

**Committee Planning Application Report and Report of Handling as required by Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 relative to applications for Planning Permission or Planning Permission in Principle**

---

**Reference No:** 21/02023/PP  
**Planning Hierarchy:** Local  
**Applicant:** Mr Russell Chopping & Mrs Susan Kerr  
**Proposal:** Erection of Fencing and Decking; Erection of Two Wood Stores; and Siting of Storage Box (retrospective)  
**Site Address:** 5 Arden Craig Chalet, Arden Craig Road, Rothesay, Isle of Bute

---

**DECISION ROUTE**

Local Government Scotland Act 1973

---

**(A) THE APPLICATION**

**(i) Development Requiring Express Planning Permission**

- Erection of fencing
- Erection of decking
- Erection of two wood stores
- Siting of storage box

**(ii) Other specified operations**

- Not applicable
- 

**(B) RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that Planning Permission be **granted** as a minor departure to the Local Development Plan subject to the condition and reason in this report.

---

**(C) CONSULTATIONS:**

None.

---

**(D) HISTORY:**

Planning Permission (ref: 778/76) granted on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 1978 for the erection of a holiday chalet development at Arden Craig Estate, Rothesay, Isle of Bute.

Planning Permission (ref: 06/01795/DET) granted on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2006 for the alteration and extension of the subject chalet, including the erection of a conservatory and decking.

Approval granted on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2009 for a non-material amendment (ref: 09/00132/NMA) to Planning Permission 06/01795/DET incorporating two additional windows on the west elevation and a variation to the design of the timber cladding on the north elevation.

Planning Permission (ref: 09/00136/COU) granted on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2009 for the change of use of the subject chalet to a dwellinghouse and the erection of a timber shed and pathway.

Approval (ref: 09/00956/TPO) granted on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2009 for the felling of one Scots Pine and the lopping of one Oak tree at the subject chalet.

Approval (ref: 14/02357/TPO) granted on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2014 for the removal of one Willow tree at the subject chalet.

---

**(E) PUBLICITY:**

Neighbour Notification (closing date 28<sup>th</sup> January 2022) and Conservation Area Advert (closing date: 11<sup>th</sup> February 2022).

---

**(F) REPRESENTATIONS:**

Objections have been received from the following 15 sources:

Margaret Green, 7 Arden Craig Chalet, Arden Craig Road, Rothesay (E-mail dated 21<sup>st</sup> January 2022)

Ralph Green, 7 Arden Craig Chalet, Arden Craig Road, Rothesay (E-mail dated 21<sup>st</sup> January 2022)

Robert Cairns, 1/2, 20 Oban Drive, North Kelvinside, Glasgow (E-mail dated 27<sup>th</sup> January 2022)

Sheila Penny, Flat 3/1, 16 Purdon Street, Glasgow (E-mail dated 31<sup>st</sup> January 2022)

Charles Cameron, Flat 2, 3 Marchmont Terrace, Glasgow (E-mail dated 31<sup>st</sup> January 2022)

Michael McWilliams, 5 Belston Small Holdings, Ayr (E-mail dated 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2022)

David Fraser, 7 Manse Crescent, Houston (E-mail dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2022)

Jan Green, 1/1, 17 Craigmillar Road, Glasgow (E-mail dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2022)

Yukari Higo Green, 1 Buckingham Street, Glasgow (E-mail dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2022)

Andrew Green, 1 Buckingham Street, Glasgow (E-mail dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2022)

J McWilliams, 5 Belston Small Holdings, Ayr (E-mail dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2022)

Sylvia Allen, Flat 2/1, 124 Maryhill Road, Glasgow (E-mail dated 8<sup>th</sup> February 2022)

Iain Cairns, 51 Alder Gate, Cambuslang (E-mail dated 8<sup>th</sup> February 2022)

Jacqueline Docherty, Daltullich House, Daviot, Inverness (E-mail dated 8<sup>th</sup> February 2022)

Jean Elizabeth Hewit, 8 Blairatholl Garden, Glasgow (E-mail dated 11<sup>th</sup> February 2022)

The points raised can be summarised as follows:

- i. It is contended that the application description is incorrect as the fence that is the subject of the application did not replace a previous one.

