

**MINUTES of MEETING of PLANNING, PROTECTIVE SERVICES AND LICENSING COMMITTEE
held in the KINTYRE COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTRE, STEWART ROAD, CAMPBELTOWN
on MONDAY, 5 SEPTEMBER 2011**

Present: Councillor Daniel Kelly (Chair)

Councillor Rory Colville
Councillor David Kinniburgh
Councillor Donald MacMillan

Councillor Roderick McCuish
Councillor Alex McNaughton

Attending: Mr Charles Reppke, Head of Governance and Law
Mr Peter Bain, Planning Officer
Mr Malcolm MacDonald, Applicant
Mr James Ross, Roads Officer
Mrs Lorraine MacPhail, West Kintyre Community Council
Mr Saunders, Objector
Mrs Saunders, Objector
Mr Baker, Objector
Ms McAllister, Objector

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were intimated from Councillors Gordon Chalmers, Robin Currie, Vivien Dance, Mary-Jean Devon, Bruce Marshall, Neil Mackay, Alister MacAlister, James McQueen and Al Reay.

2. MR M MACDONALD: APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO FORM 9 HARD STANDING AREAS FOR HOLIDAY LET LODGES/CARAVANS, FORMATION OF NEW ACCESS AND INSTALLATION OF TREATMENT PLANT WITH PARTIAL SOAKAWAY: LAND SOUTH OF BELLOCHANTUY COTTAGES, CAMPBELTOWN (REF: 11/00281/PP)

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made.

Mr Charles Reppke, Head of Governance and Law, outlined the hearing procedure and invited anyone who wished to speak at the meeting to identify themselves and once that process had been completed the Chair invited the Planning Department to set out their recommendations.

Mr Peter Bain presented the case on behalf of the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services. He advised that the planning application was for the installation of 9 hard standing areas for siting of holiday let/caravans, formation of new access and installation of treatment plant and partial soakaway on land south of Bellochantuy Cottages, Bellochantuy. He also made reference to the planning history of the site which had a consent for 5 houses still live. He advised that the original application had been for 10 hard standings and a site managers office and that this had been revised and reduced to 9 hard standings and the removal of the site managers office. He confirmed that the site was located within the 'settlement' zone for Bellochantuy and was the subject of policy STRAT DC 1 of the approved structure plan and LP TOUR 1 of the adopted local plan and that these policies supported the principle of

development of tourism development in the 'settlement' boundary subject to certain stipulations including size of the development and appropriateness of the site. He advised that the proposal including landscaping belt to the north and west of the site which would secure the privacy of the residential dwellings to the north of the site. He advised that apart from the Community Council, no objections had been received from the statutory consultees. With regard to the access, he advised that the existing access from the A83 which serves the existing development to the north of the site would be used. He advised that while the Roads Department had no objections they had stipulated a number of conditions and that these were numbered 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 as detailed in the Planning report. He advised that condition 5 referred to 10 car parking spaces and that this should be amended to read 9 car parking spaces to reflect the adjustment made to the original application. He advised that the proposal was the subject of objections from eight individuals and from the West Kintyre Community Council and that the reasons for these objections were summarised in the Planning report. He referred in particular to the issue of flooding which had been raised by the objectors and highlighted to the Committee on a series of slides the drainage arrangements which are in place on the site at the moment. He referred to recent flooding and that this appeared to have been caused by a blocked culvert which he showed in a photograph. He confirmed that he had spoken with SEPA and that they had confirmed that the site was out with the coastal flooding risk zone according to the SEPA map. SEPA had also confirmed they were not aware of any flooding issues in this area and that the likely cause would be surface water due to drainage issues. Finally, Mr Bain referred to the proposed crossing area from the site to the beach and hotel which would be situated at the south east end of the site and that there would be good visibility to cross the road at this area. He advised that notwithstanding the issues raised by the third parties and the Community Council he recommended approval of the planning application subject to the conditions detailed in the Planning report.

