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| --- |
| **Review Decision Notice** |

Decision by Fife Planning Review Body (the FPRB)

* Site Address: 1 Allan Robertson Drive, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 8EX
* Application for review by Ms Petra Ivan against the decision by an appointed officer of Fife Council
* Application 24/01899/FULL for Full Planning Permission for Installation of dormer extension to the front and rear of dwellinghouse and installation of replacement doors
* Application Drawings:

01 - Location and Site Plans, 02 - Existing various e.g. elevation, floor etc,   
03 - Proposed various - elevation, floor etc,

* No Site Inspection took place.

**Date of Decision Notice:** 13th May, 2025

**Decision**

The Fife Planning Review Body (FPRB) upholds the determination reviewed by them and refuses Planning Permission for the reason(s) outlined below in section 4.0.

**1.0** **Preliminary**

1.1 This Notice constitutes the formal decision notice of the Local Review Body as required by the Town and Country Planning (Schemes of Delegation and Local Review Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013.

1.2 The above application for Planning Permission was considered by the FPRB at its meeting on 28th April 2025.   The Review Body was attended by Councillors David Barratt (Convener), Jane Ann Liston, Altany Craik, Lynn Mowatt and Ken Caldwell. Councillor Jane Ann Liston declared an interest as the ward member and therefore did not take part in the determination of this local review.

**2.0** **Proposal**

2.1 This application relates to a semi-detached, two storey dwellinghouse which is situated on the corner of Roundhill Road and Allan Robertson Drive in St Andrews. It is set within a predominately residential area.

2.2 The application seeks planning permission to add two boxed dormer extensions to the front and rear elevations of the house. The dormers would convert the dwelling from a two to a four bedroom house. External finishes would include grey coloured GRP roofs (glass reinforced plastic), horizontal timber cladding, with windows described as matching the 'existing theme of street'.

**3.0** **Reasoning**

3.1 The FPRB assessed the design and visual impacts of the proposal against NPF4 Policies 14 (Design, Quality and Place) and 16 (Quality Homes); Policies 1 (Development Principles) and 10 (Amenity) of the Adopted FIFEplan; the Fife Council Planning Customer Guidelines on Dormer Extensions; and the Fife Council Guidelines on Minimum Distances Between Window Openings.  The FPRB examined the design and visual impact of the proposed development within the surrounding context. They considered whether there could be overlooking into neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed dormers. The FPRB agreed with the Case Officer’s assessment and concluded that the dormers would meet the relevant window-to-window separation distances as set out in the guidelines. They queried the proportion of glazing proposed and noted the preference within the guidance to maximise this in order to reduce the massing of the dormers. The FPRB assessed the proposed dormers against the minimum distances set out within the Fife Council Planning Customer Guidelines on Dormer Extensions and concluded that the dormers failed to comply with these requirements. They agreed with the Case Officer’s assessment in this regard.

3.2 The FPRB also agreed with the Appointed Officer’s position in relation to the other planning considerations that did not form part of the original refusal reasons.  They contended that these matters did not have any material impact in changing their position on this application and concluded that they should not be included as additional reasons for refusal in this instance.

3.3 Overall, the FPRB concluded that the proposal would result in unacceptable visual impacts therefore, failing to comply with NPF4 Policies 14 and 16; FIFEplan Policies 1 and 10; and the Fife Council Planning Customer Guidelines on Dormer Extensions. The FPRB did not consider there to be any other matters for consideration or any material considerations which would outweigh the Development Plan position.   The FPRB therefore decided that planning permission should be refused, upholding the Case Officer’s decision.

**4.0** **Decision**

4.1 The FPRB upholds the determination reviewed by them and refuses Planning Permission for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed dormers due to their excessive size and lack of suitably proportioned glazing would visually dominate the roof and would therefore have an adverse visual impact on the character of this dwellinghouse and would set an undesirable design precedent for any future dormers that may be proposed at a future date on this street. As such, the dormer proposals are considered contrary to National Planning Framework 4 (2023) Policies 14, 16 and Annex D - Six Qualities of Successful Places; Adopted FIFEplan Fife Local Development Plan (2017) Policies 1 and 10, and Fife Council's Planning Customer Guidelines on Dormer Extensions (2016).

……………………………………………..

Proper Officer

**NOTICE TO ACCOMPANY REFUSAL ETC.**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997**

*Notification to be sent to applicant on refusal of planning permission or*

*on the grant of permission subject to conditions*

**NOTICE TO ACCOMPANY REFUSAL ETC.**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997**

*Notification to be sent to applicant on determination by the planning authority of an application following a review conducted under section 43A(8).*

1. If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the planning authority -

(a) to refuse permission for the proposed development;

(b) to refuse approval, consent or agreement required by a condition imposed on a grant of planning permission; or

(c) to grant permission or approval, consent or agreement subject to conditions,

the applicant may question the validity of that decision by making an application to the Court of Session. An application to the Court of Session must be made within 6 weeks of the date of the decision.

2. If permission to develop land is refused or granted subject to conditions and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, the owner of the land may serve on the planning authority a purchase notice requiring the purchase of the owner of the land’s interest in the land in accordance with Part V of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.