**Comment:** This issue will be addressed in Section (C) of Appendix A later in this report.

- ii. It is contended that the plans and drawings do not convey that, whilst the chalet sits on even ground, the garden area at the front elevation runs into the property and, of great significance, rises upward at a very steep incline; turns right; and descends in steps sharply. They also do not visually record the fence in elevation form with the loss of visual amenity not being demonstrated by the limited specifications.

**Comment:** It is considered that the information submitted with the application is of sufficient detail to undertake an assessment of the development as constructed.

- iii. *'Residential Visual Amenity'* is highlighted and one of the contributors uses as the basis of their objection the Technical Guidance note 2/19 (GLVIA3) of the Landscape Institute. This document explains terms such as *'Residential Visual Amenity'* and *'Residential Amenity'*, which relate to *"the overall quality, experience and nature of views and outlook, available to occupants of residential properties including views from gardens and domestic curtilage"*.

Significant concern is expressed that the fence visually dominates the surrounding area about it. It stands on a raised ground base higher than the public track level and creates a distortion in which the previous and comprehensive soft landscape loses its pastoral integrity creating a hard uncharacteristic intrusion. This, combined with a very basic looking structure, does not add any aesthetic value to this very attractive pastoral enclave at Arden Craig.

**Comment:** This issue will be addressed in Section (C) of Appendix A later in this report.

- iv. Concern is expressed that the owners of Chalet No. 7 now encounter a singular view, which reveals the whole of the current fencing from above. They contend that the fencing is ugly and fiercely obtrusive to the extent that the gentle, natural view from their decking is now something akin to an industrialised site.

**Comment:** This issue will be addressed in Section (C) of Appendix A later in this report.

- v. It is explained that no chalet originally enjoyed fencing, as the rural enclave at Arden Craig that was approved by the Local Authority in 1978 featured an open plan spatial configuration. The then owners of Chalet 5 were refused Planning Permission in April 2009 to erect a 1.8 metre fence when a retrospective application was made for a change of use in association with other sought permissions.

**Comment:** This issue will be addressed in Section (C) of Appendix A later in this report.

- vi. There is now no access from the rear elevation (seaward side) of the chalet. The steps that were previously in place (as the chalet is not on a level with the track) have been removed. One has to look up to the chalet and this new perspective reveals a structure on stilts with a visual frontage which challenges the natural landscape. It now looms over the accessible track that curves and leads uphill to chalets 6 and 7. It is contended that it is extremely unattractive both in terms of scale, dimension and appearance and the uprights need camouflaged with some bush growth.

**Comment:** This issue will be addressed in Section (C) of Appendix A later in this report.

- vii. The drawings of the rear elevation with the new decking do not reveal the supports underpinning the new single level decking.

**Comment:** It is considered that the information submitted with the application is of sufficient detail to undertake an assessment of the development as constructed.

- viii. It is contended that the inclusion of a boundary fence beside the access track is an inconvenience for the owners of Chalet No. 7 at the entrance steps to their chalet. They are in their late seventies and they both have ambulatory problems. Additionally, they consider that the track is now functionally somewhat narrowed and are of the opinion that a fire tender would find the inclusion of the fence an impediment if attending their property.

**Comment:** It is understood that cars are able to drive up the track adjacent to the fence and there was a vehicle parked in front of Chalet 6 at the time of a visit to the site by the Planning Officer. As such, this issue would not be of such significance as to lead to a refusal of the application.

- ix. If the Committee is predisposed to grant the boundary application, it is recommended that simple planting be used to mark the boundary and that some bushes or trailing vines could be of benefit to soak up the excessive rainwater running down from the chalet's high position thereby resolving the visual impact of the exposed decking supports.

**Comment:** This issue will be addressed in Section (C) of Appendix A later in this report.

- x. Chalet 5 is the only fully residential chalet with the others being used as holiday homes principally for family use. It is explained that, whilst letters are sent to neighbouring properties, these chalet owners are not normally present to observe them and this impedes making submissions in time (currently exacerbated by lockdown events) The owners of Chalet 7 have been in communication with the Council's Chief Executive to examine if there is a remedy to resolve this difficulty and this is being considered.

**Comment:** The Council undertakes its duties to serve neighbour notification in accordance with the minimum regulatory requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) (Scotland) Regulations 2013. These regulations require notification to be issued to neighbouring notifiable properties and addressed to the "owner/occupier". The Planning Service is not able to readily identify properties that are vacant or infrequently occupied and, as such, is unable to make alternative provision for those addresses.

