

Response to the Statement of Case

By Argyll and Bute Planning Authority

**On the Delegated Refusal for the erection of a Dwellinghouse (in principle)
in Garden Ground of 91A Princes Street East Helensburgh Argyll and Bute G84 7DQ**

for Mr Peoples

91A Princes Street East Helensburgh G84 7DQ

Application Ref. – 11 / 00518 / PPP

Local Review Body Ref. – 12 / 0001 / LRB

1. The Planning Authority have in their statement basically reiterated the points made in the original Report of Handling which were fully analysed in the previous Local Review Body appeal statement.
2. The following points however are made in relation to the statement.
3. The planning Authority has remarked that there is a risk of town cramming occurring.

As illustrated in the previous statement the proposed house plot would not increase the density of the area to an unacceptable level and the house plot is in itself larger in size than many other plots in the vicinity.

This density analysis was not challenged by the Planning Authority.

It is reiterated therefore that the proposed plot would not result in an unacceptable increase in the overall density of the area and that the plot in the proposed position would not constitute the cramming of a property into an unacceptable small plot to the detriment of adjacent properties or the area as a whole.

The proposal therefore has regard to the character and density of surrounding development and that the development layout and density is effectively integrated with the overall density of the area and the streetscape/townscape setting.

4. The Planning Authority maintains that the proposal will result in a loss of the open character of development in the vicinity.

As previously outlined in the Review Body Statement the character of the area is varied and is not dominated by a sense of openness.

It is maintained that as previously outlined that the proposal follows the townscape elements along Princes Street East which consists of a mixture of development including two tier development with houses being located behind other dwellings and buildings.

As also previously illustrated principal views into and from the site will be largely maintained and as such the development will be representative of the varied townscape of the area.

5. With regards to the previous appeal decision on the site the Planning Authority whilst accepting the current Local Plan has different policies maintains that the fundamental concerns are the same.

These differences are not expounded nor are the points made by the reporter recognised.

The reporter did not dismiss the concept of a dwellinghouse on the site but considered the determining issue to be the resultant size of the associated garden.

As outlined in the previous Notice of Review Statement the application under review now conforms with the standards contained within the current adopted Local Plan with regards to housing development.

6. With regards to the objection maintained by Mr Jamie Everden the following points are submitted

As far as can be ascertained from the correspondence forwarded or the Report of Handling Mr Everden has not submitted an address so it is difficult to respond to his points concisely with regards to the relationship between his property and the site.

However, the whole question of overlooking with regards to surrounding properties was fully investigated at the time of the application by the Planning Authority and as illustrated in the Report of Handling it was concluded that the proposal would not lead to any unacceptable overlooking of adjacent properties.

The points raised concerning possible restrictions on the Title Deeds of the property are legal points and as such are not material planning considerations in relation to determining this application.

7. Considering the above points and the original points made in the Local Review Statement it is maintained that the proposal complies with the relevant policies in the Development Plan and that there are no adverse material considerations.

It is respectfully submitted therefore that the proposal for the erection of a dwellinghouse (in principle) should be granted planning consent.

Ian MacLeod Chartered Architect

2 Kidston Drive

Helensburgh G84 8QA

1st February 2012