APPLICANT

The Applicant, Mr Malcolm MacDonald, advised that he was co-owner of the Bellochantuy Hotel and that he saw his proposal as assisting with the economical viability of the hotel and the life blood of the local community. He advised that he had missed the first meeting of the Community Council when his application had been discussed but confirmed that his business partner had attended the second meeting and he hoped that a lot of the issues raised at this meeting had been addressed. He referred to the flooding issue and advised that he had not been aware of a problem and that this would be addressed within his proposal. He referred to his existing planning approval for the erection of 5 dwelling houses on the site. He advised that he had thought long and hard about what to do with the site in the current economic climate and did not feel he could add anything further to what Planning had already said.

STATUTORY CONSULTTEES

Mr James Ross, on behalf of the Roads Authority, commented on the road safety issues raised by the objectors and highlighted on the slides the proposed crossing point from the site to the beach and hotel. He advised that there would be a hard standing on both sides of the road and that there would also be a pedestrian guard rail erected in a chicane type fashion on the side nearest the

site. He advised that on the beach side of the road there would be a ramp down to the old A83 road and that the Applicant had agreed to clear this back and maintain it with a footway running down towards the hotel. He advised that he was comfortable that there would be good visibility at the crossing area and that the Applicant had also been asked to erect 'pedestrian in road ahead' signs. He referred to the possibility of a pedestrian access from the existing residential development into the north of the site and running along the west of site to the crossing area to enable the local residents of Bellochinty to also walk safely to the crossing point. He advised that he was not sure if the Applicant could consider this as this was not a condition that could be imposed on the application.

Mrs Lorraine MacPhail, on behalf of West Kintyre Community Council, advised that their main issue of concern was road safety and stated that it would be their preference for speed restrictions to be put in place along the same lines as at Kilchenzie. She also referred to the vehicular access to the site which would result in visitors to the site driving past residential houses and that there was already limited space here for residents to park their cars and that the Community Council did not think this road was capable of supporting a lot of traffic back and forward. She also referred to noise, indicating that the noise people would make when sitting outside their caravans late at night would carry across to local residents. She referred to the hedges that would be planted to assist with blocking out this noise, and queried whether or not the farmer's access to his field had been taken into consideration when deciding where the hedges would be planted. As a side issue she also raised concerns about the types of people who would accommodate the caravans. She advised that there had been recently a methadone clinic set up at the local GP clinic and sought a guarantee from the Council that, as a short term measure, they would not be housing people using this clinic in the caravans.

OBJECTORS

Mr Saunders, on behalf of his wife, spoke about flooding in the area and circulated to the Committee a copy of the Campbeltown Courier which showed the flooding which had taken place in this area the previous year. He referred to the burn and advised that the farmer cleaned this out twice a year but it kept being blocked every time there was heavy rain. He stated that he was worried about the septic tank that would be installed and whether or not it would cope with this flooding. Mr Saunders also referred to the proposed crossing area and stated that he did not believe that this crossing would be used and that people would take the shortest route across the road rather than walk down to the proper crossing. He referred again to the septic tank which could potentially be used by up to 45/60 people staying in the 9 caravans and queried how big the septic tank would be. He stated that he had no objections to houses being erected on this site and that this proposal was just to enable a private business to get bigger. He also referred to the farmer needing a 12 foot access into his field and that he would be requiring to access this field on a more regular basis as he proposed turning his field into a market garden. He advised that his main concern was the flooding issue and the septic tank and queried whether or not residents could receive a guarantee that if flooding was to occur they could make a claim against Mr MacDonald and the Council for allowing this to happen. Finally, he queried what the distance would be between each caravan.

Mr Baker advised that Mr Saunders had covered most of the issues he wished to raise. He advised that his main concern was the road and that there was no path on either side of the road that residents could walk on. He advised that he also believed that people would not use the proposed crossing area. He advised that he had no objection to the permission previously granted for 5 dwellings on the site.

QUESTIONS

Councillor McCuish asked the Applicant to confirm how much space would be allocated between each of the caravans. Mr MacDonald confirmed that there would be at least 6 metres which was the standard laid down by the caravan industry.

Councillor McCuish asked Planning to explain why SEPA had no evidence that this was a high risk area for flooding. Mr Bain advised that he could not explain the disparity and confirmed that no concerns about flooding had been raised from residents when the previous application for 5 dwellings had been submitted. He advised that he had been in contact with SEPA who confirmed that this area was not designated a flood risk and was not on the maps and that the local office had not received any complaints about flooding.