- xi. As a consequence of contact by the owners of Chalet 7 with the Planning Department, they have been afforded the opportunity to comment on the current application but they contend that no other neighbour has been advised (except Chalet 6 who were forwarded details by Chalet 7).

**Comment:** In addition to fulfilling the neighbour notification requirements mentioned in (x) above, an advertisement appeared in the Isle of Bute News on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2022 and a notice was placed at Chalet 5 on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022, both of which invited comments on the application that had been submitted. As such, the Council has exercised its statutory duties in respect of the necessary publicity procedures.

---

## (G) SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Has the application been the subject of:

- |       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| (i)   | <b>Environmental Impact Assessment Report:</b>  | No  |
| (ii)  | <b>An appropriate assessment under the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994:</b>  | No  |
| (iii) | <b>A design or design/access statement:</b>   | No  |
| (iv)  | <b>A report on the impact of the proposed development eg. Retail impact, transport impact, noise impact, flood risk, drainage impact etc:</b> | No  |
| (v)   | <b>Supporting Statement</b>   | Yes |

The applicants have provided an extensive amount of information in support of their application and this document can be viewed by using the following link:

<https://www.argyll-bute.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/find-and-comment-planning-applications>

---

**(H) PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

**Is a Section 75 obligation required:** No

---

**(I) Has a Direction been issued by Scottish Ministers in terms of Regulation 30, 31 or 32:** No

---

**(J) Section 25 of the Act; Development Plan and any other material considerations over and above those listed above which have been taken into account in the assessment of the application**

**(i) List of all Development Plan Policy considerations taken into account in assessment of the application.**

**'Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan' Adopted March 2015**

LDP STRAT 1 – Sustainable Development  
LDP DM 1 – Development within the Development Management Zones  
LDP 3 – Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of our Environment  
LDP 9 – Development Setting, Layout and Design

**'Supplementary Guidance to the Argyll and Bute Local Plan 2015' (Adopted March 2016)**

SG LDP ENV 17 – Development in Conservation Areas and Special Built Environment Areas (SBEAs)  
SG LDP Sustainable Siting and Design Principles

**(ii) List of all other material planning considerations taken into account in the assessment of the application, having due regard to Annex A of Circular 3/2013.**

Scottish Planning Policy (2014)  
Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (2019 )  
Historic Environment Scotland '*Managing Change in the Historic Environment* Series  
Planning History  
Third Party Contributions

**Argyll and Bute Proposed Local Development Plan 2 (November 2019)**

The unchallenged policies and proposals within PLDP2 may be afforded significant material weighting in the determination of planning applications at this time as the settled and unopposed view of the Council. Elements of the PLDP2 which have been identified as being subject to unresolved objections still require to be subject of Examination by a Scottish Government appointed Reporter and cannot be afforded

significant material weighting at this time. There are no provisions in PLDP2 that may be afforded significant weighting in the determination of this particular application.

---

**(K) Does the application relate to a Schedule 2 Development not requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment: No**

---

**(L) Has the application been the subject of statutory pre-application consultation (PAC): No**

---

**(M) Has a sustainability check list been submitted: No**

---

**(N) Does the Council have an interest in the site: No**

---

**(O) Requirement for a hearing:**

There is a total of 15 no. objections to the application. However, the land-use planning related issues raised are not considered to be unduly complex and, as such, it is considered that a fully informed assessment and determination can be made with reference to this report.

It is also considered that, whilst the development is not fully consistent with the relevant provisions of the Local Development Plan, there are mitigating measures that can be undertaken that allow the development to be approved as a minor departure.

On this basis, and having regard to the approved guidelines for hearings, it is considered that a hearing would not add value to this assessment.

---

**(P) Assessment and summary of determining issues and material considerations**

Retrospective Planning Permission is sought for the erection of fencing, decking and two wood stores and the siting of a storage box at Chalet 5, Ardenraig, Rothesay, Isle of Bute.

The seven-chalet development at Ardenraig is located within the Rothesay Conservation Area and the relevant legislation requires that “*special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area*” in assessing applications for Planning Permission.

