Agenda Item 5

PLANNING AND ACCESS COMMITTEE
SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

MEETING: Monday 23rd November 2015

SUBMITTED BY:	**Head of Planning & Rural Development**
APPLICATION NUMBER:	**2015/0124/DET**
APPLICANT:	**Pelham Olive**
LOCATION:	**Land to the South Of Cuilimuich, Carrick Castle, Lochgoilhead**
PROPOSAL:	**Erection of lodge building comprising a mixed use of guest house/hostel (Class 7), estate business office space (Class 4) and residential and non-residential research and learning facility (Class 8 & 10); Erection of estate manager's dwellinghouse/office; Erection of ancillary services and meeting facilities building; and formation of associated parking, yard and landscaping.**

NATIONAL PARK WARD:		Cowal Ward
COMMUNITY COUNCIL AREA:		Loch Goil Community Council
CASE OFFICER:	Name:	Craig Jardine
	Tel:	01389 722020
	E-mail:	craig.jardine@lochlomond-trossachs.org

1 SUMMARY AND REASON FOR PRESENTATION

1.1 The application is for the erection of a multi-purpose estate lodge and estate manager's dwellinghouse (linked with a service block) situated close to the eastern entrance to Carrick Estate, at Carrick Castle.

1.2 The application was presented to the Committee on 27 October 2015 as a result of a significant level of objection to the proposal from this small community and an objection from Loch Goil Community Council. The Committee decision was to defer the application to allow members to visit the site before determining this application.

2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1

That Members:

APPROVE the application subject to the conditions contained in Appendix 1.

3 BACKGROUND

(see sections 3.8 to 3.14 of the original report contained in Appendix 1 for full details of the proposed development).

3.1 For the avoidance of doubt, this is a supplementary report prepared primarily to re-introduce the agenda item. At the 27 October meeting members did not request clarification from officers on any additional points. The decision to continue determination of the application was taken solely to enable Members to undertake a site visit to enable a better understanding of the context of the proposal, the physicality of the site and the landscape setting, before forming a decision on the application.

3.2 This report does not repeat or replace the details of the original report. It does however, provide a summary of the late representation received from Carrick Residents Group and which was verbally reported at the previous meeting. The description of the site and the proposal is nevertheless reproduced below for clarity.

Site Description and proposal:

3.3 The application site is located outwith, and to the rear of, the settlement boundary of Carrick Castle, situated on the shore of Loch Goil. The site comprises of an existing access from the C06 public road, leading to a level site at an elevated position from the road and loch shoreline.

3.4 The proposed development area is on undeveloped improved grassland with an existing field boundary stone dyke forming the rear boundary of the site. To the south of the site is the Carrick Burn.

3.5 The development proposed is for a new operational base for the combined Carrick Estate and a tourism/business venture to assist with supporting the management and running of the operational base.

3.6 Planning permission is sought for three buildings clustered around a courtyard and located towards the western boundary of the application site as shown in figures 3 and 4 below. The proposals comprise of the following:

- Estate Lodge (two and a half storeys);
- Estate Manager's dwellinghouse (two storeys);
- Service building (single storey, linking lodge and manager's house);
- Widened and re-surfaced vehicle access providing access from public road to buildings;
- Yard and parking areas adjacent to the buildings.
- New drystone walling and hard/soft landscaping.
- Private foul drainage treatment plant.

4 REPRESENTATIONS & PLANNING ASSESSMENT

4.1 Representations received on the application are detailed in the original report (Appendix 1 sections 4.8 – 4.19). These consisted of 32 representations of objection received from members of the public, Carrick Residents Group, Carrick Castle Community Trust and Michael Russell MSP.