Councillor Kinniburgh asked Roads to point out the proposed crossing area on the slides. Mr Ross did so and confirmed that the access to the crossing area would be at the south end of the site near the road side and that the hard standing would be directly opposite the old A83 road. He stated that a fence would be erected between the hedge and the road running along the west side of the site to screen car lights and to protect children on the site running out onto the road. He also pointed out where the pedestrian guard rails would be sited and referred again to the chicane feature of these rails. He advised that you could not predict where people would wish to exit the site but would presume that they would wish to exit the site to the south which was nearest to the hotel rather than to the north end of the site.

Councillor Kinniburgh referred to the site visit which had taken place prior to this meeting and asked if it would be possible to place a speed restriction on this area and, if it were possible, would there be any point in it. Mr Ross advised that speed restrictions in this area had been asked for on a number of occasions over the years and that assessments had been carried out and the road did not meet the required criteria for speed restrictions to be put in place. He advised that speed restrictions should be self enforcing. He stated that as there was no street lighting and no footpath to encourage slower speeds, he had asked for 'pedestrian ahead' signs to be placed further north on the road to warn drivers of the possibility of people being on the road.

Councillor Colville referred to the existing planning permission for 5 dwellings and also referred to the pink 'settlement' zone on the local plan. He asked if the Committee were to grant planning permission would there no longer be the opportunity for affordable housing in this area and would the new local plan take cognisance of that. Mr Bain advised that he could not give a guarantee and that there was no affordable housing requirement within the existing planning permission for 5 dwellings and that this application was not viable due to the current economic climate.

Councillor Colville referred to the Development Plan policies and quoted the terms of Policy LP TRAN 3. He queried whether this Policy should have been taken into consideration as no reference was made to it within the Planning report. Mr Bain confirmed that LP TRAN 3 should have been referenced in the report and confirmed that consideration of it had, nevertheless, been taken into account in respect of safe access from the site.

Councillor Colville asked if this was a material change and would it allow Roads to relook at speed restrictions on the road. Mr Ross confirmed that the road would still not meet the criteria. Councillor Colville advised that this was fast stretch of road and it was common knowledge that a number of incidents of speeding had been reported to the Procurator Fiscal.

Councillor Colville referred to the raised area next to the south side of the site and asked if approval of this planning application would prevent development on this site where the raised area was. Mr Bain advised that the area Councillor Colville was referring to was out with the application site and it was out with the 'settlement' zone.

Councillor Colville referred to the site already being raised by 6 inches and asked how confident Planning were that condition 3 in his report would address the flooding issue. Mr Bain advised that the purpose of condition 3 would be to maintain what was there before and may well have the ability to improve the situation.

Councillor Colville asked the Applicant to confirm whether he thought the flooding issue was out with his control. Mr MacDonald referred to the silt trap that was there and that it was his opinion that this had been neglected and that the farmer needed to be mindful of this.

Councillor Colville referred to the suggestion that the Applicant could allow neighbouring residents access through his site to the proposed crossing area and felt that this would not be an appropriate request to make and that this would disturb the caravanners. He asked if there would be anything to prevent a pathway being made available between the fence which would be erected in front of the hedge and the road way inside the red line boundary of the application site. Mr MacDonald advised that he would be happy to look at this. Mr Bain advised he could certainly engage with the Applicant in this respect but that it would be for the Applicant to volunteer this proposal and not something that could be imposed by way of a condition.

Councillor Kelly advised that this was perhaps something that the Applicant, Roads and Planning could investigate further.

Councillor Kelly asked Mr Ross if he wished to respond to an earlier question in respect of flooding. Mr Ross advised that spot checks could be carried out by local Roads Officers to make sure the farmer was regularly unblocking the culvert to prevent drainage problems and flooding of the area. He advised that he would take this up with the local Roads Office to ask that they approach the farmer to make it clear to him that it was his responsibility to clear any blockages and that the Council could recover expenses from the farmer if they needed to act on any flooding that occurred.

Councillor Colville referred to policy LP ENV 1 – Impact on general environment and asked if the Committee approved this planning application would it be the Planning Officer's opinion that this would mean unimpeded or enhanced access to the site from the beach is supplied by having to cross the A83 and, if not, would it not be more appropriate for traffic calming or speed restrictions in this area. Mr Bain advised that existing conditions would need to be looked at and it would be no more of an impediment than what is there for existing residents. He advised that there are no physical barriers preventing people from accessing the beach or hotel and that the road needed to be approached with care.

