

**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**

---

**Reference No:** 24/01153/PP  
**Planning Hierarchy:** Local  
**Applicant:** Ms Liz Maxwell  
**Proposal:** Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of replacement dwellinghouse and associated works  
**Site Address:** Comraich, Manna, Isle of Tiree

---

**DECISION ROUTE**

- Delegated - Sect 43 (A) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997
- Committee - Local Government Scotland Act 1973
- 

**(A) THE APPLICATION**

**(i) Development Requiring Express Planning Permission**

- Erection of dwellinghouse
- Installation of septic tank
- Formation of parking spaces

**(ii) Other specified operations**

- Demolition of dwellinghouse
  - Connection to public water main
- 

**(B) RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and reasons appended to this report.

---

**(C) CONSULTATIONS:**

Argyll and Bute Council – Roads Authority

Report dated 03/07/24 advising no objection to the proposed development subject to a condition being imposed on the grant of permission to secure parking and turning for 2 vehicles.

Argyll and Bute Council – Conservation Officer

Letter dated 19/07/24 advising, in summary, no objection to the proposed development. The detailed comments submitted by the Conservation Officer are

discussed in detail in the main assessment of the proposal within Appendix A of this report.

Argyll and Bute Council – Environmental Health Service

No response at time of report.

Scottish Water

Letter dated 05/07/24 advising no objection to the proposed development which would be served from the Tiree Water Treatment Works. Scottish Water further advise that there is no public waste water infrastructure within the vicinity of the site and therefore private arrangements will be required.

Tiree Community Council

Letter dated 19/08/24 advising that the Community Council has agreed to support the application, stating that they are following the Community Council's mission statement to grow the resident population of the island. They further advise that this reflects the view of those who commented who are on the island's electoral roll who supported the application.

Consultation responses are published in full on the planning application file and are available to view via the [Public Access](#) section of the Council's website.

---

**(D) HISTORY:**

23/01717/PP

Demolition of dwellinghouse and erection of replacement dwellinghouse, installation of septic tank and formation of parking spaces – Pending Consideration

23/00133/PP

Demolition of dwellinghouse and erection of replacement dwellinghouse, installation of septic tank and air source heat pump – Withdrawn: 18/04/23

---

**(E) PUBLICITY:**

The proposal has been advertised in terms of Regulation 20 and Neighbour Notification procedures, overall closing date 01/08/24.

---

**(F) REPRESENTATIONS:**

At the time of writing, representations had been received from 39 respondents in relation to this planning application. 25 respondents raise objection and 14 provide support.

**OBJECTION**

Mrs Julie Bissell, High House, Halstead Road, Sible Hedingham, C09 3RJ (26/07/24)  
Caroline Stickland – by e-mail only (20/07/24)  
Lucy Campbell – by e-mail only (19/07/24)  
James Maxwell – by e-mail only (19/07/24)  
Catriona Stickland – by e-mail only (18/07/24)  
Mr Andrew Payne, 6 Jellicoe Gardens, Cardiff (17/07/24)  
Miss Carol Wilson, 29 Loudon Gardens, Renfrewshire, PA58 HB (16/07/24)

J.E. Guest, Tyddyn Grugor, Llangoed, Anglesey, LL58 8SD (15/07/24)  
Mr Christopher Stickland, 0/2 8 Whitefield Road, Glasgow, G51 2YD (14/07/24)  
Mrs Sara Mason, Lane Cottage, Amberley, Stroud, GL5 5AB (14/07/24)  
Gary Nicholson – by e-mail only (12/07/24)  
V. Caratozzolo – by e-mail only (11/07/24)  
Mrs Jennifer Trevillion, Shionnachan, Inverness, IV6 (11/07/24)  
Mr William Colvin, Shionnachan, Stratnacro, Drumnadrochit, IV6 (11/07/24)  
Mrs Roberta Lang, 59 Union Street, Kirkintilloch, G66 1DL (11/07/24)  
Robert (Bob) Stickland – by e-mail only (10/07/24, 22/07/24, 14/08/24 & 21/08/24)  
Hardip Devsi – by e-mail only (10/07/24)  
Russet J. Fullarton, Bayview, Scarinish, Isle of Tiree (10/07/24)  
Gurmeet Ghatoray, 3 Smith Gardens, Bishopbriggs, G64 1FJ (10/07/24)  
Martin Shields, Ballagan Lodge, Strathblane, G63 9AE (10/07/24)  
Mrs Kathleen White, 1 Free Street, Ilchester, BA22 8LY (10/07/24)  
Doctor Alan K.Stone – by e-mail only (09/07/24)  
Mrs Stone – by e-mail only (09/07/24)  
Mrs Gurpal Stickland – by e-mail only (09/07/24)  
William Stickland – by e-mail only (08/07/24)

## **SUPPORT**

Mrs Kate Maccallum, 17 Balevullin, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6XD (22/07/24)  
Monica Smith, 14 Crossapol, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6UP (30/07/24)  
Mr Stuart Smith, 14 Kenovay, Crossapol, Isle of Tiree (25/07/24)  
Mr Calum MacLean, Sgarbh Cleit View, Mannal, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6UB (23/07/24)  
Mrs Jackie Jones, Taobh-na-Mara, Balemartine, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6UA (23/07/24)  
Ms Christine Murray, Sgoire Brrac, Dungarhill, Dunkeld, PH8 OJE (19/07/24)  
Mrs Alison Clark, Mannal House, Mannal, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6UB (19/07/24)  
Mr David Clark, Mannal House, Mannal, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6UB (19/07/24)  
Mrs Christina Milne, 1 Pier View, Scarinish, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6AB (18/07/24)  
Mrs Catriona Cowling, Clachan-Dubh, Barrapoll, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6XJ (18/07/24)  
Mrs Anne Forsyth, Burnside, Mannal, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6UB (18/07/24)  
Mrs Fiona Green, 5 Mannal, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6UB (18/07/24)  
Mrs Gillian Steel, 6 Lochside Avenue, Bishopton, PA7 5FZ (14/07/24)  
Mr Colin Donald, Iona View, Crossapol, Isle of Tiree, PA77 6UP (13/07/24)

Representations are published in full on the planning application file and are available to view via the [Public Access](#) section of the Council's website.

The applicant's Agent has submitted a detailed response to the objections received. This document is titled 'CH1087 Response Letter' and is dated 15<sup>th</sup> August (received 16<sup>th</sup> August) and is also available to view via the [Public Access](#) section of the Council's website.

### **(i) Summary of issues raised – Objection**

#### **Siting, Design and Finishes of the Development**

- 'Comraich' and 'Myrtle Bank' are two traditional blackhouse style cottages connected to each other via a party wall that would require to be demolished which would ruin the overall appearance and the character of the two buildings which, together, form an aesthetically pleasing pairing which contribute immensely to the overall character of the area.