4.2 Subsequent to the issuing of committee papers and prior to the 27 October meeting, further correspondence was received from Carrick Residents Group. The late representation largely addresses the same issues raised previously but in more detail. This representation is available to view on the Authority's planning website but is summarised below with corresponding planning officer response:

- Prime concern is that the development would be located outwith the village settlement, boundary when a previous application was previously refused (referring to application ref: *2006/0092/OUT – erection of four houses and access road. Refused on 2nd October 2006*);

  Planning Officer response – This point relates to the policy assessment of the 'principle of development' which is addressed in sections 7.2 – 7.22 of the original report contained in Appendix 1. This original assessment considers the elements of the application in light of the appropriate housing and tourism policies which offer support for 'out-of-settlement' and 'edge of settlement' development. The 2006 application for a private housing development (also located outwith the settlement) was determined on a much earlier (inherited) set of local plan policies that did not support such housing development, and was therefore refused. The 'principle of development' of this current application is supported by the current adopted local plan and proposed local development plan. Furthermore, in terms of the landscape context it has been assessed that the proposal, by nature of its intended estate use, will be viewed separately from the characteristic residential ribbon development of Carrick Castle. For this reason, the landscape assessment for the proposed estate buildings differs significantly to the earlier refused application for a housing development. There is no concern that this unique proposal under consideration would result in an undesirable expansion of the settlement of Carrick Castle.

- The business plan for the proposal is not comprehensive and should be subject to independent scrutiny and review;

  Planning Officer response – This point relates to the policy assessment of the 'principle of development' which is addressed in sections 7.2 – 7.22 of the original report contained in Appendix 1. Furthermore, the business plans submitted in support have been assessed and are considered to be sufficiently comprehensive given that this proposal is supported by the 'principle of development' local plan policies. Were this proposal to be contrary to development plan policies, further information, and independent external review of these submitted documents may have been considered necessary. In this case, however, this was not necessary as the submitted information provides sufficient confidence to assure that an alternative use (i.e. private housing) is not intended.

- The stated estate management strategy is in direct conflict with the National Park's first aim;

  Planning Officer response – This point is addressed in sections 7.38 – 7.44 & 7.56 *of the original report contained in Appendix 1. The proposed development does not raise any potential adverse impacts on the natural or cultural heritage that cannot otherwise be safeguarded through planning conditions. Matters relating to the estate's programme of deer management are not a material planning consideration in the determination of this*

application.

- The proposal would result in no direct local benefit;
  Planning Officer response – This point is addressed in section 7.56 of the original report contained in Appendix 1. Although local jobs cannot be guaranteed by the granting of any planning permission, it is anticipated that the introduction of this proposed development would provide a level of ongoing employment and that it would also result in secondary economic benefits to other businesses in the area and the National Park.
- There is existing housing available in the area and therefore no rationale for a new manager's house;
  Planning Officer response – This point is addressed in section 7.4 of the original report contained in Appendix 1.
- The proposal would not result in social or economic development.
  Planning Officer response – This point is addressed in section 7.56 of the original report contained in Appendix 1. It is acknowledged in the original report that the offer of the lodge for community meetings would, in part, support the fourth aim. The recommendation of approval of this application does not rest on this single point as sufficient weight of support is offered through the development plan policies and the remaining park aims.
- The application raises issues relating to land use across Scotland and monitoring of cross-agency public funding for estates.
  Planning Officer response – It is considered that this point is part of wider political discussions regarding draft legislation and funding matters which are outwith the scope of material planning considerations in the determination of this application.

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 The late representation does not raise any new material planning considerations that were not already assessed in the original planning report presented to members on 27 October or as responded to above. Therefore, the original planning assessment and recommendation to approve the application remains unaltered.

5.2 It is therefore recommended that Members:

- **APPROVE** the application subject to the conditions contained in Appendix 1 of the original report.

Background Documents: ***http://www.lochlomond-trossachs.org/planning/***
Click on view applications, accept the terms and conditions then enter the search criteria as '2015/0124/DET'

List of Appendices: ***Appendix 1 : Previous report to committee dated 27th October 2015 - including Conditions and Informatives***