The Conservation Area is predominantly characterised by urban and suburban built development and the chalets at Ardenraig are unrepresentative of the designated area in terms of their design and they are also incorporated within the surrounding trees as opposed to the majority of the built-up areas where woodland acts as a backdrop or provides a wider setting.

There have been applications for boundary fencing at two of the chalets in the past (including the current application site) and the assessment of both of these has

highlighted the absence of physically defined boundaries between the chalets and has mentioned this as a feature that contributed to the character of the chalet development.

The fence for which retrospective permission is now sought has introduced a form of solid boundary definition that does not accord with previous assessments. However, the applicants are proposing landscaping (which will be reinforced through an appropriately-worded condition) that would result in the current visual impact of the fence being significantly lessened and the creation of a boundary treatment with a less solid and artificial appearance. As such, it can be supported as a minor departure to the Local Development Plan.

It is considered that the replacement decking and minor ancillary structures have a '*neutral*' effect thereby preserving the character and appearance of both the subject chalet and the wider Rothesay Conservation Area.

---

**(Q) Is the application consistent with the Development Plan: No**

---

**(R) Reasons why Planning Permission Should be Granted:**

The site is in the Rothesay Conservation Area and is one of seven chalets located in a woodland setting to the south of Arden Craig House.

The current application includes fencing that has already been erected and the assessment of two applications within the last thirteen years for fencing in this small development (including for a deer fence at the subject property) highlighted the absence of physically defined boundaries between the chalets and mentioned this as a feature that contributed to the character of the chalet development.

The fence for which retrospective permission is now sought has introduced a form of solid boundary definition that does not accord with previous assessments and, as such, it is concluded that it does not meet the tests of '*enhancing*' or '*preserving*' the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that appropriate landscaping can be achieved via a suitably-worded condition that would result in the current visual impact of the fence being significantly lessened and the creation of a boundary treatment with a less solid and artificial appearance.

On the basis of the above, the application would not fully accord with Policies LDP 3 and LDP 9 and Supplementary Guidance policies SG LDP ENV 17 and the Sustainable Siting and Design Principles of the Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2015 but there are mitigating measures that can be undertaken that allow the development to be approved as a minor departure.

---

**(S) Reasoned justification for a departure to the provisions of the Development Plan**

See Section (R) above.

---



**(T) Need for notification to Scottish Ministers or Historic Environment Scotland:  
No.**

---

**Author of Report:** Steven Gove

**Date:** 28<sup>th</sup> March 2022

**Reviewing Officer:** Howard Young

**Date:** 29<sup>th</sup> March 2022

**Fergus Murray**  
**Head of Development and Economic Growth**

## **CONDITIONS AND REASONS RELATIVE TO APPLICATION REF. NO. 21/02023/PP**

1. Within two months of the date of this permission, a planting plan and schedule shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority that shall include details of:
  - i) Existing landscaping features and vegetation to be retained
  - ii) Proposed landscaping works in relation to the boundary fence and the land below the decking including the location, species and size of every shrub to be planted
  - iii) A programme for the timing, method of implementation, completion and subsequent on-going maintenance.

All of the landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Any shrubs which, within a period of five years from the completion of the approved landscaping scheme, fail to become established, die, become seriously diseased, or are removed or damaged shall be replaced in the following planting season with equivalent numbers, sizes and species as those originally required to be planted unless otherwise approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in order to integrate the development with its surroundings and in order to preserve the character of this part of the Rothesay Conservation Area.

## **APPENDIX A – RELATIVE TO APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/02023/PP**

### **PLANNING LAND USE AND POLICY ASSESSMENT**

#### **A. Settlement Strategy**

The application site comprises an existing chalet and its associated curtilage located within the '*Main Town*' settlement of Rothesay as identified in the Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan (LDP) 2015. Within this type of settlement, Policy LDP DM 1 encourages sustainable forms of a variety of scales of development on appropriate sites subject to assessment against all other material policy considerations. The development is considered to comply with the Settlement Strategy.

#### **B. Location, Nature and Design of Development**

Policy LDP 3 of the Local Development Plan does not support development where it would not protect, conserve or, where possible, enhance the established character of the built environment in terms of its location, scale, form and design. Policy LDP 9 seeks to ensure that the design of developments and structures would be compatible with their surroundings and advises that particular attention should be given to massing, form and design details within sensitive locations such as Conservation Areas. These principles are reinforced in Supplementary Guidance policies SG LDP ENV 17 and the LDP's Sustainable Siting and Design Principles.