Councillor McCuish asked the objectors if he was correct in assuming that they originally thought the proposed pedestrian access to cross the road was at the north end of the site as they appeared surprised when the Roads Officer pointed out that it would be at the south end of the site. The objectors confirmed that this was the case.

Councillor McCuish then asked the objectors if this gave them comfort that the proposed access was not at the north end of the site. Mrs MacPhail advised that it did not.

Councillor McCuish asked what would intensify traffic more, 5 dwellings or 9 caravans. Mr Ross advised that in his opinion the 5 dwellings would generate more traffic as each house could have possibly 2 or 3 cars each coming and going from the properties at all times of the day and that they would also receive visitors with their own cars to the properties. In the case of the caravans, it was his opinion that holiday makers would use this site as a base and perhaps leave to tour about the area in the morning and return again in the evening. He advised that there was even the possibility that those people staying at the caravan site would arrive by bus and spend the rest of their holiday on the beach.

Councillor Colville referred to other factors in this area such as the bus stop, the hotel, and the end of road farm sales which generated a lot of traffic. He asked if Planning were aware of these other constraints. Mr Bain advised that he was.

Councillor Kinniburgh asked Roads if the bend in the road beyond the hotel led to a tendency for traffic to slow down. Mr Ross advised that he did not think the bend was severe enough. He advised that it may reduce the speed slightly but not noticeably. He advised that the proposed pedestrian access onto the road had visibility sightlines of in excess of 160 metres which would have been a condition for a vehicular access. He also advised that calculations had been made and it was considered that pedestrians would need 7.2 seconds to cross the road and that this was achievable at this area.

Councillor Kinniburgh asked the Community Council what their opinion was about the bend in the road. Mrs MacPhail advised that the bend in the road did not slow traffic down and she also stated that she found it difficult to believe that a parent with more than one child of differing ages would be able to cross the road safely in 7.2 seconds. She advised that this was a dangerous stretch of road.

Councillor Kinniburgh asked if there had ever been an accident involving a

pedestrian on this stretch of the road. Mr Saunders confirmed that there had been an accident involving 1 person.

Councillor Colville asked the Community Council if they believed this stretch of the road encouraged a lot of overtaking. Mrs MacPhail advised that she would agree with this statement.

Councillor McCuish asked the objectors if they regularly crossed the road. Mr Baker advised that residents regularly crossed the road to access the post box and recycling facilities at the hotel. He confirmed that you had to quickly jump on to the grass verge when traffic was passing.

Councillor Kinniburgh asked the Applicant to confirm how big his caravans were likely to be. Mr MacDonald advised that they would likely be no more than 4 or 6 berths.

SUMMING UP

Planning Authority

Mr Bain advised that having heard from the objectors and the Community Council it was very apparent they were not objecting to development of the site if it were the 5 dwelling houses. He referred to objectors' concerns regarding privacy, pedestrian safety, nature of operation of the site and flooding issues which related to surface water and drainage. He advised that it was his point of view that it was possibly within the scope of the application to provide a safe crossing point. He advised that he would dispute that there was a flooding issue and thought it odd that this was not raised at the time of the application submitted for the 5 dwelling houses and he took this to mean that the current problem was due to drainage issues. He advised that the condition being imposed in respect of flooding would seek to neutralise the position over and above development of the site. He advised that having regard to the issues raised and taking into the consideration the provisions of the Development Plan he recommended approval of the planning application subject to the conditions detailed in the Planning report.

Applicant

Mr MacDonald advised that he had nothing further to add.

Statutory Consultees

Mr Ross confirmed that the location of the crossing point and use of the old part of the A83 would result in there only being a short distance that residents would have to walk on the road especially if pedestrian access through the caravan site was made available by the Applicant.

Mrs MacPhail acknowledged that the hotel was well used and was a well established part of the community and that it made sense to make sure they were in a viable position. She advised that the Community Council's main concern was traffic going back and forward in front of residents' houses and that pedestrian road safety was a great concern.

