

## **Argyll and Bute Council**

### **Local Review Body**

**Reference: 13/0002/LRB**

We would like to comment as follows on the Planning Authority's representations concerning the above LRB Submission.

#### **Existing Situation**

We would reiterate that although the applicant has run his farm and contracting business successfully from his existing residence for a number of years, this has been through necessity and not choice. It is only now that the applicant is in a financial position to consider alternatives. The efficient running of the farm and business is being hindered by his current residential arrangements hence the desire to improve this situation for the future.

#### **Alternative Sites**

We would point out that the existing two houses on the farm are adjacent to the working farm yard but have a separate vehicle access to the main road and a separate parking and turning area. They are not located "in" the working farm yard with access "through" it. This would be the case for a house which was located in the "livestock gathering and penning area" which is suggested as a suitable alternative site by Planning. Also, as indicated on the submitted plans, a Hydro Electric 11kv high voltage supply cable passes through this area which would constrain development of this site. The applicant believes that placing a family home within the confines of a busy working yard is nonsensical if a more suitable alternative site is available.

Planning's reference to the predominant arrangement of siting farmhouses immediately alongside a working farm yard certainly holds true for many buildings inherited from the past. The Scottish Government's Planning Advice Note: PAN39: Farm And Forestry Buildings however states that the siting of buildings on farms "should not blindly perpetuate past traditions when in many cases these are no longer appropriate to contemporary farming practice or building technology".

In the applicant's opinion, relocating the existing livestock penning area to another part of the farm would be detrimental to the farming operation. This facility is located within the yard to allow vehicles safe and easy access when loading livestock for transportation. Moving this operation to a less accessible part of the farm, as suggested by Planning and constructing a house on the vacated site, would only result in compromising both facilities. The house site proposed by the applicant has been chosen after careful consideration of the alternatives options available.

### **Comparison with nearby permission**

The applicant makes reference to planning consent 11/00704/PP which was granted to a neighbouring property, as he believes there are parallels with his own application. This consent for residential development was granted to Celtic Sea in recent times on the basis of operational need and is located nearby the applicant's proposed site. The Celtic Sea premises appear to be occupied on a part-time basis and the site farms mussels offshore which require no daily feeding or attendance. The applicant believes his argument for operational need on Arduaine Farm is every bit as valid as that presented by his neighbour Celtic Sea whose application was fully supported by Planning.

## Conclusion

The applicant believes there **are** pertinent material considerations to justify a departure to existing policy.

- The applicant runs a farm and expanding contracting business which provides essential local services and employment.
- The farm has been owned and occupied by the applicant's family for 115 years. This is not speculative house-building but a genuine desire to provide a new family home on Arduaine Farm commensurate with the landholding and sited in an appropriate place.
- The applicant wishes to invest in the renewal of farm infrastructure to help secure it's future, an action he believes should be supported by planning policy.
- The applicant's case has been disadvantaged by the inclusion of the farmyard in the local settlement zone when compared to most "normal" farm situations.
- Existing dwellings on the farm comprise a very small one bedroom retirement home occupied by the applicant's mother and a sub-standard fifty year old Dorran prefabricated bungalow. The farm could hardly be considered over developed.
- The applicant is prepared to effect a non-residential change of use for the Dorran bungalow if consent for the proposed new house site were granted.

- The alternative site identified by Planning is not a credible solution as it places the proposed house in a compromised location and impinges on the existing working arrangements of the farm and business. Acceptance of this proposal would be a major compromise in order to fit a rigid planning policy rather than a pragmatic solution that meet the applicant's needs and circumstances.
- Residential development on the proposed site would not be contrary to the local settlement pattern of Arduaine, as there are already several neighbouring properties located outside the designated Settlement Zone.



J.R.Litster - Agent

For and on behalf of Mr Michael Campbell.

26<sup>th</sup> February 2013