- Should permission be granted, the special character of these two traditional semi-detached and historically important properties would be lost and the visual appearance of 'Myrtle Bank' adversely affected.
- The footprint of the proposed dwellinghouse is significantly larger than that of 'Comraich' as currently existing.
- The proposal incorporates metal roofs, in two different colours, which are not in keeping with the traditional felt found on surrounding buildings.
- The proposed patio windows to the front of the property are not a traditional feature found in surrounding buildings.
- Whilst the proposed 'traditional' part matches the ridge height of 'Myrtle Bank' the roof ridge line of the contemporary part does not. The ridge height of the contemporary part is approximately 1.4 metres higher than 'Myrtle Bank' making 'Myrtle Bank' look insignificant.
- The contemporary part is also considerably higher than all the immediate surrounding properties of 'Seaview', 'Stevie's Cottage', 'The Sheiling' and 'Taobh na Mara'.
- The size and height of the proposed building will have an adverse impact on the character of the existing traditional properties in Mannal which will be tainted and the area degraded.
- A perfectly liveable property, for permanent occupation, could be built, there is no reason for it to be so large. A different design that is smaller and much more in keeping with its neighbour, 'Myrtle Bank', should be produced.
- The previous renovations of 'Myrtle Bank' demonstrate that repair, in a sustainable and environmentally responsible form, is possible on the existing footprint.
- Whilst there is support for the redevelopment of 'Comraich' to provide a property for permanent occupation, the overall scale, design and finishing materials proposed in the current application are out of keeping with the area failing to reflect the historic appearance of the original cottage and the surrounding blackhouses.
- The proposal is contrary to Local and National Planning Policy.

**Officer Comment:** *These comments are noted by the Planning Officers. The proposal is fully assessed against the relevant Local and National Planning Policy in the assessment of the proposal within Appendix A of this report.*

#### **Procedural Issues / Conservation Officer Consultation Comments**

- Planning Officers state, in an e-mail to the agent on 25/04/24 that unless the previous application (23/01717/PP) is changed it would be recommended for refusal.

Since that time, the application has been changed, however the proposal has been made significantly larger than before. The footprint of the latest proposal has been increased from 110sqm to a much larger 129 sqm.

There is confusion over the Conservation Officers acceptance of the current scheme, when previously the mass and height of the proposal were such important issues. It bears little resemblance to the existing building, being considerably larger, and even bigger after the conservation officer's attempt to be helpful by increasing the footprint to allow a single storey option. It is totally out of place with the surrounding properties and still dwarfing 'Myrtle Bank'.

- No documented evidence exists to suggest that the Planning Department or Conservation Officer would agree to the development proposed in the current application.

**Officer Comment:** *It is not uncommon for two planning applications to run in tandem. Should permission for the current proposal be granted, the previous application is expected to be withdrawn.*

*Verbal discussions took place between Planning Officers, Conservation Officer and Agent which informed the design solution proposed in the current application. The design is discussed in more detail in the main assessment of the proposal within Appendix A of this report.*

*The comments relating to the comparative sizes and massing of the existing dwellinghouse, the original proposal and the current proposal are somewhat misleading. The existing dwellinghouse has a footprint area of 72.8 square metres with all of the internal accommodation contained on the ground floor level. The previously submitted application (undetermined and expected to be withdrawn depending upon the outcome of the current application) proposed a replacement three bedroom dwellinghouse with a footprint area of 110 square metres and with accommodation within the roof void above almost the entirety of the ground floor area. The current application, the subject of this report, proposes a three bedroom dwellinghouse with a slightly larger 121 square metre footprint but with a narrower gable and the first floor accommodation limited to part of the roof void such that a substantial part of the proposed dwellinghouse now has a lower ridge height to match that of the adjacent cottage 'Myrtle Bank'.*

### **Building and Construction Standards Relating to Demolition**

- Whilst the cottage is in a poor state, it is not at risk of collapse. The existing stone walls are not in any works state than those at 'Myrtle Bank' were when it was renovated a number of years ago.
- The current proposal will require complete demolition, separation and rebuilding, which will have an adverse impact on the structural stability of 'Myrtle Bank'.
- There is lack of detail as to how the demolition of 'Comraich' will affect 'Myrtle Bank', therefore, should planning permission be granted, the following conditions should be imposed:

*“The finished gable end wall of Myrtle Bank should include sloping hips which slope away from the roof at the chimney end, similar to the existing building.*

*The end wall should be made to be structurally sound and wind and watertight and the finished gable end wall should be smooth rendered with waterproof render to match the existing cottage.*

*The loss of material at the join between the two properties should be professionally assessed and replaced with, at the very least, the thermal equivalent in the newly separated wall of ‘Myrtle Bank’.*

*Demolition will cause noise, nuisance, and possible danger to the inhabitants of ‘Myrtle Bank’ and surrounding properties, therefore, this work should be undertaken between the months of October and March when it may be arranged for ‘Myrtle Bank’ to be unoccupied to minimise risk.*

*The gap between the new end wall of ‘Myrtle Bank’ and the new end wall of ‘Comraich’ should be sufficient to allow routine maintenance and painting of the end wall of ‘Myrtle Bank’.*

*Stonework and debris should be taken off site and not ‘dumped’ on the beach with the footpath kept intact and clear”.*

- Building and construction standards relating to the demolition of the property and the appropriate financial and legal allowances would require to be considered to mitigate any structural defects of the remaining property.
- Comraich provides support to ‘Myrtle Bank’, therefore, details are required to show how mitigation are, or will be, in place to ensure that the remaining property’s gable wall will be supplemented with support to secure its long term integrity.
- A Structural Engineers SCR design certificate will act as a suitable liability for the design of new property and the protection of the remaining property.
- Architect and structural engineer liabilities should be clearly articulated with a clear indication of the routes to litigation for any potential issues within 5 years of completion.
- After demolition, appropriate measures would require to be put in place to ensure that Myrtle Bank remains wind and water tight.

**Officer Comment:** *The points relating to demolition will be fully considered by the Council’s Building Standards Services at the time when a Demolition Warrant is applied for. The applicant will require to ensure that any demolition is undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Building Standards Service and it will be the applicant’s responsibility to ensure that ‘Myrtle Bank’ remains wind and water tight throughout any development.*

*Furthermore, during the Building Warrant process for the replacement dwellinghouse, there will be the requirement for a Structural Engineers Certificate to be submitted which will address details regarding separation, making good the existing wall and details of temporary support measures required during the construction period.*

*The above details will all require to be agreed with the Building Standards Service prior to any works commencing on the development.*

### **Legal Issues**

- The title deeds of both properties would need to be updated to ensure that boundaries and access rights are defined.
- The applicant proposing the new property should surrender the land adjoining 'Myrtle Bank' by at least 1.5 to 2 metres. This would enable maintenance of the 'Myrtle Bank' gable wall and for sufficient space for scaffolding and other maintenance equipment.
- All legal costs should be met by the applicant.