Objectors

Mr Saunders advised that his main concern was flooding and any sewage problems that may occur if the septic tank were to back up. He advised that the farmer regularly cleared the pipe but it blocked every time there was heavy rain and that the farmer couldn't be there 24/7 to deal with this problem.

Mr Baker advised that he had nothing further to add.

The Chair asked all parties whether they had received a fair hearing and this was confirmed.

DEBATE

Councillor Colville advised that he was not against the proposal which would enhance this vibrant community, however he was very concerned about road safety and referred to a child having been killed in Muasdale and it was his fear that this could happen again. He referred to the suggestion of 'pedestrian ahead' road signs and advised that it was his opinion that people would not pay attention to these signs. He advised that people have been complaining about there being no signs showing where the Kintyre Way was when, in fact, there were signs there and that people just did not see them. He advised that signs warning of pedestrians on the road would not give him faith and that he would like a condition added that the road must have a speed restriction of 40 mph if the planning application were to be approved. He also asked that the final details of the flooding condition should be determined in consultation with the Chair and Local Member.

Councillor Kelly asked for advice on whether or not a 40 mph speed restriction condition could be imposed.

Mr Reppke advised that Members had heard from the Roads representative during the hearing that the road did not meet the criteria to allow for a 40 mph speed restriction, and Members would have difficulty imposing this as a planning condition if the criteria could not be met as the condition would require to be a suspensive one. He advised that if Members wished to look at this further they should consider continuing the application until further advice was sought from the Head of Roads and that they would not be able to impose this condition on the application today.

Councillor McCuish advised that it was his belief that if planning permission were to be granted today this would lead to a material change in circumstances and would allow the Roads Department to relook at the criteria for the road been restricted to 40 mph. He believed that there was a better chance of the road being subjected to a 40 mph speed restriction as a result of the increase in traffic from the caravan site. With regard to the flooding issue, he felt that it would be in the Applicant's interest not to have his land flooded and that he would do everything possible to prevent this happening.

Councillor Colville advised that he respected the advice given by Mr Reppke. He advised that he had also taken advice from the Senior Planning Officer in advance of this meeting and felt he would be able to provide a competent motion to impose a condition in respect of a 40 mph speed restriction.

Mr Reppke stressed that Members could not impose a planning condition if it could not be given effect to and that their decision could be the subject of challenge. He advised that Roads had already confirmed that the road did not support a 40 mph speed restriction and that further advice would need to be sought from the Head of Roads and the Head of Planning. He advised that Planning would not normally impose a condition that could not be given effect to and that it was not in the competence of this Committee to impose the 40 mph speed restriction.

Councillor Kelly advised that he could understand where Councillor Colville was coming from in respect of the concerns he has raised.

Councillor Kinniburgh advised that he agreed with Councillor McCuish's statement regarding flooding. With regard to road safety, he advised that he would have reservations about a 40 mph speed restriction and believed that it would be very difficult to enforce. He accepted the point Councillor Colville made about the road signs and that this was his concern also and asked if it would be possible to have flashing lights to draw attention to the road signs. He advised that he could support the Planning Officer's recommendation if condition 9 could be looked at again in this respect.

Councillor Kelly advised that he was sure Roads would take on board every concern raised.

Mr Reppke advised that in regard to Councillor Kinniburgh's comments about flashing road signs, Members would have to come up with a competent motion to change condition 9 and again he would recommend continuing consideration of this application until clarity was sought from the Head of Roads in this respect.

Councillor McNaughton advised that he understood that development was required for this small village if it meant there was a future for it and that he would not like to be seen to be not supporting developments like this. He advised that he also had concerns about the road and hoped that something could be done to slow the traffic down. He advised that he also agreed with Councillor McCuish's comments in respect of flooding and that it was in the interest of the Applicant not to have his land flooded and that he was happy to support the application at this stage.

Councillor MacMillan advised that he had faith in the Planners and Roads and was happy to support the application.

Councillor Colville advised that he did not wish to impose planning costs on the Applicant in respect of erecting roads signs. From the history of this area it was quite clear that the local community have been asking for a speed limit for a number of years. He also advised that he could not support the application without further investigation.