Ardencraig House is a Category B Listed Building dating from the earlier to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century that has been subdivided into separate units and operated as tourist accommodation for a number of years. The grounds that originally pertained to the main house have been subdivided over a considerable period of time into residential sites and a small-scale development of timber holiday chalets.

This chalet development is located in a wooded area that begins approximately 35 metres to the south of Ardencraig House. It comprises seven single storey, timber-clad structures, which are accessed by a private single track road. Five of the chalets are positioned in a single tier with the remaining two being located on higher ground to the south-west.

Chalet 5, which is the subject of the current application, is located at the southern end of the single tier of chalets. It is the property that has been altered the most since the seven chalets began to be sold as separate entities in the mid-2000s. It has been extended and modified so is larger than the other chalets and Planning Permission was also given in April 2009 for it to be occupied as a dwellinghouse as opposed to the original holiday accommodation.

The present application seeks retrospective Planning Permission for the following works:

- The erection of timber fencing along the boundaries of the chalet's curtilage
- The removal of the previous decking on the east-facing elevation of the chalet and the erection of new timber decking
- The erection of two wood stores and the siting of a plastic storage container within the curtilage of the chalet

## C. Impact upon Built/Natural Environment

Ardencraig Chalets are located within the Rothesay Conservation Area and the relevant legislation requires that “*special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area*” in assessing applications for Planning Permission.

### Conservation Area Status

The Rothesay Conservation Area is one of Scotland's most extensive and it stretches along the east coast of the Isle of Bute for some five miles, beginning at Port Bannatyne and ending at Ascog. It encompasses Rothesay's town centre and esplanade; its early industrial area; the extensive seafront residential suburbs; and two villages.

It is fair to say that, with the exception of Skeoch Wood (located between Ardbeg and Rothesay) and Bogany Wood (located on the sloping and higher ground between the town centre and Craigmore), the Conservation Area is characterised by urban and suburban built development. The seven chalets at Ardencraig are unrepresentative of the designated area in terms of their design and they are also incorporated within the surrounding trees as opposed to the majority of the built-up areas where woodland acts as a backdrop or provides a wider setting.

### Public Nature of Application Site

The chalet development can be accessed by both vehicles and pedestrians from the north via the private road that runs past Ardencraig House although the usage by cars is almost exclusively in association with the occupation of the chalets. This road continues in a southerly direction beyond the chalets after which it becomes essentially a route for pedestrians. It is understood that, in addition to users of the chalets, the access that runs past the chalets is regularly frequented by dog walkers and walkers.

On this basis, it can reasonably be stated that the application site is not in a solely private location outwith public views. Whilst not next to a busy public thoroughfare that is a main route, it is adjacent to a footpath that is used by members of the public for leisure purposes.

### Previous Appearance of Chalet and Curtilage

The applicants have advised that, when they purchased the property in 2019, the chalet was in serious need of repair and restoration. They have explained that the decking had not been treated/maintained annually with the result that it was beyond economic repair due to excessive rotting of the supporting and main timbers.

They have also stated that the chalet grounds were overgrown and overrun with weeds, various brambles etc. that covered most of the rear and the side gardens of the chalet. They have mentioned that the rear garden had been used as a “*dumping ground*” for pruned shrubs, trees, old plants and other garden waste.

### The Development Works

#### i. Fencing

The fencing that has been erected runs along the northern and western boundaries of the chalet's curtilage together with parts of its eastern and

southern boundaries. It is constructed of vertical timber boards and is 1.2 metres in height.

As part of their objection, the owners of Chalet 7 have stated that there was no boundary fence previously at the property. The applicants have advised that, when they were tidying up the overgrown garden, there was evidence of an old fence that had perished to the point that it had collapsed in on itself and then rotted down. They mention that parts of this previous wooden fence were still standing but were cleared away along with other garden rubbish and detritus.

It is reasonable to conclude that, based upon the information that is available, there was no significant and meaningful fencing around the boundaries of Chalet 5 for a considerable number of years. On this basis, it is not considered that the potential presence of previous boundary fencing is afforded any significant weighting in an assessment of the current fencing.