**Officer Comment:** *Legal issues relating to land ownership and changes to title deeds do not represent material planning considerations, these are separate civil issues outwith the planning process to be addressed between affected parties.*

### **Impact on Neighbouring Properties**

- The proposal will have an adverse impact on the desirability for people to stay in many of the properties in Mannal which are let out as self-catering properties, particularly during the demolition and construction period.
- The proposal would not be visually pleasing when viewed from within 'Stevie's Cottage' and 'Seaview'.

**Officer Comment:** *The proposed development is considered acceptable to the site and its immediate surroundings and has been developed in consultation with the Council's conservation officer.*

### **Biodiversity**

- The proposal, by virtue of its increased footprint and proposed parking area, will disrupt existing biodiversity unnecessarily.

**Officer Comment:** *The proposed development is situated within a 'brownfield' site where there are no current biodiversity issues. Should permission be granted, a condition is proposed to secure biodiversity enhancement and protection measures proportionate to the scale of development proposed.*

### **Location of Septic Tank**

- The septic tank is unfavourably close to the public access to the local beach.

**Officer Comment:** *The application proposes to replace the existing septic tank, in the same position. The Council's Building Standards Service will apply sufficient control over the detailed arrangements of the septic tank and soakaway to ensure no amenity or health issue arises.*

### **Historic Environment Scotland (HES)**

- HES were in the past insistent that the traditional structures should be retained.
- Although not listed, 'Comraich' and 'Myrtle Bank' are subject to a live listing proposal currently with HES for consideration.

**Officer Comment:** *Whilst these comments are noted, the dwellinghouse is not currently a Listed Building and HES have advised that they will not consider the building for potential listing given the current planning application. Nevertheless, given the historic nature of the property, comments were sought from the Council's Conservation Officer, details of which are discussed in the assessment of the proposal within Appendix A of this report.*

### **Condition of Existing Building**

- Section 5 of the Design Statement is an admission of guilt that the property has been deliberately left in a state of disrepair to ensure that it becomes uninhabitable. The Council have powers under the Building (Scotland) Act 2003, Planning (Scotland) Act 2019, Local Development Plan Policies and Enforcement Notices to ensure buildings are maintained.

**Officer Comment:** *The property in question is not a Listed Building and therefore the Planning Authority does not have any formal method of ensuring that the building is kept in an appropriate manner. Planning Officers are not in a position to comment on the Building (Scotland) Act 2003.*

### **Important Tourist Destination**

- Mannaal is an important tourist destination and the proposal, if approved, would introduce a large, grotesque structure, not in keeping with the area and making Mannaal a less desirable place for people to stay.

**Officer Comment:** *This comment is noted by Planning Officers. Tiree is also, primarily, a place of permanent residence and work with one of the key outcomes of both local and national planning policy being to secure appropriate sustainable growth and to reverse population decline to address the nationwide 'housing emergency'. The visual impact of the proposed development is fully assessed in the main assessment of the proposal with Appendix A of this report.*

## **(ii) Summary of issues raised – Support**



- Out of the 18 properties in Mannal, only 3 are occupied by permanent residents.
- The proposal is to provide a new home for a family wishing to return to live on Tiree, on the site of the original family home lived in by the same family since it was first constructed and who are unable to do so due to the dwellinghouse in its current state being uninhabitable and in need of rebuilding.
- For the dwellinghouse to be suitable for permanent occupation, rather than a holiday home, then of course the footprint needs to be bigger.
- The balance of permanent homes needs to be addressed, Tiree needs more people living on the island full time without obstacles being put in their way.
- Should people choose not to visit Mannal as a result of this proposal, then so be it, it is much more preferable to have permanent residents living in habitable buildings and consequently making a positive contribution to the island.
- It is hard to accept that comments from people who come to the island for a couple of weeks a year can affect the choices of people who wish to live on the island permanently.
- The proposal will enhance the village of Mannal where there is a wide variety of designs, not all of traditional appearance.
- Change shouldn't be seen as a bad thing, especially if it repopulates an island with permanent residents.
- The proposal will provide a more modern version and evolution of Tiree townships seen throughout the island.
- Some of the objectors to the application have no connection with Tiree and have been canvassed to complain by one individual, something which is considered to be unfair, unacceptable and irrelevant.
- It is hoped that timing of the building will be allowed to take place whenever the weather allows, after all it is just a temporary inconvenience to surrounding dwellings.
- Regarding the concerns about the wall and chimney of 'Myrtle Bank' could this have anything to do with the amount of wall being removed to accommodate a multi fuel stove?
- It is noted that no residents of Mannal have objected to the application.

**Officer Comment:** *These expressions of support are noted by Planning Officers. The siting and design of the proposed development is fully assessed against the relevant planning policies in the assessment of the proposal within Appendix A of this report.*

---

**(G) SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Has the application been the subject of:

(i) **Environmental Impact Assessment Report:** Yes No

(ii) **An Appropriate Assessment under the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994:** Yes No

(iii) **A Design or Design/Access statement:** Yes No

A Design Statement has been submitted in support of the proposed development which is discussed in more detail in the main assessment of the proposal within Appendix A of this report.

(iv) **Sustainability Checklists (with reference to the requirements of LDP2 Policy 04)**

TN06 Sustainability Checklist Yes No

TN07 Sustainable Buildings Checklist Yes No

The relevant Sustainability Checklists have been submitted and examined. It is the assessment of the Case Officer that the applicant has understood and given adequate consideration to the sustainability aspects of the proposed development, sufficient to accord with the core sustainability requirements of both national and local planning policy, specifically the relevant details of the 'Sustainable Places' group of policies within NPF4 and LDP2 policies 04, 08 and 09.

(v) **A report on the impact of the proposed development e.g. Retail impact, transport impact, noise impact, flood risk, drainage impact etc:** Yes No

---

**(H) PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

Is a Section 75 agreement required: Yes No

---

(I) **Has a Direction been issued by Scottish Ministers in terms of Regulation 30, 31 or 32:** Yes No

---

- (J) **Section 25 of the Act; Development Plan and any other material considerations over and above those listed above which have been taken into account in the assessment of the application**
- (i) **List of all Development Plan Policy considerations taken into account in assessment of the application.**

**[National Planning Framework 4 \(Adopted 13<sup>th</sup> February 2023\)](#)**

**Part 2 – National Planning Policy**

**Sustainable Places**

NPF4 Policy 1 – Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises  
NPF4 Policy 2 – Climate Mitigation and Adaption  
NPF4 Policy 3 – Biodiversity  
NPF4 Policy 4 – Natural Places  
NPF4 Policy 7 – Historic Assets and Places  
NPF4 Policy 9 – Brownfield, Vacant and Derelict Land and Empty Buildings (*includes provisions relevant to Greenfield Sites*)  
NPF4 Policy 11 – Energy  
NPF4 Policy 12 – Zero Waste  
NPF4 Policy 13 – Sustainable Transport

