

From: Jim Duncan
Sent: 13 April 2020 22:01
To: localreviewprocess
Cc: McCallum, Fiona; Linda Duncan
Subject: Notice of Review Reference 20/0007/LRB. (Planning Ref:
19/01573/PP - Duneira, Pier Road, Rhu, G84 8LH)
Attachments: Duneira JD.pages; Duneira LJD.pages

Local Review Body
Committee Services
Argyll & Bute Council
Kilmory
Lochgilphead
PA31 8RT

13th April 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

Review Reference 20/0007/LRB. Duneira, Pier Road, Rhu, G84 8LQ

Our objections to the original planning application 19/01573/PP still remain and are attached below.

In light of the appeal 20/0007/LRB we would like to make the following additional comments.

Information is lacking on what type of "training" is proposed, what duration, start and stop times, how many days per week.

There is also a lack of information detailing how many people in total will be in attendance at the "training courses" or how many staff will be there. The submission now says 14 plus staff. It is also proposed that meals will be delivered and there will be other service providers attending daily. It is clear that this proposed development would produce an unspecified number of additional daily vehicle movements in and out of Duneira.

Car parking areas have now been illustrated on the drawing on the Appeal document 20/0007/LRB . It is for 11 cars. However 8 parking spaces are proposed to be situated adjacent to the boundaries of the only 2 neighbouring residential homes. In fact the area is directly beside our living room and glass conservatory. Positioning the car

parking area here
would reduce the amenity and cause nuisance to these 2 neighbouring properties.
At present
there is no access by vehicle to this area. In fact the area is on 3 levels,
which has not been
detailed on the submission but can be seen on one of the photographs on the
original application.
The illustration on the drawing in 20/0007/LRB is seriously misleading in scale
and positioning
of parking relative to the boundaries with the 2 adjoining neighbours. The
reality is that parking
8 vehicles in the proposed location will be much closer to the perimeter of
neighbouring
boundaries than illustrated and inevitably increase noise, nuisance and
disruption to
neighbouring properties. We would suggest that a "good neighbour" would
consider an
alternative location for parking that would cause less nuisance to adjoining
properties. There are
plenty of alternative areas within Duneira at the western side of the property
which does not
border with any neighbours.

The applicant does not detail how often these course would run or how long they
would last. Is
there going to be turnaround of people every 2 days, 3 days or more? This would
impact on the
traffic and also the possible nuisance to neighbours.

Another detail in the original application says, "There are extensive trees and
landscaping around
the perimeter which provides screening from adjacent neighbours." This is not
now true. Since
that application 19/01573/PP was made much of the screening at Duneira's
eastern boundary has
been almost completely removed, hence our property has lost any security and
privacy. This is of
particular concern as people using Duneira are transient.

The A814 is an extremely busy road. There are approximately 7,000 employees at
Faslane Naval
Base and this road is the main route to get there. This number does not include
local traffic or
tourist traffic.
The use of a bus stop/layby is not officially designated as an undertaking
route in the event that
vehicles approaching Duneira from the east are blocking the A814 carriageway
while waiting for
a gap in oncoming traffic in order to turn right in to Duneira. In fact the
entrance to Duneira is
opposite the narrowing part of the bus stop/layby.

There are ongoing issues re traffic in Pier Road. It is used by large trailored
HGVs hauling

timber from tree felling operations in the hills above Rhu and this work will continue “ into perpetuity “ according to the company in charge of operations. Also Pier Road is considered to be dangerous for pedestrians in that it does not have a pavement at the area bordering Duneira.

Minutes from an Argyll & Bute Council meeting in December 2019 record that-

“The road carriageway (Pier Road) was sub-standard in terms of width, with one section entirely without a footpath.

“Two short-space lanes are incorporated, further reducing the road lane width,”

“These lanes do not comply with the requirements of the Equality Act and force pedestrians to turn their backs on oncoming traffic.

“Encroachment by traffic into lanes is a common everyday occurrence, with pedestrians prevented from stepping out of harm’s way by a grass embankment and a stone wall. These effectively trap them there.

“It is used as a timber haulage route, with hundreds of timber journeys per year, and the industry suggests it will go on.

“Pier Road is part of the Highland Road, a popular tourist attraction, but it is also a route for children and residents on the A814. It is probably the busiest residential route with traffic, with over 100 vehicles per hour.

“These figures are likely to increase significantly when congestion takes place on the A814. Those with local knowledge see it as a route of bypassing delays and the increased risk to pedestrians has had a negative effect on the community.

At the same meeting a local Councillor, George Freeman, said

“I have a copy of the report from the road policing department at Dumbarton, and clearly they have said that the safety of pedestrians is compromised”.

Although there are problems associated with the whole length of the road Police Scotland have said they have concerns about-

“The shared use of the south lane of Pier Road near to where it junctions the A814”. (at Duneira).

Under such circumstances it would seem irresponsible to add an unspecified but significant number of additional daily traffic movements to this dangerous road, especially drivers who are not familiar with the dangerous nature of Pier Road. The applicant’s assertion that a widened exit from Duneira onto Pier Rd will increase pedestrian safety does not balance with the significant increase in daily traffic movements at this already dangerous part of Pier Rd. Mr Jim Smith, Head of Roads and Amenities department at Argyll & Bute Council has been fully involved with the ongoing issues of pedestrian safety being compromised on Pier Road for

almost a year
now.

In the Report of Handling it was stated that, if a fire escape was required in the property since it was no longer a domestic residence, that would be looked at the Building Warrant stage and may need planning permission. It is of concern that the creation of a fire escape was not part of the planning conditions.

Also in the Report of Handling it states that any " matters relating to noise and anti-social behaviour can be controlled by either the police or Environmental Health". This seems to suggest an acknowledgement that noise and anti-social behaviour could be expected if this application is approved. We would consider that acknowledgement to constitute a loss of our amenity and therefore grounds for refusing the application. There are other properties in the area where there are such issues and local affected residents do not find it easy to get their complaints addressed.

Since there is the possibility that those hearing this appeal may not be from Helensburgh and Lomond Ward, could we suggest that a site visit is organised once this Covid-19 Pandemic is over and normal living is restored. At the moment people here are following the guidelines and there is very little traffic on the roads and Faslane does not have the usual traffic volumes on the normally very busy A 814.

As stated at the start of this submission our objections to the original application still stands. We of course understand that that application has already been given approval but with carefully considered conditions set by experienced planning officials. We remain in hope that the applicant's appeal against the planners decision on conditions will give planners the opportunity to reconsider the conditional approval and now reject the Application 19/01573/PP .

If the Planning Department however is minded to confirm approval of Application 19/01573/PP we would ask that the carefully considered conditions set out in that approval remain.

We trust that you will take all of the above comments into consideration and reject the applicant's application and or their appeal.

Yours sincerely

James Duncan

Linda J Duncan