

23 October 2017

Head of Governance and Law
Argyll and Bute Council
Kilmory
Lochgilphead
PA31 8RT

Dear Sir/Madam

**Proposed Additional Dwelling House at 32 Macleod Drive, Helensburgh, G84 9QU
Planning Application 16/01835/PP (Amended Plans)
Review Reference No 17/0008/LRB**

I wish to make the following points of relevance to the Local Review Body in relation to the submission from Cameron Planning. The paragraph numbers referred to are from that submission.

1.3 It is acknowledged that the following changes were made to the amended submission in February 2017.

- a) Proposed footprint reduced in scale
- b) Building footprint moved 2.3 metres towards Macleod Drive
- c) Ground floor level reduced by 400 mm

With reference to b) above I would draw the authority's attention to inaccuracies in the Location Plan submitted by the applicant's agent and repeated by the Cameron Consultancy reference figure 3.1 which shows the proposed building considerably further away from the heel of the pavement than indeed would be the actual situation. This error is misleading and misrepresents the proposed building's relationship in the context of surrounding properties. The porch entrance as shown on the amended site layout is a mere 2.1 metres from the heel of the pavement on Macleod Drive. This proximity of building to street frontage is not evident in any other locations within the area either in Macleod Drive or Paterson Drive. In general terms the proposed building breaches the natural building line established at the time of construction in the late 1960's and would form an unwelcome intrusion.

With reference to c) above it should be noted that with reference to the agent's submission, referring to the drawing sections submitted by the agent, that the level difference between the proposed building ground floor level and the heel of the pavement is approximately 900mm. This would require many more steps than are shown on the south elevation resulting in the entrance steps commencing in close proximity to the heel of the pavement.

- 2.4 The consultant makes reference to the proposals providing appropriate landscape treatment. It is my contention that the proposal destroys the existing landscape by the removal of 2 substantial trees and the mature hedge. The consultant refers to the Google street image contained in his submission. He further states that there will be the "*retention of the existing hedge where appropriate.*" However, examination of the proposed site layout plan clearly indicates the complete removal of the hedge and substitution with a 1.8 metre high wooden fence along a small section on the east boundary. In summary, the existing landscape features have been removed to accommodate development.
- 3.2/ I refute the suggestion that "*the decision notice includes a single reason for refusal.*" The
3.3 notice clearly and specifically points out the various reasons which lead the authority to reach their conclusion that the proposals could not be supported.
- 3.5 The Location Plan, as before noted, incorrectly shows the position of the proposed dwelling within the proposed development site and therefore does not reflect its true position within the streetscape and thus provides misleading information. Please refer to the attached Plan A prepared by a professional architect and which is based on the dimensions noted on the site

layout plan submitted by the applicant's agent.

- 3.7/ With paragraphs 3.7 to 3.10 the consultant presents the case that the existing property at
3.10 no. 32 Macleod Drive is "*not in keeping with the estate development*" and the "*donor plot has no relationship to the modern estate.*" It is considered that the existing cottage and grounds represent a period in time which the consultant's historic map of 1914 Edition adequately conveys. It is my contention that this railway cottage sits comfortably within its surroundings and would be very much compromised if the proposals being reconsidered were approved
- 3.13 I refer to Plan A which accompanies this submission and which clearly demonstrates that the corrected siting of the proposed dwelling house would be visually intrusive and would project well beyond an established building line along the street frontage.
- 3.20 The suggestion that "*the new dwelling would have the effect of providing a more open aspect, in keeping with other properties*" is refuted on the basis that the long hedge row as exists acts as a suitable landscape break between the smaller estate houses of one developer and the larger houses to the east .

Summary

The amended plans submitted in February 2017 were in response to concerns raised in relation to the initial application. In order to attempt to overcome the window to window distance between the donor property and the new dwelling house, the proposed building has been moved 2.3 metres nearer to Macleod Drive the result of which it leaves the front porch (building line) a mere 2.1 metres from the heel of the pavement. It is of great significance that this has not been correctly shown on the location plan submitted and as a result provides a false relationship between the building and its surroundings. The corrected siting of the proposed house confirms the conclusions stated in the refusal notice that the proposed development is visually intrusive and visually discordant.

The proposals represent over development in as much as mature hedging and trees have been removed in an attempt to create sufficient area for development. Furthermore the siting of the proposed house could be described as " back land development in reverse. "

Approval of this application would be an unwelcome addition to the housing stock.

I would also request that the comments contained in my letter dated 20 February 2017 and my email dated 13 July 2016 are considered by the Local Review Body.

Yours sincerely



Elizabeth A. B. Jamieson (Mrs)

Attachment - Plan A



© Crown copyright and database rights 2017 Ordnance Survey 100048957. The representation of road, track or path is no evidence of a boundary or right of way. The representation of features as lines is no evidence of a property boundary.

Supplied by: www.ukmapcentre.com
Serial No: 125620
Centre Coordinates: 229043, 683648
Production Date: 16/10/2017 13:54:14

PLAN 'A'