**Liveable Places**

NPF4 Policy 14 – Design, Quality and Place  
NPF4 Policy 15 – Local Living and 20 Minute Neighbourhoods  
NPF4 Policy 16 – Quality Homes  
NPF4 Policy 17 – Rural Homes  
NPF4 Policy 18 – Infrastructure First  
NPF4 Policy 22 – Flood Risk and Water Management

**[Argyll and Bute Local Development Plan 2 \(Adopted 2024\)](#)**

**Spatial and Settlement Strategy**

Policy 01 – Settlement Areas  
Policy 04 – Sustainable Development

**High Quality Places**

Policy 05 – Design and Placemaking  
Policy 06 – Green Infrastructure  
Policy 08 – Sustainable Siting  
Policy 09 – Sustainable Design  
Policy 10 – Design – All Development  
Policy 15 – Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Our Historic Environment

**Connected Places**

Policy 37 – Development Utilising an Existing Private Access or Existing Private Road  
Policy 40 – Vehicle Parking Provision  
Policy 43 – Safeguarding of Aerodromes

**Sustainable Communities**

Policy 60 – Private Sewage Treatment Plants and Wastewater Drainage Systems  
Policy 61 – Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)  
Policy 63 – Waste Related Development and Waste Management

### **Homes for People**

Policy 67 – Provision of Housing to Meet Local Needs Including Affordable Housing

### **High Quality Environment**

Policy 73 – Development Impact on Habitats, Species and Biodiversity  
Policy 74 – Development Impact of Sites International and National Importance  
Policy 75 – Development Impact of Sites on Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)

**(ii) List of all other material planning considerations taken into account in the assessment of the application, having due regard to Annex A of Circular 3/2013.**

- Third Party Representations
- Consultation Responses
- Planning History
- [ABC Technical Note – Biodiversity \(Feb 2017\)](#)
- [ABC draft Technical Note – Argyll and Bute Windows \(April 2018\)](#)
- [ABC Isle of Tiree Sustainable Design Guidance](#)
- [TN06 Sustainability Technical Note and Checklist \(Oct. 2023\)](#)
- [TN07 Sustainable Buildings Technical Note and Checklist \(Oct. 2023\)](#)
- [ABC Housing Needs and Demand Assessment](#)
- [ABC Housing Emergency Statement](#)

---

**(K) Is the proposal a Schedule 2 Development not requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment:** Yes No

---

**(L) Has the application been the subject of statutory pre-application consultation (PAC):** Yes No

---

**(M) Does the Council have an interest in the site:** Yes No

---

**(N) Requirement for a pre-determination hearing:** Yes No

In deciding whether to hold a discretionary hearing Members should consider:

- How up to date the Development Plan is, the relevance of the policies to the proposed development, and whether the representations are on development plan policy grounds which have recently been considered through the development plan process.

- The degree of local interest and controversy on material considerations, together with the relative size of community affected, set against the relative number of representations and their provenance.

At the time of writing, representations have been received from 39 respondents in relation to this planning application. 25 respondents raise objection and 14 submit support.

The main thrust of objection relate to the scale, design and finishes of the proposed development.

The agent has worked closely with Planning Officers and the Conservation Officer to secure a mutually acceptable design which is sympathetic to the site and its surroundings.

It is the opinion of Planning Officers that the representations received, together with officer assessment of the relevant planning issues contained within this report, provide all the information required to enable Members to make an informed decision based on all of the material planning considerations in this case.

In this instance it is not considered that the objections raise any complex or technical issues that have not been addressed in the current Report of Handling and it is not considered that a discretionary local hearing would add value to the planning process.

The determining factor in the assessment of this application is whether the proposed development is consistent with the provisions of the adopted National Planning Framework 4 and Local Development Plan 2 and whether the issues raised by third parties raise material considerations of sufficient significance to withhold planning permission.

In this instance the proposed development is considered to be consistent with the provisions of both National and Local Planning Policy whilst helping to address the locally and nationally declared 'housing emergency'.

A full report is provided within Appendix A.

#### **(O)(i) Key Constraints/Designations Affected by the Development:**

Adjacent to, but outwith:

- Sleibhtean agus Cladach Thiriodh (Tiree Wetlands and Coast) SPA
- Sleibhtean agus Cladach Thiriodh (Tiree Wetlands and Coast) RAMSAR
- Sleibhtean agus Cladach Thiriodh (Tiree Wetlands and Coast) SSSI

#### **(O)(ii) Soils**

[Agricultural Land Classification:](#)

Class 4.2 - Land capable of producing a narrow range of crops, primarily on grassland with short arable breaks of forage crops.

[Peatland/Carbon Rich Soils Classification:](#)

- Class 1
- Class 2
- Class 3

Peat Depth Classification:

N/A  
N/A

- Does the development relate to croft land? Yes No  
Would the development restrict access to croft or better quality agricultural land? Yes No N/A  
Would the development result in fragmentation of croft / better quality agricultural land? Yes No N/A

**(O)(iii) Woodland**

- Will the proposal result in loss of trees/woodland? Yes  
(If yes, detail in summary assessment) No  
Does the proposal include any replacement or compensatory planting? Yes  
No details to be secured by condition  
N/A

**(O)(iv) Land Status / LDP Settlement Strategy**

- Status of Land within the Application Brownfield  
Brownfield Reclaimed by Nature  
Greenfield

**ABC LDP2 Settlement Strategy**

- Settlement Area  
Countryside Area  
Remote Countryside Area  
Helensburgh & Lomond Greenbelt

**ABC LDP2 Allocations/PDAs/AFAs etc:**

N/A

**(P) Summary assessment and summary of determining issues and material considerations**

In terms of the Settlement Strategy set out in the adopted LDP2, the site is identified as being within the defined Settlement Area of Balemartine on the proposals maps where LDP2 Policy 01 states that development will normally be acceptable subject to a number of criteria.

The proposal is seeking to secure planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse, 'Comraich' to allow for the redevelopment of the site with a purpose built dwellinghouse.

The detailed siting, design and finishes of the proposed dwellinghouse are considered acceptable and are discussed in detail in the main assessment of the proposal within Appendix A of this report.

An existing vehicular access is to be utilised to serve the proposed development with the formation of two parking spaces. Water supply is via connection to the public water main and foul drainage is by way of a septic tank and soakaway due to the lack of public infrastructure within the vicinity of the site. All access, parking and infrastructure matters are considered acceptable and are discussed in detail in the main assessment of the proposal within Appendix A of this report.

The proposal has elicited 25 objections and 14 expressions of support.

The key factor in the assessment of this application is whether or not the replacement dwellinghouse is of an appropriate scale, design and finishes which respects the character and appearance of the surrounding townscape in terms of scale, massing, design and finishing materials and whether it is consistent with the provisions of adopted National and Local Planning Policy.

It is the opinion of Planning Officers that the design proposed for the replacement dwellinghouse pays appropriate regard to the characteristics of the area within which it proposed to ensure no significant adverse impact arises and the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of the current Development Plan and with national planning policy.

Taking account of the above, it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions appended to this report.

A full report is provided within Appendix A.

