water and Waste Water Drainage Infrastructure; specifically that the private water supply is not of a sufficient quality and the efficiency of any treatment which would be required and the long term sustainability of the supply have not been proven.

The Local Review Body considered that the relevant policies as contained within the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan (2012) were: Policy 1: Business Development and SG Bus 4: Tourist Facilities and Accommodation; Policy 3: Development in the Countryside and SG Rural Development 1: Housing and Business Development in the Countryside; Policy

8: Layout, Siting and Design of New Development and SG LSD2: Layout, Siting and Design of New Development; Policy 9: Developer Contributions and SG DC1: Developer Contributions, SG DC2: Access to New Development and SG DC3: Waste and Waste Water Drainage Infrastructure; Policy 11: Natural Heritage and SG Natural Environment 2: Protection of the Wider Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Policy 12: Landscape Conservation and SG Landscape 1: Landscape Character. Other material considerations were: Aberdeenshire Planning Advice: 6/2011: Implementation of policy SG LSD2 Layout, Siting and Design of New Development and Planning Advice 13/2012: Housing and Business Development in the Countryside and Greenbelt.

The Chair then asked the Local Review Body to consider whether there was now sufficient information before them in order for members to consider the review without further procedure.

During discussion the Local Review Body made reference to the Environmental Health response on Page 93 of the agenda papers which advised that the service objected to the proposal on the grounds that the applicant had failed to provide sufficient information on water supply for a private water supply for the site and the additional information provided by the applicant in the Notice of Review which related to the efficiency of water treatment.

The Local Review Body agreed that it would be helpful if the Environmental Health Service were afforded the opportunity to comment on the additional information presented by the applicant on the efficiency of private water supply for the site and they also agreed that it would also be helpful to present that information to the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) to ascertain whether they had any issues which they wish to raise on the proposed application.

After due consideration, the Local Review Body **agreed** to follow further procedure by way of seeking additional information on the private water supply to the application site by providing a full copy of the Notice of Review and supporting documentation to the Environmental Health Service and to SEPA and ask that they provide a response on the suitability of the proposed development having taken all the information into account.

#### **8. LRB 355 – NOTICE OF REVIEW AGAINST REFUSAL OF FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR ERECTION OF DWELLINGHOUSE AT SITE TO THE NORTH OF CLOAK FARM, CATTERLINE, STONEHAVEN – REFERENCE: APP/2016/1309**

Local Review Body: Councillors S W Pratt (Chair), R Cassie, G J Clark, P K Johnston and M Stewart.

There had been submitted a Notice of Review and supporting documents by the applicant which sought a review of the Appointed Officer's decision to Refuse Full Planning Permission for the Erection of a Dwellinghouse at the Site to the North of Cloak Farm, Catterline, Stonehaven – Reference: APP/2016/1309.

The Planning Adviser introduced the Notice of Review and advised the Local Review Body that in terms of review procedure the applicant had requested a site inspection and a review of the documents as presented before them. The Planning Adviser then provided the Local Review Body with the background to the applicant's case along with a series of slides and photomontages of the site and surrounding area.

The Planning Adviser ended his presentation by reporting that no valid representations had been received during the consultation period.

Further to consultations undertaken it was reported that Roads Development had commented that they had no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions relating to off-street parking, visibility splays and formation of a refuse bin store uplift area and Developer

Obligations had sent a report directly to the applicant for consideration in relation to required developer obligations contributions.

The Local Review Body then considered the Appointed Officer's reasons for refusal, namely:-

- (1) The main business as a caravan site, to which the proposed dwellinghouse relates, is not primary industry and that care of the herd of Highland cattle is insufficient in terms of identifying an essential need for the applicant to be located on site, on a full time basis, to justify an additional dwellinghouse relating to the retirement succession of the farm holding which in itself has not been demonstrated to be viable as a standalone enterprise. The proposal therefore does not comply with the specified criteria of Policy 3: Development in the Countryside and Associated SG Rural Development 1: Housing and Business Development in the Countryside of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan, 2012.

The Local Review Body considered that the relevant policies as contained within the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan (2012) were: Policy 3: Development in the Countryside and SG Rural Development 1: Housing and Business Development in the Countryside; Policy 8: Layout, Siting and Design of New Development and SG LSD2: Layout, Siting and Design of New Development and LSD11: Carbon Neutrality in New Development; Policy 4: Special Types of Rural Land and STRLtype 1: Development of the Coastal Zone; Policy 9: Developer Contributions and Developer Contributions 1: Developer Contributions, SG Developer Contributions 2: Access to New Development and SG Developer Contributions 3: Water and Waste Water Drainage Infrastructure; Policy 13: Protecting, Improving and Conserving the Historic Environment and Historic Environment 2: Conservation Areas and Policy 14: Safeguarding of Resources and Areas of Search and Safeguarding 2: Protection and Conservation of Agricultural Land.

The Chair then asked the Local Review Body to consider whether there was now sufficient information before them in order for members to consider the review without further procedure. The Local Review Body were in agreement that they had sufficient information before them and proceeded to determine the Notice of Review.

The Local Review Body then agreed that the main determining issue for the Notice of Review as presented before them was whether the proposal met with the policy criteria that would normally apply for the erection of a new house in the countryside.

The Local Review Body recognised the applicant's desire to seek to continue to grow and expand their existing rural business, however, having considered all of the information as presented before them they took the view that the applicant had not presented anything material which could overcome the key policy criteria as set out in Policy 3 and SG Rural Development 1 of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan, 2012.

The Local Review Body agreed that the existing mixed rural business would not be defined as a 'primary industry' under the terms of the policy which could potentially justify approval for a further dwellinghouse in the countryside based on an identified operational need or farm succession. The Local Review Body noted that the Notice of Review and supporting statement presented by the applicant had provided a list of tasks associated with the business rather than a full labour calculation and it was clear from the applicant's submissions, the accompanying SAC letter and the assessment contained within the Appointed Officer's Report of Handling that the proposal did not support the agricultural case for a further dwellinghouse and therefore the proposal failed to comply with any of the relevant qualifying criteria specified within Policy 3 and SG Rural Development 1 of the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan, 2012

The Local Review Body also noted that the landholding had previously had other properties, the applicant had not explored any other options and that no planning condition or legal agreement could be imposed to restrict the occupancy of any new house which could then be sold on the open market.

After due consideration, the Local Review Body **agreed** to dismiss the Notice of Review and Uphold the Appointed Officer's decision to REFUSE Full Planning Permission for the reasons contained within the Decision Notice issued on 19 July, 2016.