

24 July 2012

Review Reference Number: 11/0013/LRB

Planning Application: 11/00732/PP

Comments on the Statement of Case dated 10th January 2012

On the comments that the Croft is not impacted:

The site area bounded in red represents approximately 10% of land on the small croft and it is likely that I would want to work part of this area (the house footprint is only 100sqm). As the planning department point out, within inches there is permitted development across the rest of the croft for agricultural purposes. It may well produce a ridiculous situation of potential partial planning permission application / permitted development scenarios, with the greater restrictions applied when further from any views.

On the comments regarding treatment of boundaries:

As per above, if we were to site fencing just outside the site boundary then the restrictions do not apply. I would have thought that a simple condition restricting boundary treatment to the description provided by the planning authority of 'Low Stone walling with or without a wire top, or a stockproof rylock and post fence' would suffice. This would save on a proliferation of process and cost.

On the comments to restrict Permitted Development other than boundaries:

Permitted Development limits development to ensure minimal visual impact of any extensions or other buildings. They would have to be further from the road and limited in size, with no increase in roof height. Therefore, any potential development would have to be small scale and even further west out of the views to the coast. As mentioned by the planning department in the comment, travelling East there is still visibility, but with a rocky backdrop and not the coastal views that are well to the right. At the roads nearest point the dwelling is 70m away and is left of views to the coast. So I would see permitted development as being able to serve its purpose in this case.



Figure 1: View travelling East – Photo montage with dwelling in the centre

In support the Isle of Coll Sustainable Design Guide states in this area: '**Croft**houses; these share the characteristics of the smaller croft houses described on the preceding pages. These are often larger than their equivalent to the north of the island and their massing is broken up by often smaller extensions to either side.' So small extensions are normal and I believe no such conditions apply in neighbouring properties at Clabhach.

As an example, I may be looking at a small poultry shed close to the house. This would be reasonably straightforward on croft land nearer to the views, but would need a full planning application if further west, when next to or beyond the house out of view.

On the comment of no application fee:

Whilst the planning department quite rightly point out that there is no application fee, this does involve considerable cost and additional work for both me and even more so for the Council. It also impacts other agencies that would have to comment.

In summary:

Unlike a number of recent developments on Coll that reflect a more modern approach, my intention has been to create a house that is in character with the area, as I hope is self evident in the traditional cottage design and sensitive siting. The house was sited specifically to prevent encroaching on views, further out of view in fact than a previous Planning Department recommendation. Any Permitted Development would have minimal impact on this. I believe:

- Permitted Development provides adequate control in this case; any potential development on the site other than boundaries can only be small scale and further west out of the view of the coastline. Planning permission was granted on the site for being 'offset from the main coastal views'
- The condition does impact the croft and can create an absurd situation of part planning permission application and part permitted development across the development site boundaries, with greater restrictions away from the views
- This condition is likely to cost myself, and the council, time and money better spent on more productive work

Ian Rae