LOCAL REVIEW BODY REF: 20/0011/LRB

PLANNING APPLICATION REF: 20/00668/PPP

FURTHER REPRESENTATION

The Statement of Case from the Planning Department states "The proposed site is located within an area generally deemed acceptable to accommodate appropriate scales and forms of development and has historically accommodated a small garage structure". The site is in the Settlement Area of Oban and a garage was previously erected on the site.

The application was advertised and there were no objections from Consultees or Third Parties. The Road Engineer had no objections.

The proposed garage measures $6m \times 5m$ and I submit is of an appropriate scale. The Planning Department refer to it as a "modest building".

I find it incredible that the Planning Department states that insufficient and inaccurate information has been submitted. This application is for Planning Permission in Principle (PPP) I do not understand why the response states that it is unusual for this type of development as many applications are for PPP.

It is more expensive to prepare detailed plans and if an application is approved there could be Conditions that would have to be considered when a detailed application was lodged. The site and location plans already lodged can be used for a detailed application. You do not require two sets of drawings as the Planning Department state.

I have been dealing with planning applications for twelve years and I have never been asked why the application was in Principle.

Can the applicant not decide what type of application is lodged?

Document No.2 which was attached for the Review was an email from the Planning Officer and the last bullet point asked why there was a need for a garage when a vehicle could park on the hard standing on the site.

Again I find it incredible that the Planning Officer should ask that question.

If a person owns a site where a garage was situated previously surely he or she would obviously wish to have another garage rather than park the vehicle on an exposed site.

Insurance policies can be reduced for parking in a garage and the vehicle is secure.

I am certain the Review Panel are aware of how vulnerable vehicles are when they are parked overnight outwith the curtilage of a dwelling house.

Contrary to the Planning Department's submission the site does represent an appropriate opportunity. A garage was located there previously and it is not an attractive area of green space. It is overgrown with weeds, briars and rubble. It is not maintained.

If permission was granted a landscaping condition could be attached which would clearly improve the area.

The garage could be used by the applicant or one of the employees of the company to house a vehicle loaded with electrical equipment.

The application was straightforward – a garage on a site where there was a garage previously. I cannot understand what further information was required and I submit that the reasons for refusal are clearly not robust and the application should be approved.