A K M c I L V R I D E ARCHITECTURAL ILLUSTRATION

Further Information Submission per Review Ref; 17/0007/LRB

Land West of Fire Station, Kilmelford, Argyll and Bute.

To All Parties with an Interest,

Further to the first review report of the LRB, as the Applicants Agent, would note the following:

We are dismayed at the suggestion that a service bay should now be considered on the opposite side of the carriageway from the Applicants site. We have no idea where this suggestion came from.

My client has sought the Review of the need for a service bay appended to his site entrance by the utilization of the EXISTING and ADJACENT Service Bay adjacent to his Site (in front of the Fire Station) as detailed on plans submitted earlier and again with this submission.

This Service Bay is the subject of the review and has been discussed on various occasions with the Roads Dept and indeed the extent of which was the subject of My enquiry to Mr Stewart Watson for clarifications which was not responded to.

It is difficult not to feel that a lot of Valuable Public Resource is being misspent on this unhappy procedure, and that such could have been avoided had consistent communications been in place during the standard Planning Application Consultation Period. However we welcome the site visit by concerned parties to clarify the Councils View.

The Main point of the review is that there is a generous service bay effectively appended to the site For Clarity, my client is not and has never been minded to sponsor a service bay on the opposite side of the road. in front of the fire station, which would facilitate my clients site and the needs of service providers perfectly well.

Secondarily is the debilitating area required from this already constrained site by a further service bay, a few meters along the road from the existing one.

With regard to the concern raised about visibility, attention is drawn to the need for the existing ground level within the Application Site to raise the Existing Ground Level some 150-200mm, this to compensate for an elevated Ground Floor Datum required in terms of future Flood Risk. All contained and detailed within the Planning Approval. Ref 17/01092. This will bring the effective height of the wall to less than the statutory requirement, and so offer no restriction to clear site lines.

Further to ongoing discussions with The Planning Department it should be noted that they do not have any objection to the aesthetic of the Wall as detailed within the "Approved" Set of Plans.

They have confirmed that there has been no objection from the Community Council to the aesthetic of the wall. (there was an enquiry pertaining to procedure when the Wall was built in advance of the Application being Submitted.)

That they have no procedural objection to my clients intention to reduce the corner of wall to present the intended configuration for the pending, and greatly appreciated, Site Visit.

There will also be posts on site to illustrate the intended repositioning of the Access gates allowing for a cars length between carriageway and gate.

It is hoped that there will be an opportunity for the Roads Dept to clarify what is meant by "Setting the Wall back by 1000mm", from existing position or from the road "edge".

Thank you for your consideration,

Regards

Andrew Kullado. Andrew K McIlvride

Agent for the Application.

Enc

Comparative Plan showing wall alignment as exist and proposed. Highlighting "Existing Service Bay" AR/239/B/08.

Site and Proximity Plan showing effective special requirement of an Additional Service Bay.AR/239/B/02 rev B.

note email from From Scott forwarded electronically.

Hanks.

The Studio @ Lunga Mill, Ardfern, Argyll, PA318uu 077961 84004 akmcilvride@yahoo.co.uk