---

**(Q) Is the proposal consistent with the Development Plan:** Yes No

---

**(R) Reasons why Planning Permission Should be Granted:**

**The proposal is considered to be consistent with the relevant provisions of the Development Plan, and there are no other material considerations of sufficient significance, including issues raised by third parties, to indicate that it would be appropriate to withhold planning permission having regard to Section 25 of the Act.**

---

**(S) Reasoned justification for a departure to the provisions of the Development Plan**

N/A

---

**(T) Need for notification to Scottish Ministers or Historic Environment Scotland:**  
Yes No

---

**Author of Report:** Tim Williams

**Date:** 26/08/24

**Reviewing Officer:** Peter Bain

**Date:** 04.09.2024

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

## CONDITIONS AND REASONS RELATIVE TO APPLICATION REF. NO. 24/01153/PP

**Standard Time Limit Condition** (as defined by Regulation)

**Standard Condition on Soil Management During Construction**

**Additional Conditions**

### 1. **PP - Approved Details & Standard Notes – Non EIA Development**

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the details specified on the application form dated 19/06/24, supporting information and, the approved drawings listed in the table below unless the prior written approval of the planning authority is obtained for an amendment to the approved details under Section 64 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.

<b>Plan Title.</b>	<b>Plan Ref. No.</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Location Plan	CH1087 – AECO – XX – ZZ – DR – A – 2000	05	20/06/24
Site Plan as Proposed	CH1087 – AECO – XX – ZZ – DR – A – 2001	07	20/06/24
Site Plan as Existing	CH1087 – AECO – XX – ZZ – DR – A – 2002	05	20/06/24
Floor Plans as Proposed	CH1087 – AECO – XX – ZZ – DR – A – 2004	07	20/06/24
Elevations as Proposed	CH1087 – AECO – XX – ZZ – DR – A – 2005	02	20/06/24
Street Elevation as Proposed	CH1087 – AECO – XX – ZZ – DR – A – 2006	03	20/06/24
Sections as Proposed	CH1087 – AECO – XX – ZZ – DR – A – 2007	02	20/06/24
Design Statement – 10 Pages			20/06/24

*Reason: For the purpose of clarity, to ensure that the development is implemented in accordance with the approved details.*

2. **PP – Timescale to be Agreed for Completion** No development shall commence until details of the proposed timescale for completion of the approved development have been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the duly approved timescale for completion unless an alternative timescale for completion is otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. *Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of NPF4 Policy 16F.*

### 3. **PP – Sustainable Drainage System**

Notwithstanding the effect of Condition 1, the development shall incorporate a surface water drainage system which is consistent with the principles of Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) compliant with the guidance set out in CIRIA's SuDS Manual C753 and Sewers for Scotland 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. The requisite surface water



drainage shall be operational prior to the development being brought into use and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

*Reason: To ensure the provision of an adequate surface water drainage system and to prevent flooding.*

Note to Applicant:

Further advice on SuDS can be found in SEPA's Standing Advice for Small Scale Development – [www.sepa.org.uk](http://www.sepa.org.uk)

**4. PP – Submission of Sample Materials**

Notwithstanding the effect of Condition 1, no development shall commence until samples of the proposed roofing materials to be used in the proposed development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be completed using the approved materials or such alternatives as may be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

*Reason: In order to integrate the development into its surroundings.*

**5. PP - Electric Vehicle Charging – Residential with off street parking**

Prior to the commencement of the development (or such other timescale as may be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority), a scheme detailing the provision of a minimum 7kw electric vehicle charging point shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Where charging cannot be provided then the appropriate ducting to future proof the property must be installed.

The approved charging point, or where relevant, the approved cable ducting shall be installed in full prior to the first occupation of the development, and thereafter retained in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority

*Reason: to comply with the provisions of NPF4 Policy 13 Sustainable Transport and LDP2 Policy 34 – Electric Vehicle Charging.*

**6. PP – Biodiversity Statement**

No development shall commence until a biodiversity statement demonstrating how the proposal will contribute to conservation/restoration/enhancement of biodiversity, and how these benefits will be maintained for the lifetime of the development has been submitted and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

All biodiversity enhancement measures consisting of new or enhanced planting shall be undertaken either in accordance with the approved scheme of implementation or within the next available planting season following the development first being brought into use.

The biodiversity statement should refer to [Developing with Nature guidance | NatureScot](#) as appropriate.

*Reason: To comply with the requirements of NPF4 Policy 3.*

<b>COMMITTEE REPORT</b>	
<b>APPENDIX A – RELATIVE TO APPLICATION NUMBER:</b>	<b>24/01153/PP</b>
<b>PLANNING LAND USE AND POLICY ASSESSMENT</b>	

## 1. Introduction

1.1. The proposal the subject of this application is seeking to secure planning permission for the demolition of a dwellinghouse and the erection of a replacement dwellinghouse together with the formation of two parking spaces and the installation of a septic tank and soakaway.

## 2. Settlement Strategy

2.1. In terms of the Settlement Strategy set out in the adopted LDP2, the site is identified as being within the defined Settlement Area of Balemartine on the proposals maps where LDP2 Policy 01 states that development will normally be acceptable subject to compliance with a number of criteria.

The main criteria within Policy 01 which are applicable to the proposal the subject of the current application are:

- *It is on a site which is the redevelopment of a brownfield site; and*
- *It is compatible with surrounding uses including but not exclusively; providing access, service areas, infrastructure for existing, proposed or potential future development, and*
- *It is of an appropriate scale and fit for the size of settlement in which it is proposed; and*
- *Respects the character and appearance of the surrounding townscape in terms of density, scale, massing, design, external finishes and access arrangements; and*
- *It complies with all relevant LDP2 policies.*

In order to address the determining issues, the key considerations in this application are:

- 2.1.1. Compliance with the Development Plan and other relevant planning policy
- 2.1.2. Any other material considerations.

## 3. Proposal

3.1. The proposal is seeking to secure planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse, 'Comraich' to allow for the redevelopment of the site with a purpose built dwellinghouse.

'Comraich' as existing is a traditionally designed and proportioned, single storey, curved roof black top structure which forms a semi-detached pairing with 'Myrtle Bank' which has a slightly higher ridge. Both dwellinghouses are finished in white painted stone with black felt roofs with both incorporating external chimney stacks to each of their gable ends.

Whilst 'Comraich' and 'Myrtle Bank' are referred to as semi-detached structures, they are not semi-detached structures in the traditional sense as they do not share a party wall, each dwellinghouse has their own wall which adjoin each other.

The dwellinghouse is situated within a small cluster of well preserved and maintained black top dwellinghouses of various sizes, some of which have been sympathetically renovated, including the neighbouring dwellinghouse 'Myrtle Bank'.

The Design Statement (DS) submitted with the application details that the existing structure of Comraich is in a poor physical state and is at risk of collapse. The DS details that the wooden roof structure shows evidence of years of structural decay, water damage, and insect damage, with photographic evidence submitted in support of this claim.

