

**BARESSAN
TAYNUILT
ARGYLL
PA35 1HY**

12.06.2014

Argyll & Bute Council
at
localreviewprocess@argyll-bute.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

**Local Review Body ref: 14/0005/LRB
Planning Application ref: 13/02178/PPP
Land South of Dugarro, Taynuilt**

I refer to the Local Review Statement prepared by Houghton Planning Ltd & would like to answer some of the points raised in this document as follows:-

1. Page 1, para 5, states - *"It is interesting to note that whilst the owners of Baressan, which adjoins the site, have objected, the owners of Dugarro, which is referred to in the reasons for refusal have not."*

I am not quite sure what point the Applicants are trying to make here. If they are implying that the owner of Dugarro has no objections then I would suggest that it could be otherwise. Silence cannot be construed either way. In any case Planning Law is there to protect the community as a whole not just one owner at one specific point in time.

2. Page 2, para 5, states - *"It is already used as a main access by Baressan."*

It is also the main access for Tullich & a subsidiary access for Craig Mor & the crofters - the latter for feeding cattle. All the service vehicles for Tullich & Baressan use this access.

3. Page 2, para 7, states - *"The trees are not the subject of a TPO, according to the TPO map on the Council's web site. As such, they can be removed without consent, not that there is any intension of doing so."*

This is a good point. I assume that the Applicants have no intention of removing lots of trees but what about any new owners? Would it not be in the best interests of the local community for the Council to make a TPO on all the semi-mature oaks?

4. Page 3, para 3, states - *"The oaks are just visible through this planting, set well back from the road, but it is doubtful whether the loss of a single oak would have a significant impact upon what should remain a thick screen of planting."*

Is the main point not being missed here. The removal of one oak tree is bad enough but it is the removal of a beautiful open space from community enjoyment that should be prevented.

5. Page 3, para 3, states - *"The oak, which is the subject of removal, is really only important to anyone walking along the track and, as this is a private road, really only to anyone attending at Baressan."*

The road in question is the old public road & is used extensively, on a daily basis, for walking, dog exercising & as a wild play area for local children. It is dangerous for people to walk up the main road due to the bad corner.

6. Page 3, para 5, states - *"Yes, a new dwelling on the application site will be higher, but an overbearing impact is on a person, not a building. The fact that the owners of this dwelling have not objected, perhaps suggests that this issue has been overplayed."*

It is of little concern whether the correct use has been made of the word overbearing. The point is that the proposals constitute over-development. Many new developments these days have to incorporate a play area. This site is the play area for Lonan road & beyond & should be retained as such.

The present owner of Dugarro has not objected, for whatever reason, but I can imagine a future owner being rather put out if, as the trees on the Northern boundary of the site grow up, they are cut down to maintain the view from the application site to Loch Etive. The Applicants have warn of this themselves on page 5, para 3, of their submission.

7. Page 4, para 2, states - *"The occupiers of this property (Baressan) would be likely to see the new dwelling on a day to day basis....."*

As a joint owner of Baressan I am well aware of this but the main thrust of our objections is the loss of amenity to the whole community, of which who ever is in Baressan, or Dugarro, in the future, will be part.

8. Page 4, para 5 states - *"... the overall impact on the character of this part of the settlement will be limited."*

This is not correct. The overall impact will be very considerable. The loss of this amenity area will adversely affect every outdoor loving person who lives in the vicinity, including the village itself.

9. Page 5, para 1, states – *“where we disagree is that building a new dwelling on the application site would somehow unacceptably tip the balance towards built form overwhelming the greenery and open spaces.”*

The reason why the balance would be unacceptably tipped is the conversion of a public open space to a private house & garden.

Yours faithfully,

Lorne Brown FRICS & Eive Brown.