

McCallum, Fiona

From: Mulderrig, Matt
Sent: 22 February 2022 08:06
To: localreviewprocess
Cc: steven@cameronplanning.com; Bain, Peter (Planning); Young, Howard; Jane, Emma; Lawson, Donna; planningconsultations@scottishwater.co.uk; Lodge, Mark
Subject: LRB Review Letrualt Farm Rhu, [OFFICIAL]
Attachments: FR_067_Douglas Black.pdf; FR_077_Gay Black.pdf; FR_085_Gordon Black.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Classification: OFFICIAL

Dear all,

Further information request: Local Review Board 21/0007/LRB

I would advise that 3 separate representations in relation to the proposed Green Belt boundary at Letrualt Farm were received from Douglas Black (rep ID 67), Gay Black (Rep ID 77) and Gordon Black (Rep ID 85). All three representations gave their stated position as “Objection” and make it clear that they are objecting to the proposed greenbelt boundary. This issue has been identified as a matter which requires to be referred to Examination by the reporters. Copies of the objectors representations are attached.

At Examination the Reporter will examine all the evidence submitted in relation to this issue and having considered this will make their own recommendation as to where the boundaries of the greenbelt should be. The course of action open to the Reporter is to make whatever recommendation which they see fit, this means that they do not necessarily have to agree with either the objectors or the Councils position.

The greenbelt boundaries at Letrualt Farm in the proposed plan are different from those in the Adopted 2015 plan, and as this change has specifically been objected to, this means that this element of the proposed LDP2 cannot be given weight as a material consideration in relation to the current application.

In relation to Paragraph 6.19 of the proposed LDP2 this provides the introduction to proposed Policy 38 – Construction Standards for Public Roads. This recognises that in more rural areas of Argyll and Bute, with a predominant system of single track roads with passing places; a “Variable Standard of Adoption” as set out in the *Councils Roads Development Guide* may be applied where the Roads Authority consider the variable standard appropriate, thereby allowing a more rural design solution. Neither paragraph 6.19 or Policy 38 of the proposed LDP2 have been objected to, and can be treated as relevant material considerations, although they do not change the assessment against the current adopted development plan policy where SG LDP TRAN 4 (B) 1. (ii) makes the same provision.

Regards

Matt Mulderrig



Argyll and Bute Council classify the sensitivity of emails according to the Government Security Classifications. The adopted classifications are:

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Non public sector business i.e. does not require protection.

OFFICIAL

Routine public sector business, operations and services.

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE

Particularly sensitive information that can be shared on a need to know basis, where inappropriate access or release could have damaging consequences. Disclosure in response to FOISA should be verified with the data owner prior to release.

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE PERSONAL

Particularly sensitive information that can be shared on a need to know basis relating to an identifiable individual, where inappropriate access or release could have damaging consequences. For example, where relating to investigations, vulnerable individuals, or the personal / medical records of people.

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE COMMERCIAL

Commercial or market-sensitive information, including that subject to statutory or regulatory obligations, that may be damaging to Argyll and Bute Council, or to a commercial partner if improperly accessed. Disclosure in response to FOISA should be verified with the data owner prior to release.