The DS suggests that the majority of properties in Mannel are second homes and holiday homes which are not permanently occupied throughout the year, with the current proposal allowing a permanent resident, originally from Mannel, to move back to the island, which would be a significant benefit to the community and the local economy.

Whilst 'Comraich' is not a Listed Building or located within a 'Conservation Area', it nevertheless an old traditional building and accordingly, in order to inform in the assessment of the proposal, consultation was undertaken with the Conservation Officer (CO).

The proposal the subject of this current application has come forward as a result of concerns raised by the CO during the processing of the previous planning application submitted for the proposed development, reference 23/01717/PP, which remains undetermined by the Planning Authority. If the current application is approved the earlier one will be withdrawn.

The CO deemed the design proposed in the previous application to be insensitive to the character and appearance of the area not only in terms of its ridge height but also the deep plan.

As a result of the concerns raised by the CO the agent has worked closely with the CO and Planning Officers to achieve a mutually acceptable design which has been brought forward in the current application.

In order to break up the massing proposed in the previous submission, the current application proposes two distinct elements, one single storey and the other 2 storey.

The single storey element is traditionally designed and proportioned sited immediately adjacent to Myrtle Bank where it broadly lines through in terms of its roof and eaves.

The two storey element is set back from the single storey element where it is sufficiently separated from Myrtle Bank and, whilst higher than Myrtle Bank, shares a similar ridge height with other buildings in the area.

The barn-style roof proposed to the two storey element introduces a very distinctive form to the area, which the CO deems to be slightly awkward in design. However, as the roof form of the single storey element is similar to what is existing, the CO deems that the proposal would not detract from the area and that the characteristics of the built environment would generally be preserved.

The CO further notes that the use of modern materials at the single storey part such as the metal roof, is in some ways regrettable as the traditional black top character is lost, it does allow legibility between the old and new (Myrtle Bank and Comraich) and as per LDP2 Policy 10, embodies "*honesty and legibility of contemporary design*".

The siting, design and finishing materials of the proposed dwellinghouse are assessed against the relevant Development Plan Policies below.

An existing vehicular access is to be utilised to serve the proposed development with the formation of two parking spaces. Water supply is via connection to the public water main and foul drainage is by way of a septic tank and soakaway due to the lack of public drainage infrastructure within the vicinity of the site.

#### **4. Compliance with National and Local Development Plan 2 Policy**

Argyll and Bute 'Local Development Plan 2' (LDP2) was adopted on 28 February 2024 which, together with NPF4 which was adopted on 13 February 2023, represent the Development Plan providing the policy background against which proposed developments are assessed.

The proposal is assessed against the relevant NPF4 Policies below which include details of the associated LDP2 policies.

##### **4.1. NPF4 Policy 1 – Tackling the Climate and Nature Crises**

NPF4 Policy 1 seeks to prioritise the climate and nature crises in all decisions; it requires to be applied together with other policies in NPF4.

Guidance from the Scottish Government advises that it is for the decision maker to determine whether the significant weight to be applied tips the balance in favour for, or against a proposal on the basis of its positive or negative contribution to climate and nature crises.

##### **4.2. NPF4 Policy 2 – Climate, Mitigation and Adaption**

NPF4 Policy 2 seeks to ensure that new development proposals will be sited to minimise lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions as far as possible, and that proposals will be sited and designed to adapt to current and future risks from climate change.

Guidance from the Scottish Government confirms that at present there is no single accepted methodology for calculating and / or minimising emissions. The emphasis is on minimising emissions as far as possible, rather than eliminating emissions. The Spatial Settlement Strategy set out within LDP2 seeks to deliver sustainable levels of growth by steering the majority of development to our existing settlements as these are where the most of our current infrastructure, services, employment opportunities, housing and community facilities are to be found, however LDP2 recognises that there are instances where a different approach to significant development has to be taken particularly where existing infrastructure or services are at capacity and where a more sustainable option would be to provide new facilities elsewhere.

##### **4.3. NPF4 Policy 3 – Biodiversity**

NPF4 Policy 3 seeks to protect biodiversity, reverse biodiversity loss and deliver positive effects from development and strengthen nature networks.

With regards to the need in NPF4 Policy 3 to secure biodiversity improvements, it is not considered that there are any issues of compliance with Policy 3. No material biodiversity impacts have been identified in the assessment of this application by the Planning Officers and no specific proposals for biodiversity improvements have been submitted.

Tiree is known for its careful treatment of landscaping with most buildings sitting unassumingly on the machair with no structured or manicured landscaping with coastal sand dunes and grasslands a feature of the island. Notwithstanding this, it is still considered that an element of biodiversity enhancement and protection, proportionate to the scale of development proposed can be secured for the site by way of planning condition which will be attached to any grant of permission.

**With such a condition, the proposed development aligns with the broad aims of NPF4 Policy 3 and LDP2 Policy 73, Development Impact on Habitats, Species and Biodiversity.**

#### **4.4. NPF4 Policy 4 – Natural Places**

NPF4 Policy 4 seeks to protect, restore and enhance natural assets making best use of nature-based solutions.

The proposed development is not within a National Park, a National Scenic Area, National Nature Reserve nor is it within an area identified as Wild Land. The site is however partially within Sléibhtean agus Cladach Thiriodh (Tiree Wetland and Coast) Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and adjacent to the Tiree (Corncrake) SPA.

Whilst NatureScot did not provide comments to this application, during the processing of the previous application, for the same site, they advised that, in their view, as the proposal is seeking to demolish and rebuild an existing development, located within the settlement of Mannal, where the site does not have a suitable habitat for waders, geese or corncrake, it is unlikely that the proposal will have a significant effect on these natural heritage interests of national importance. NatureScot concluded that an Appropriate Assessment was not required and raised no objection to the proposed development.

**The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with NPF4 Policy 4 and does not conflict with the provisions of LDP2 Policy 74, Development Impact on Sites of International Importance and Policy 75, Development Impact on Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and National Nature Reserves and the current proposal would raise no issue of conflict should permission be granted.**

#### **4.5. NPF4 Policy 7 – Historic Assets and Places**

NPF4 Policy 7 seeks to protect and enhance historic environment assets and places, and to enable positive change as a catalyst for the regeneration of places.

Whilst 'Comraich' is not a Listed Building or located within a Conservation Area, it is an old traditional building and accordingly consideration requires to be given to Part (a) of Policy 7 which seeks development proposals with a potentially significant impact on historic assets or places, to be accompanied by an assessment which is based on an understanding of the cultural significance of the historic asset and/or place. The assessment should identify the likely visual or physical impact of any proposals for change, including cumulative effects and provide a sound basis for managing the impacts of change.

LDP2 Policy 15 provides protection for non-designated heritage assets, and states that development proposals will not be acceptable where they fail to *“protect, preserve, conserve or enhance the special characteristics and/or cultural significance of the historic built environment in terms of its location, scale, form, design or proposed use”*.

