

**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**

---

<b>Reference No:</b>	21/02141/PP
<b>Planning Hierarchy:</b>	Local Application
<b>Applicant:</b>	Ardfin Estate Ltd
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of buildings to facilitate residential staff accommodation with associated access and parking arrangements
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land North East Of Coastguard Station Craighouse Isle Of Jura Argyll And Bute.

---

## **SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT NO. 1**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Since the publication of the officer's report additional late representations have been received from the following parties:

#### **Local Members for Ward 2:**

**Cllr Robin Currie (23.09.2022)** – Neutral representation advising that he was supportive of a hearing prior to determination, and stating that any hearing should be held on Jura.

**Cllr Dougie McFadzean (27.09.2022)** – Representation raising concern on behalf of residents of Jura as follows:

*"I respectfully request this written submission be considered by the Planning, Protective Services and Licensing Committee (PPSL) meeting on Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2022.*

*I feel compelled to submit this note after speaking with many Jura residents face to face, conversing with others in writing and receiving copies of emails sent to planning officers and elected members alike. I represent Ward 2, Kintyre and the Islands, and note there are no councillors from this ward on the PPSL Committee and would strongly suspect that few or none of the elected members on the PPSL Committee have set foot on Jura. I therefore have a unique perspective on this application and, in my opinion, the harm that will be caused to this fragile, yet sustainably growing community.*

*I have spoken with approximately 45 Jura residents on this issue, this representing about 20% of the population of the island and not one person was in support of the proposed development. If extrapolated to the population of Glasgow City, that would represent **123, 000 people**. All with a negative view of the development. Bringing that to a more local perspective that would equate to **1700** Oban residents objecting to this proposal. Jura only has 230 residents, or thereabouts, so small numbers cannot be taken in isolation.*

Further, I am very aware of the fragility of the island's infrastructure, as are the residents. The Jura Ferry is owned and operated by Argyll and Bute Council, This service has been under significant strain for several years now, with a very old and small vessel which needs replaced. There have been severe difficulties and service disruption for about 5 months now because of crew shortages, much to the anger of Jura residents. I doubt very much the service could cope with additional construction traffic relating to this proposed development or indeed a sudden population increase of around 40 people, representing a sudden and transient increase of 17%, **which would equate to a sudden increase in Glasgow's population of around 104, 000!** What is being asked of Jura, in my opinion, and that of the residents I've spoken with, is simply not realistic and will cause a negative impact on Craighouse village and the wider island.

I sit on the national Carbon Neutral Islay steering group, which aims to have the industrialised island of Islay carbon zero by 2040, and is being used as a learning project to guide national policy going forward. Jura is one quarter of a mile from Islay and our communities are intrinsically linked, and have been for thousands of years. While we endeavour to reduce greenhouse gas output, this proposal will result in the exact opposite. A population increase of around 40, all requiring to commute approximately 4 miles to get to their work, each way, will result in approximately **14, 000 KG** of extra CO2 being put into our atmosphere, never mind the other greenhouse gases. The calculation behind this takes the best case scenario with car sharing in small economical vehicles, use of bikes and buses and only two shifts per day. If the accommodation was built on Ardfin Estate, near to the work place, there would be no commuting and little, or no, additional greenhouse gases polluting our atmosphere.

Traditionally staff working for an estate in Scotland have been housed on estate land. Houses have been supplied to estate workers for hundreds of years and this has formed a part of Scottish culture. It make sense to have your workers close to hand so that they are not inconvenienced and that they are to hand should they be needed. The planned development flies in the face of this and the actual buildings are not planned to be self-sustained homes, but communal, hostel type accommodation which does not currently exist on Jura.

I also note that the residents of the newly occupied Otter Brae social housing development have not been consulted. I visited this site two days ago (Sunday 25<sup>th</sup>) and noted that the layout of the houses will result in considerable additional through traffic, using the beautifully laid mono block surface. Also, two houses in particular will have vehicle headlights shining directly into their homes.

Concerns have been raised with me regarding additional drug use on Jura, in part due to an increase in transient population employed at Ardfin estate, and other employers. The public expectation is that drug use, alcohol consumption and associated anti-social behaviour will increase in the village of Craighouse should these plans be approved. There is no police office on Jura. There is no police vehicle on Jura. There is one Special Constable living on Jura who would not be in a position to deal with increased levels of anti-social behaviour, resulting in officers having to come over from Islay, where there are only five. The fear is a poorer quality of life for Jura residents. I am a retired police officer and would tend to agree with this sentiment.

Health care on Jura is very limited, with no ambulance and only one FTE General Practitioner.

