

Delegated or 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:	21/02308/PP
Planning Hierarchy:	Local Development
Applicant:	Mr Richard Stein
Proposal:	Erection of detached garden room ancillary to dwellinghouse
Site Address:	Eilean Da Mheinn, Harbour Island, Crinan, Lochgilphead, Argyll and Bute, PA31 8SW

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT NO. 1

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The attention of Members is drawn to the main Report of Handling dated 5th April 2022 that is currently before them for consideration in respect of the above application.

Subsequent to the publication of the main Report of Handling for today's (20 April, 2022) PPSL meeting, officers have received further representations from both residents and the general public.

This has resulted in a total of 113 representations – 71 of which are in objections and 41 in support. A further neutral comment was received from a Local Member. Details of the contributors and comments not addressed in the body of the main report are as follows.

1.1 REPRESENTATIONS

Local Member comment:

- A neutral comment was received from Councillor D. Philand

New support comments were received from:

- Derek MacKinnon 8 Crinan Cottages Crinan Lochgilphead Argyll And Bute
- Sally Wilkin 5 Slockavullin PA31 8QR

New and further objection comments were received from:

- Jo Daly 1/2 29 Bolton Drive Glasgow G42 9DX
- Angus Pigott Dunvullaig Criagnish Argyll PA31 8QS
- Mathew Walsh Dundiggin' Craignish Argyll PA31 8QS
- Frances Ryan The Cottage Crinan Argyll PA31 8SR
- Frances Ryan No Address Provided

- Archie, Jamie and Jock Spencer The Dancing Fox Lunga Craobh Haven PA31 8UU
- Boyd and Rosi McNab Skybergoth Penzance TR20 8UL
- Miss Helen McCall Add View Bellanoch Lochgilphead Argyll And Bute
- C. Berry, 128 East Trinity Rd, Edinburgh EH5 3PR
- K. Campbell, Shore Cottage, Crinan Harbour, Lochgilphead, PA31
- A. and J. English, Anchor Cottage, Crinan Harbour, Lochgilphead, PA31 8SW
- Dr A. Kidd, Corlan, Pencelli, Brecon, Powys, LD3 7LX
- J. Lehmann, Mheall, Kilmichael Glassary, Lochgilphead, PA31 8QJ
- J. and M. MacFarlane, No. 2 Harbour House, Crinan Harbour, Lochgilphead, PA31 8SW
- M. Macintyre, Fuaran, Crinan Harbour, Lochgilphead, PA31 8SW
- A. and S. Murdoch, Harbour Cottage, Crinan Harbour, Lochgilphead, PA31 8SW
- A. Stephen, 45/2 East Claremont St, Edinburgh EH7 4HU
- Andrew Hugh, Birlinn Ltd West Newington House 10 Newington Road Edinburgh EH9 1QS

2.0 SUMMARY OF POINTS RAISED

Neutral comment from Local Member

- Referring to Section F of the report set before council committee for the 20th April 2022, confirmation was sought that updated figures of overall representations were recorded and due to be presented to the committee on the day of determination?
- *Comment: It is confirmed that this Supplementary Report provides members with an update on late representations received subsequent to the finalisation and publication of the main report.]*
- A further comment referred to Section O of the report which is dealing with the requirement for a hearing. A suggestion was made that due to this being a sensitive issue for both supporters and objectors the committee be minded to accept the proposition to have a public hearing, although not complex in a planning sense. This is to allow everyone has their full say before any determination.
- *[Comment: This comment is noted. However, given that the land-use planning related issues raised are not considered to be unduly complex, it is considered that a hearing in this instance would not add value to the determination process. The decision on whether or not to hold a pre-determination hearing does however remain the prerogative of the PPSL]*

Support Comments

- As the proposed construction cannot be seen from the mainland we can see no reason why it should not go ahead.
- *[Comment: Point raised in support is noted and has been assessed in the main body of the report.]*

Objection Comments

- We can confirm that the area in which the site of this new building is proposed was not a well-established garden. It was restricted by the very swampy conditions which existed and had some planting, where possible, of the trees and shrubs. The glen and the site in question, therefore, was populated entirely by shrubs and trees, making up a natural woodland. We understand this area has been recently drained.
- *[Comment: The point raised is noted.]*
- The owners do of course rent out the Island for holiday let so possibly need other accommodation during the season and a good sized bothy would surely suffice.
- *[Comment: This comment is partially not a material consideration to this proposal and may be subject to a separate investigative action. The design statement submitted in support of the application has referenced the purpose of the proposed structure which has also been conditioned for the sole domesticated use ancillary to the main dwellinghouse.]*
- The access road is well overused and in the summer dangerous for small children and the car park is always over full so parking has to be along in front of the houses.
- *[Comment: Given that building is ancillary to the main dwelling, it is not intended to significantly increase the existing vehicular traffic, if at all.]*
- Detailed and historical dialogue in relation to the potential existence or inexistence of a building on the existing ruin foundation at the proposed site location and why that should not set precedence for the proposed development.
- *[Comment: This pointed is noted and though new, has been assessed in the main body of the report]*
- The proposal should be assessed against the special qualities of the Knapdale NSA cited where the Planning Authority seek to recommend approval for the application. They must be certain the proposal can be clearly found to align with policy and does not give rise to any conflict with the existing special qualities outlined.
- *[Comment: This pointed has been assessed in the main body of the report. The proposal is deemed compliant with all the relevant policy requirements including that of the NSA]*
- The applicant has not provided sufficient detail or rationale for the design, scale, and sitting of the proposal nor has any justification been presented as to why the overarching statutory designations should be relaxed. It is the case that the Island is a location which merits strict development control, and we would encourage the Planning Authority to consider applying such in the event that any grant of planning permission is issued.

- *[Comment: A design statement detailing the proposed development was submitted in support of the proposal. A summary of it is produced in the report and a further condition has been appended to restrict the use of the building]*
- The site increases the human footprint on the island and is a distinct and clear expansion in every area of that footprint.
- *[Comment: Though not a material consideration for the application in that the building is ancillary to the main dwelling, it is considered that due to its intended use, it will not result in a materially detrimental impact to the established visual amenities.]*

Note: All other comments are addressed in the main body of the report. Full details of all representations can be view on the Council's website at www.argyll-bute.gov.uk

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

Officer's recommendation remains as referenced in the main report of handling.

Author of Report: Tiwaah Antwi

Date: 19th April 2022

Reviewing Officer: Peter Bain

Date: 19th April 2022

Fergus Murray
Head of Development and Economic Growth