As detailed at Section 3 above, the proposal the subject of the current application has come forward as a result of the concerns raised by the CO to the previous submission with the agent working closely with the CO and Planning Officers to achieve a mutually acceptable design.

In her response to the proposal, the CO notes that the building is not listed (with Historic Environment Scotland not willing to intervene as long as there is an ongoing planning process on the site), nor is the building in a Conservation Area, therefore there is nothing to prevent the demolition of Comraich and therefore the loss of the historic relationship between the two buildings.

The CO is satisfied that the design solution the subject of the current application, which is discussed in more detail at Section 4.9 below, will not detract from the characteristic of the built environment.

**The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the broad aims of NPF4 Policy 7 and LDP2 Policy 15, Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Our Historic Built Environment.**

#### **4.6. NPF4 Policy 9 – Brownfield, Vacant and Derelict Land and Empty Buildings**

NPF4 Policy 9 seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate the reuse of brownfield, vacant and derelict land and empty buildings, and to help reduce the need for greenfield development.

Part (a) of Policy 9 states that development proposals that will result in the sustainable reuse of brownfield land including vacant and derelict land and buildings, whether permanent or temporary, will be supported.

Whilst Part (d) of NPF4 Policy 9 notes the need to conserve embodied energy in order to give significant weight to the climate emergency as required by NPF4 Policies 1 and 2, and sets out that demolition will be the least preferred option, it does not expressly prohibit it.

In this regard, as the existing building is not currently a Listed Building, or situated within a Conservation Area it does not benefit from any statutory protection which would prevent its demolition.

The development proposed by this application is considered to be on a brownfield site by virtue of the fact that it is a proposal seeking to demolish an existing building and erect a replacement building.

**The proposal represents the sustainable reuse of brownfield land directly supported by NPF4 Policy 9(a) and Policy 01 of LDP2 which defines the site as being within the Settlement Area of Marnal and the current proposal would raise no issue of conflict should permission be granted.**

#### **4.7. NPF4 Policy 12 – Zero Waste**

NPF4 Policy 12 seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate development that is consistent with the waste hierarchy as defined within the policy document.

The development the subject of this planning application seeks to secure permission for the demolition of an existing dwellinghouse and erection of a replacement dwellinghouse. Whilst this is a development likely to generate waste when operational, it will already

benefit from regular waste uplifts by the Council and will be expected to comply with our adopted and enforced recycling and reuse strategy.

**The proposed development is considered to be in compliance with NPF4 Policy 12 and does not conflict with the requirements of LDP2 Policy 63, Waste Related Development and Waste Management which seek to ensure that effective provision for waste/recycling is provided within developments and the current proposal would raise no issue of conflict should permission be granted.**

#### **4.8. NPF4 Policy 13 – Sustainable Transport**

NPF4 13 seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate developments that prioritise walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport for everyday travel and reduce the need to travel unsustainably.

The application is seeking to secure permission for the demolition of an existing dwellinghouse and erection of a replacement dwellinghouse, a development which is not considered to be a significant travel generating use or a proposal where it is considered important to monitor travel patterns resulting from the development. Part (b) of Policy 12 requires consideration of the sustainable travel hierarchies including provision for vehicles and cycle charging points. A condition is recommended to secure an ev charging point.

The application shows the existing access spurring from the B8066 Heylipol-Hynish public road utilised to serve the proposed development with two parking spaces provided adjacent to the proposed dwellinghouse to which the Roads Authority has raised no objection.

**The proposed development is consistent with the broad aims of NPF4 Policy 13 and is consistent with the requirements of LDP2 Policy 34 – Electric Vehicle Charging, Policy 37, Development Utilising an Existing Private Access and Policy 40, Vehicle Parking Provision which collectively seek to ensure that proposed developments are served by a suitable and safe access regime and provide appropriate parking provision commensurate with the scale of the development proposed and the current proposal would raise no issue of conflict should permission be granted.**

#### **4.9. NPF4 Policy 14 – Design, Quality and Place**

NPF4 Policy 14 seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate well designed development that makes successful places by taking a design-led approach and applying the 'Place Principle'.

NPF4 Policy 14(a) details that development proposals should be designed to improve the quality of an area whether in urban or rural locations, regardless of scale with Part (b) affording support to developments where they are consistent with the six qualities of successful places: Healthy, Pleasant, Connected, Distinctive, Sustainable and Adaptable.

Part (c) details that development proposal which are poorly designed, detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding area, or inconsistent with the six qualities of successful places, will not be supported.

The DS provides a statement addressing the six qualities of successful places as follows.

***“Healthy: Our proposal will provide a much healthier home than the existing house at***

Comraich. The existing house is structurally un-safe and poses a risk to respiratory health. Our proposal uses Passivhaus principles to provide a healthy, breathable home; **Pleasant:** Our proposal uses high quality building materials and natural materials, to provide a pleasant house inside and out; **Connected:** Our proposal brings a habitable home back into the heart of Mannal, reducing the need for car dependence as future habitants can walk to neighbouring properties and cycle to the adjacent town of Balemartine; **Distinctive:** Our proposal is a creative play on the traditional Tíree house type, while also providing accommodation suitable for permanent living; **Sustainable:** Our proposal uses natural building materials such as timber kit construction and hemp insulation. It also includes provision of sustainable energy technologies: mechanical heat ventilation recovery, air source heat pump, and solar panels; **Adaptable:** Our proposal features three bedrooms, one on the ground floor and two on the first floor. This allows for future use by larger families as well as providing accessible accommodation for future disabled users”.

As detailed above, the design the subject of the current application has come forward due to concerns raised by the CO to the previous proposal.

In order to break up the massing proposed in the previous submission, the proposal the subject of the current application comprises two distinct elements, one single storey and the other 2 storey.

The single storey element is traditionally designed and proportioned sited immediately adjacent to Myrtle Bank where it broadly lines through in terms of its roof and eaves. This element of the proposal comprises white rendered walls with a dark grey standing seam metal roof.

The 2 storey element is set back from the single storey element where it is sufficiently separated from Myrtle Bank and, whilst higher than Myrtle Bank, shares a similar ridge height with other buildings in the area. The 2 storey element introduces a contemporary roof shape and window style whilst retaining the set-back eaves found in traditional blackhouses. The walls are to be finished in white render to match the single storey element with the roof finished in a green coloured standing seam metal to provide a visual separation between the traditional and contemporary elements of the dwellinghouse and also to provide a softer colour that will help to minimise the visual mass of the development.

Whilst the CO deems the contemporary barn-style roof to the 2 storey element to be slightly awkward in design, as the roof of the single storey element is similar to the existing situation, the CO deems that the special characteristics of the built environment would generally be preserved.

The CO further notes that the use of modern materials at the single storey part such as the metal roof, is in some ways regrettable as the traditional black top character is lost, it does allow legibility between the old and new (Myrtle Bank and Comraich) and as per LDP2 Policy 10, embodies “*honesty and legibility of contemporary design*”.

