

REFERENCE NO: 11/01009 - CONTINUATION

3. WE DO NOT BELIEVE POINT 3. OF THE REFUSAL TO BE TRUE AS THE SHED IS VERY UNOBTRUSIVE, THE WOOD IS THE SAME COLOUR AS THE SURROUNDING TREES AND IN SUMMER IS COMPLETELY HIDDEN BY THE TREES WHEN IN LEAF. WE BELIEVE IT DOES RESPECT THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER OF THE AREA AND THE AMENITY AS IT PROMOTES FISHING AND BOATING. THERE ARE PEOPLE LIVING CLOSE BY AND ACCESS ISSUES CAN BE ADDRESSED, SEE POINT 2.
4. WE DO NOT BELIEVE POINT 4 OF THE REFUSAL, TO BE TRUE AS THE MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS WHICH JUSTIFY IT ARE LEISURE AND EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN WHO WOULD NOT OTHERWISE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR SUCH.
5. POINT 5 OF THE REFUSAL IS UNTRUE AND UNDER THE CONTROL OF ARGYLL AND BUTE COUNCIL.
6. POINT 6 IS UNTRUE. ACCESS WOULD MAINLY BE BY BOAT, BUT PROVISION FOR VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKING CAN BE MADE AS A PROVISO OF PLANNING PERMISSION BEING GRANTED.