I also note that additional written representation has been submitted in the last day or so, signed by 23 Jura residents, reinforcing their objections and position regarding this development. These residents, some of whom I have spoken with, are not politically motivated, are not used to dealing with planning issues and are not 'trouble makers', but truly want what's

*best for Jura. They want sustainable growth and additional opportunities. They want to help. They want to work towards making Jura all that it can be, but what they do not want is for the only village (Craighouse) and for their island to be damaged.*

*In summary, I ask that;*

- *The community of Jura is listened to and involved in any decision making, as per The Islands (Scotland) Act 2018*
- *A public meeting is held on Jura with key decision makers*
- *An island Community Impact Assessment is carried out*
- *The unique needs of the islanders of Jura and sympathetically considered and not ignored*
- *The very fragile infrastructure on Jura is carefully considered*
- *The emails, letters and other representations from Jura are truly considered and committee members gain a true understanding of the potential impact of this development*
- *The committee members visit Jura, visit the proposed development site and get a feel for this unique island*
- *No final planning decision is taken at the meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2022 to allow all of the above to happen*

*I thank you for taking the time to consider this submission.”*

**Officer Comment:**

The points raised regarding ferry capacity; the choice of site with regard to available alternatives; the population increase in the settlement and its effect on existing service provision; and the loss of amenity to the existing residents and the new houses have all been considered in comments in the Report Of Handling and in the relevant sections of the report and its appendices. The increase in CO2 and other greenhouse gasses is accepted and noted.

**Third Party Representation:**

One additional letter from a third party as follows:

A petition from **Louise Muir (28.09.2022)** which is submitted with 21 signatories, all bar two of whom have already made individual written representations that are recorded in the main report of handling.

*“We write to you as a group of Jura community members who object to the erection of buildings to facilitate residential staff accommodation with associated access and parking arrangements at the land North East Of Coastguard Station, Craighouse Isle Of Jura, Argyll And Bute. Application Number: 21/02141/PP.*

*We believe that the development is contrary to local and national planning policies and will have serious detrimental impacts to the Jura community, its services and infrastructure. There must be a recognition that growth and development must have the support of local people if communities are to be truly sustainable.*

*In light of our material objections outlined below we respectfully request that you reject this proposal at the Planning, Protective Services and Licensing Committee on the 28th of September and if this is not possible then we would like a discretionary pre-determination*

*hearing to take place on the Isle of Jura, where members of the Jura community can safely, openly and transparently raise their concerns.*

*The planning application is contrary to:*

- LDPS STRAT 1 – Proposal does not support local communities and would place already strained services and infrastructure under more pressure.*
- SG LDP BUS 1 – Proposal does not deliver sustainable economic growth, it is not a medium sized development in context of Jura and will erode the residential character of the area and adversely affect local residents.*
- SG LDP BAD 1 – The volume of people and traffic, associated noise and light will negatively impact on the amenity of nearby affordable housing.*
- LPD 9 – The proposal with 40 people in this type accommodation would be considered as high density and would overshadow surrounding affordable housing.*
- SG LDP ENV 12 – The development site is on a high area of ground visible from coastal areas of Jura, negatively impacting the qualities of the NSA.*
- LPD 11, SG LDP TRAN 4 and SG LDP TRAN 6 – The proposal does not detail an ambition to create a safe foot path from the site into the centre of the village.*
- LDP 10 and SG LDP SERV 1 – the proposal is not acceptable under these policies as the development seeks to connect to an already at capacity foul water tail which discharges into a water course within a SSSI.*
- LPD 10 – The proposal will have a negative impact on emissions and climate change targets in respect of unnecessary construction and creating unnecessary travel patterns through the remote location of this facility from the actual location of staff employment.*
- SG LDP BUS 5 – The application fails in respect of conditions i),iii), iv), v), vi) and viii) of this planning policy and does not fulfil stipulations related to Economic Fragile Areas.*

*Taking all of the above into account, this application is neither appropriate, necessary, nor sustainable. The proposal would be better located adjacent to the principal location of staff employment at Jura House and the land in question, if it is to come forward for development at some point in the future, would be more appropriate for additional affordable housing in line with the Jura Community Action Plan 2018-2023. Many thanks in advance for your consideration of the Jura residents views on this proposal."*

#### **Officer Comment:**

The policies listed above have been considered within the Report of Handling and commentary regarding the proposal in relation to the LDP policies has been provided. Policy SG LDP SERV 1 has not been considered as the proposed foul drainage requires the agreement of Scottish Water before any development may be considered.

## **2.0 Officer Comment**

These late objections do not raise any new planning issues which are not already addressed in the Main Officer Report **and the Informatives attached**. The number of objections received stands at 24 and one petition at time of writing, in addition to two representations from Local Members for Ward 2.

### **3.0 RECOMMENDATION**

The objections made in these late submissions have been raised by other objectors and do not alter the recommendation contained in the main Report of Handling.

**Author of Report: Derek Wilson**

**Date: 27.09.2022**

**Reviewing Officer: Peter Bain**

**Date: 27.09.2022**

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