**It is considered that the proposal the subject of the current application would preserve the character and local distinctiveness of this part of the settlement, and therefore would be supported by NPF4 Policy 14, and would accord with LDP2 Policies 5, Design and Placemaking, 10, Design: All Development, and 15, Supporting the Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Our Historic Built Environment.**

#### **4.10. NPF4 Policy 15 – Local Living and 20 Minute Neighbourhoods**



NPF4 Policy 15(a) seeks development proposals to contribute to local living including, where relevant, 20 minute neighbourhoods. To establish this, consideration will be given to existing settlement pattern, and the level and quality of interconnectivity of the proposed development with the surrounding area, including local access to a number of facilities.

The LDP2 settlement strategy seeks to deliver sustainable levels of growth by steering the majority of development to our existing settlements where the most of our current infrastructure, services, employment opportunities, housing and community facilities are to be found and thereby making best use of these resources is a sustainable approach to development.

In this instance, the site, by virtue of being within the Settlement of Mannal, as defined in the LDP2 proposals maps, would reasonably comply with NPF4 Policy 15 given the scale of the environment within which the development is to be located, and given its compliance with the existing settlement pattern and the level and quality of interconnectivity of the proposed development with the surrounding area where people can reasonably meet the majority of their daily needs within a reasonable distance of their home. The applicant's sustainability checklist states *"The site is only a 10 minute walk to Balemartine, which has a few small businesses including a café and bakery. The site is 7 minutes by car to Crossapol and 13 minutes by car to Scarinish, the two largest settlement on the island with more amenities. Tiree has a private hire mini-bus and school bus which is able to pick up and drop off people along the route."*

**The proposed development aligns with NPF4 Policy 15 and there is no conflict with LDP2 Policy 01, Settlement Areas and Policy 04, Sustainable Development with the current proposal raising no issue of conflict should permission be granted.**

#### **4.11. NPF4 Policy 16 – Quality Homes**

NPF4 Policy 16 seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate the delivery of more high quality, affordable and sustainable homes in the right locations and providing choice of tenure to meet diverse housing needs.

Policy 16(c) supports development proposals for new homes that improve affordability and choice by being adaptable to changing and diverse needs, and which address identified gaps in provision, including 'self-provided homes' of which the proposed development represents.

With regards to Part (f) of Policy 16(i) an agreed timescale for build-out could be covered through the use of a planning condition; 16(ii), whilst the development proposed by this planning application is not on land actively allocated for housing in the LDP2, it would wholly accord with the adopted settlement strategy and would accord with the principles of 'local living' and '20 minute neighbourhoods'; 16(iii) the proposal is for a smaller scale opportunity within an existing settlement and in addition is consistent with NPF4 Policy 17, Rural Homes (a) (viii) as it is a one-for-one replacement of an existing permanent house.

**The proposed development is deemed to be consistent with NPF4 Policy 16 and there is no conflict with LDP 2 Policy 01, Settlement Area with the current proposal raising no issue of conflict should permission be granted.**

#### **4.12. NPF4 Policy 17 – Rural Homes**

NPF4 Policy 17 seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate the delivery of more high quality, affordable and sustainable rural homes in the right locations.

Policy 17(a) supports development proposals for new homes in rural areas where the development is suitably scaled, sited and designed to be in keeping with the character of the area and gives specific support for one-for-one replacement of an existing permanent house. As detailed at NPF14 above, it is considered that the proposal the subject of the current application would preserve the distinctive and special characteristics of the area.

Policy 17(b) requires proposals for new homes in rural areas to consider how the development will contribute towards local living and take into account identified local housing needs. It has already been seen at NPF4 Policy 15 above that the proposed development is consistent with our adopted settlement strategy policies and that it would have no materially harmful access or environmental impact. The proposed development seeks the introduction of a replacement dwellinghouse which would accord with the Council's key planning policies aims of supporting and sustaining fragile rural communities by contributing to actions to reverse our falling rural populations and supporting the local economy.

Policy 17(c) offers additional support to new homes in remote rural areas where such proposals (i) support and sustain existing fragile communities; (ii) support identified local housing outcomes; and (iii) are suitable in terms of location, access and environmental impact.

**The proposed development is deemed to be consistent with NPF4 Policy 17 and LDP2 Policies 09, Sustainable Development and Policy 10, Design all Development which are discussed in more detail at NPF4 Policy 14 above with the current proposal raising no issue of conflict should permission be granted.**

#### **4.13. NPF4 Policy 18 – Infrastructure First**

NPF4 Policy 18 seeks to encourage, promote and facilitate an infrastructure first approach to land use planning, which puts infrastructure considerations at the heart of placemaking.

The application indicates water supply via connection to the public network with a private drainage system comprising a septic tank and soakaway due to the lack of public drainage infrastructure within the vicinity of the site. Scottish Water raised no objection to the proposed development but advised that the applicant will require to submit a Water Connection Application to allow them to fully appraise the proposal. The Council's Building Standards Service will apply sufficient control over the detailed arrangements of the proposed private drainage system should the development proceed.

**The proposed development aligns with NPF4 Policy 18 and is in accordance with LDP2 Policies 04, Sustainable Development and Policy 60, Private Sewage Treatment Plants and Wastewater Drainage Systems which seek to ensure that suitable infrastructure is available to serve proposed developments and give support to private drainage arrangements where connection to the public system is not available. The current proposal would raise no issue of conflict should permission be granted.**

#### **4.14. NPF4 Policy 22 – Flood Risk and Water Management**

NPF4 Policy 22 seeks to strengthen resilience to flood risk and to ensure that water resources are used efficiently and sustainably.

As detailed above the development proposes connection to the public water supply to which Scottish Water has not objected to.

With regards to the management of rain and surface water at the site, this could be controlled through a condition to secure a suitable sustainable drainage system for the site should permission be granted.

**The proposal aligns with NPF4 Policy 22 and LDP2 Policy 61, Sustainable Drainage Systems with the current proposal raising no issue of conflict should permission be granted.**

## **5. Public Representation**

5.1. At the time of writing, representations had been received from 39 respondents in relation to this planning application. 25 respondents raise objection and 14 provide support.

It is not considered that the objections raise any complex or technical issues that have not been addressed in the current Report of Handling.

## **6. Conclusion**

6.1. The key factor in the assessment of this application is whether or not the replacement dwellinghouse is of an appropriate scale, design and finishes which respects the character and appearance of the surrounding townscape in terms of scale, massing, design and finishing materials and whether it is consistent with the provisions of adopted National and Local Planning Policy

No objections have been received from consultees with regards to the infrastructure required to serve the proposed development.

Tiree Community Council has indicated their support to the application, stating that they are following the Community Council's mission statement to grow the resident population of the island.

The proposed development has been assessed against the provisions of both the adopted National and Local Policy set out above and is deemed to be in compliance with their requirements.

The issues raised by third parties are not considered to amount to material planning considerations that have not been addressed through the processing of the planning application.

Accordingly the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.