Proposals for boundary fencing at Arden Craig Chalets have been submitted in the past. The application for Planning Permission (ref: 09/00136/COU) that was processed in April 2009 related to the change of use of Chalet 5 to a dwellinghouse together with the erection of a timber shed, deer fence and pathway. The report at that time stated the following:

*“The proposed erection of a 1.8 metre high deer fence is considered to be unacceptable. Arden Craig Chalets is characterised by chalets located within open ground. The proposed fence would enclose Chalet No. 5 and introduce an alien form of development that would have an uncharacteristic and unsympathetic visual impact at this location.”*

On this basis, a condition was attached to the Planning Permission that precluded the erection of the deer fence.

An application (ref: 14/00862/PP) was processed in 2014 for various works to Chalet 3 (located approximately 25 metres to the north of Chalet 5), including the erection of a fence to define the rear curtilage of the property. This land to the rear gently sloped upwards from east to west and there was woodland where the grassed lawn stopped.

The report mentioned that there was virtually no boundary fencing around the curtilages of the seven chalets at that time; however, the proposed fence was approved on the basis that it was to be modest in height; that access would remain around the rear of the chalet's curtilage; and that the main view towards the chalet would be unaffected.

The assessment of both of these applications highlighted the absence of physically defined boundaries between the chalets and mentioned this as a feature that contributed to the character of the chalet development.

The fence for which retrospective permission is now sought has introduced a form of solid boundary definition that does not accord with previous assessments and, therefore, there is a need to ascertain whether there are any material considerations that would justify approving the application as a minor departure from the Local Development Plan.

The parts of the fence that have the most visual impact when viewed from the private road that runs along the lower ground to the east of Chalet 5 are those

on the southern and south-western boundaries. The northern and north-western boundary fencing is principally viewed by the two chalets on the higher ground to the west and from the rear curtilages of the chalets to the north.

The applicants have advised that the fence has been made from wood that is designed to weather-in and blend into its surroundings. In addition, they have undertaken some initial planting along part of the southern boundary with *Griselinia Littoralis* (broadleaf), which is evergreen, hardy and able to withstand salty air.

They have stated that it is their intention to complete the planting of these broadleaf shrubs together with ornamental grasses and similar species against the remainder of the new fencing. They are of the opinion that these will grow in and around the vertical boards, which would soften the appearance of the fence.

It is considered that the landscaping proposed by the applicants (that will be reinforced through an appropriately-worded condition) would result in the current visual impact of the fence being significantly lessened and the creation of a boundary treatment with a less solid and artificial appearance.

ii. Decking

Based upon the plans of the previous decking that have been submitted with the current application, the main area for external congregation measured approximately 18 square metres but it also included sets of steps and platforms that allowed access from the private road below. The replacement decking has an area for congregation measuring approximately 40 square metres but does not feature any means of access from the road. In terms of the footprint of land taken up by the respective decking structures, the replacement one occupies a smaller area.

The applicants have advised that trellising was installed at the same time as the replacement decking in order that the plants/shrubs and bushes that they are cultivating below the deck have a structure to climb up and out of, with the objective of softening the impact of the decking's "newness".

They have explained that they intend to finish the planting of climbers and similar plants against the trellising and also complete the planting of bulbs and similar in the areas revealed as a result of the old decking being removed, thereby "greening up" these bare spaces.

The presence of decking on this elevation of the chalet has previously been established and, whilst the trellising that has been erected gives a more solid vertical mass to the structure when compared with the previous one, it will provide a good opportunity for plants to grow in the future. As such, it is considered that the visual impact of the replacement decking is acceptable.

iii. Ancillary Works

The two wood stores and the plastic storage container are modest in size and sited in suitable locations within the chalet's curtilage. As such, their visual impact is considered to be acceptable.

## Conclusion

In taking all of the above factors into account, it is considered that the fencing, whilst introducing a physically defined boundary at odds with the predominant openness of the chalet curtilages, can be suitably landscaped such that its visual impact would be lessened to an acceptable level. As such, it can be supported as a minor departure to the Local Development Plan.

The replacement decking and minor ancillary structures have a '*neutral*' effect thereby preserving the character and appearance of both the subject chalet and the wider Rothesay Conservation Area in accordance with the relevant national and local planning policy and supplementary guidance