Motion

Councillor Kelly advised that the issue of flooding, road safety and speed restrictions had been well discussed and moved to approve the Planning Application subject to the conditions and reasons as recommended by the

Planning Department with the exception of condition 3 which should be amended to include the provision that the final details of this would be agreed in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of this Committee and with the Local Member.

Moved by Councillor Kelly, seconded by Councillor McCuish.

Amendment

To continue consideration of this application until such times as guidance has been sought from the Head of Roads on the various road safety matters.

Moved by Councillor Colville, seconded by Councillor Kinniburgh.

Decision

The Motion was carried by 4 votes to 2 and the Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions and reasons:-

1. The proposed holiday letting units hereby approved shall not be occupied by any one person, family or group for any more than three months in any one calendar year, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority

Reason: In accordance with the proposed use, as the holiday letting unit by reason of its siting and lack of curtilage would be unsuitable for use as permanent residential accommodation.

2. Prior to the commencement of works, the exact specifications, appearance, materials and orientation of the proposed units shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt the caravans should be timber clad unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained as such unless any subsequent variation thereof is agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual and site amenity.

3. No development shall commence on site until details of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) have been submitted and approved by the Planning Authority in writing in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning, Protective Services and Licensing Committee and with the Local Member. Such details shall include a drainage layout plan which shall include full details of the surface and foul water discharge from the site and shall include any mitigation measures required to address surface water runoff from the site. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with this plan.

Reason: To ensure that there is a satisfactory drainage system in place for the development in the interests of health and amenity.

4. Prior to the occupation of any of the proposed lodges/caravans a dropped kerb shall be installed between the public and private road. The private access road is to be surfaced for a minimum distance of 5 metres from the connection to the public road. Additionally, the proposed private access road should not encroach on the public road drainage ditch, with a minimum separation of 2 metres from the back of the road side ditch.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

5. Prior to the commencement of works, a site plan demonstrating parking for a minimum of 1 vehicle per plot with a total minimum number of 9 spaces provided shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Area Roads Manager. These spaces will be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any of the approved plots.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

6. A refuse collection point is to be provided adjacent to the public road, in accordance with details which shall be agreed in advance in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Area Roads Manager.

Reason: In the interests of site management, waste management and amenity of site users.

7. The development shall not begin until details of a scheme of boundary treatment, surface treatment and landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council, as Planning Authority: Details of the scheme to include –

- i) location and design, including materials, of any walls, fences, hedges and gates;
- ii) surface treatment of means of access and hardstanding areas;
- iii) screening in the form of hedging and/or fencing to be provided along the site boundary between the private and public road.

All the hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the scheme approved in writing by the Council as planning authority, within six months of the site being brought into use for the approved purpose. This plan shall be consistent with the suggestions made by the Local Biodiversity Officer under the consultation response dated 27/7/11. All planting, seeding or turfing as may be comprised in the approved details shall be carried out in the first planting season following the commencement of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Council, as Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, in order to integrate the development with its surroundings and maintain the landscape character of the area.

8. Prior to the commencement of occupation of any of the any of the proposed lodges/caravans, the existing vehicular field access at the south-west of the application site shall be restricted to pedestrian use only with bollards or a fence installed to prevent vehicles from taking access. This pedestrian access shall have a fence or railing positioned between the site boundary and public road and a hard standing will be provided adjacent to the pedestrian access and on the public road verge opposite. The exact details of this crossing point shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Area Roads Manager prior to implementation.

Reason: To prevent the potential use of two vehicular access points, the provision of a safe, pedestrian only access and in the interests of road safety.

9. No occupation of any of the proposed lodges/caravans shall be permitted until 'Pedestrians in Road Ahead' signs have been installed on the A83 Kennacraig - Campbeltown Road (Sign Diagram 544.1). The exact location of the signs shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority in consultation with the Area Roads Manager.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

10. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the details specified on the application form dated 17/2/11 and the approved drawing reference numbers:

Plan 1 of 2 (Location Plan at scale of 1:2500)

Plan 2 of 2 (Site Plan at scale of 1:500)

unless the prior written approval of the planning authority is obtained for other materials/finishes/for an amendment to the approved details under Section 64 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended).

Reason: For the purpose of clarity, to ensure that the development is implemented in accordance with the approved details.

(Reference: Report by Head of Planning and Regulatory Services dated 13 July 2011, submitted)