

S & N Busbridge
Viewfield and Viewfield Annex
Crossapol
Isle of Tiree
PA77 6UP
25 April 2022

Legal and Regulatory Support
Kilmory
Lochgilphead
Argyll
PA31 8RT

Dear Sir / Madam

LOCAL REVIEW BODY REFERENCE: 22/0002/LRB
PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE: 21/02149/PP
THE CAMP, CROSSAPOL, ISLE OF TIREE, PA77 6UP

We are writing with regard to the submission of a validated notice of review, reference as above.

Having read the request for review documentation, it is clear that the siting and size of this agricultural building will not be changed and so the reasons for refusal are still valid – the introduction of an incongruous structure, the adverse impact on the site and it's setting within the wider landscape and the detrimental impact on the amenity levels to Viewfield and Viewfield Annex, especially the loss of daylight and that it is an inappropriate form of development.

In response to points raised by Mr MacAskill:

Whilst the previous and existing buildings on the site might be classed as unsightly, the size and positioning of these caused no adverse impact on the locality.

The commercial buildings in the Crossapol area, used as examples in the request for review, are all situated away from the main road and are not with-in close proximity of any residential property.

It is noted that the applicant has croft land totaling over 100 acres but intends to use the shed for lambing and calving. Why remove stock from the croft to a shed on a commercial site for lambing and calving? We now have further concerns about increased noise levels and wonder if the applicant intends for any stock be housed in the sheds over winter which could introduce more negative impacts on our properties?

Whilst a number of Agricultural sheds have been built on the island, these have all tended to be sited on croft land, possibly near the crofters own dwelling. As mentioned in the notice of review The Camp is commercial in nature and as such should have regulations in place covering the hours work can be carried out on the site limiting any possible noise or disturbance at unsocial hours. How would this shed be suitable for lambing, calving or over wintering stock?

The intention to use the building for the storage of animal feed will be attractive to pests and vermin and introduces the possibility of rat infestations.

The retrospective planning application noted that if permission was given for this building the applicant would not need to build the shed previously approved in a more suitable location. It now appears that this may not be the case and two buildings of this size and structure will be erected on The Camp having even more of a detrimental effect to the area. Is a building of this height, size and design, with provision for three roller doors, essential for the stated use?

If permission is given for this building our previous concerns regarding the intended use of the building remain. Would any future application to change the use of either building (but more specifically the one this review applies to) for example to a workshop / industrial unit, be considered and possibly approved by the council?

With respect to our properties our concerns about any possible impact on our quality of life and also on our established holiday rental at Viewfield Annex continue and we feel that some consideration should be shown towards this.

The "quite large" shed in the Annex garden was positioned to screen the rundown building the applicant has now demolished. This shed will no longer offer any screening as the proposed shed towers above.

Whilst a view is a nice thing to have, this point has not been raised other than in the review request. Our concern has always been the impact of the building on light intensity to both properties. Having gone through the winter months with the steel framework in situ, it is clear that the sun does not rise above the ridge of the intended roof meaning that once cladding is in place there would be no direct sunlight when it is most needed and the level of shade cast by the building will steal any possible solar gain from our house and the Annex.

As mentioned in our letter of concerns dated 27 November 2021, we have no objection to a replacement building of a similar size and materials suitable for purpose being erected on the footprint of the original building.

From the documentation available on the Argyll & Bute planning website we are unable to see if the issues raised by Mark Parry, Environmental Health Officer, in his memo dated 7th December 2021, have been addressed elsewhere by the applicant.

We would welcome a site meeting in order that the Planning Authority can truly understand the impact this building would have on us, our properties and our business.

Regardless of the outcome of this review, in anticipation of future activity on The Camp, we would like some reassurance that due consideration will be given towards all local residents in respect of activity, noise, use of machinery and lights on the site at unsocial hours.

Yours faithfully,

Stephen & Natalka Busbridge