

Bowman Stewart Reference: 2639

Date: 17 June 2020

Project: Alterations and erection of 2 storey extension to Anchor Cottage, Crinan Harbour, Crinan, Lochgilphead.

Planning Application Ref: 19/02312/PP and 20/0009/LRB

Further Comments

As per Fiona McCallum's email dated 08 June 2020, we thank both the Planning Department and the Roads and Infrastructure Services Department for making representations in this case and we would like to put forward some further comments on these representations as follows:

Roads and Infrastructure Services representation

1. Regarding point 1, I can understand this is the parking standards currently in place and would be the preference by the Roads and Infrastructure Services department but I have seen other projects where it has been permitted on narrow streets to allow on-street parking bays as an alternative. Somewhat similar to our site plan drawing on 19-2639-P-02. I have noted a few I have found below and although none of these are in Crinan specifically they are in other similar single track narrow street in villages such as Tayvallich and Tarbert:
- 13/01159/PP, 17/02542/PP, 11/00287/PP

I realise this may be a different scenario as you perhaps see us as reducing the overall parking spaces by constructing the extension but if we were permitted to form a formal delineated on-street parking area here, as detailed above and similar to those applications mentioned above, then we would keep the existing 2 parking spaces, as required. We would also be happy to discuss the formal definition of this parking bay using differing materials to ensure this is formalised and clear as use as a parking area for this dwelling.

2. Regarding point 2, Anchor Cottage only has and will only have 3 bedrooms, therefore, 2 parking spaces would be required. If we were permitted to move forward as above this would be achievable here.
3. Regarding point 4, I can confirm that Anchor Cottage does not nor has ever, been available for bed and breakfast. It has only ever rented on holiday lets and nearly always to single households who nearly always travel in one car. We also wish to confirm that we do not propose parking in the existing passing bay.

1 Victoria Buildings, 34 Union Street, Lochgilphead, Argyll, PA31 8JS
01546 606 067 info@bowmanstewart.co.uk www.bowmanstewart.co.uk

Directors: Ewan Stewart, BSc PGDip MRICS C.Build E MCABE Martin Stewart, BSc MSc CEng MICE **Associate:** Kathryn Macdonald, BSc PGDip PGDE RIAS
Martin C Stewart Ltd. Registered in Scotland. 233629 Registered Office: Lochawe House, Barmore Road, Tarbert, PA29 6TW

4. Regarding point 5, we currently have no access to the original planning permission for the dwelling but we confirm that this access has a similar finish access from the public road to all others on this street. Whether this be correct or not is not for us to determine but if we were permitted to proceed as my point 1 above, the access to the public would be upgraded to a standard that meets the Roads and Infrastructure Services material requirements, and would therefore discharge your concerns here.

Planning Department's representation

5. With regard to your point 2a) We again confirm that this will only be a three bedroom dwelling. And regarding the paragraph relating to the verge, we believe if we were permitted to proceed as noted above, having an on-street parking space, this would alleviate this concern.

Also we note from the Roads and Infrastructure Services department representations, the photograph on Page 3 shows other vehicles are currently using the verge for parking and parking parallel to the road.

6. Regarding your point 2c), we understand your comments regarding this being an exceptional case as cars are not able to go to the island however, we do query the method of determination of number of car parking spaces between both that application and the way it is being determined for our application. For example, in this precedent application (Ref: 17/01819/PP) the alterations were to go from 3 bedrooms to four bedrooms and a study. The study could have capacity to convert to a single bedroom, as per your last paragraph in 2a) in your representation. Therefore, it could be readily capable of being a five bedroom property and 4 parking spaces would have been required under roads authority guidelines. Therefore, in order to accommodate this number of additional people, I do not believe there was mention of additional parking provision being required for this application. I do understand cars cannot access the island, but those people would still require parking on the mainland for those additional people but this was not requested in that application. An outtake of the Report of Handling for that application is noted below, focusing on the parking determination:

"There is no vehicle parking associated with the dwelling house, with occupiers relying on on-street parking or the public car park close to the jetty at Crinan Harbour. It is considered that the increased level of accommodation will not directly result in an intensification of traffic, and notwithstanding, that there is adequate capacity on-road or in the car park to accommodate any small increase in demand."

Therefore, we feel there are two elements we find are inconsistent between the way our application has been determined in comparison to that previous application:

1. The way that bedrooms numbers are calculated.
2. The way that car parking provision is therefore calculated and implemented.

7. Regarding your point 3a), we believe that our reason for appeal regarding the settlement pattern still holds as the streetscape and settlement pattern has a density difference between the North and South. Therefore, one aspect cannot necessarily apply to the other and is therefore seen as a transitional pattern rather than regular. As you suggest the South 3 properties do have small gaps to the side for parking etc. but as you progress towards the North the settlement pattern becomes more crowded and dense with the further 6 properties. Our development is a transitional development linking both of these styles. Originally and as existing it has a small narrow gap to the side to allow parking, and our proposals include a new extension, still allowing a narrow gap between the building and boundary, and also set back so as to be subservient to the original building, therefore forming a pattern similar to the properties to the North but also allowing for a gap to the front (roadside) of the property, therefore tying in with the existing irregular settlement pattern.
8. Regarding point 3b), it may be worth noting that this space is not a completely open space as part of the rear is already taken up with a raised concrete wood store with the oil tank on top.
9. Regarding your point 4a) and 4b), we raise a query that as some of the properties along this stretch have been built in recent times (within the last 20 years), why only now do the planners focus so strongly on a narrow view of the chimney from directly in front of the current car park area rather than when these larger developments were originally applied for and granted?
10. Regarding your point 4d), we also confirm that the views of the chimney are not rare and it can be seen from many views along the street.

I also attach below a more recent photograph of the site showing the view of the chimney stack from eye level. Please see this below. This photograph was taken while standing against the existing neighbouring masonry boat shed and as you can see the chimney can still be seen from this location and therefore the extension will not block the chimney.



Image taken by Bowman Stewart dated 19/09/2019

11. Regarding the second to last paragraph, we respectfully disagree with your suggestion that the extension and internal alterations will not add to the desirability of renting the property and hence add to the local economy. We expect that the addition of a games room will definitely add to the appeal due to the varied weather in this area. This will be attractive as an alternative to the outside opportunities. It will therefore assist with the rental of the property and therefore bring more tourists to the local area that may not otherwise be there.

In conclusion, we believe that if we were permitted to form an on-street parking bay as I described in point 1 above and as seen across some other areas of Argyll and Bute, we may be able to alleviate many of the reasons for refusal mentioned by the Planning department and the Roads and Infrastructure Services department. We also feel that some of the other reasons, once analysed, may not necessarily be relevant as the chimney will be able to be seen as shown in the photograph above and the determination of bedroom and parking seems inconsistent in this application, when comparing it with others in the area.

Amended – Point 3 altered. 22/06/20