

Mr David Watson  
Ardnacross Farm  
Peninver  
CAMPBELTOWN  
PA28 6QP  
Tel: 01586 553451

14 August, 2010

Local Review Body  
Customer Services  
Argyll and Bute Council  
Kilmory  
Lochgilphead  
PA31 8RT

Dear Sir/madam,

Re: Appeal of refusal of planning permission in principle.  
Local Review Body ref: 10/0010/LRB

Please find enclosed the further comments we wish to make in support of our appeal for planning permission in principle (ref:10/00040/PPP), in response to the planning authority's representations.

Yours sincerely



David Watson

Appellant's Comment on Representation by the Planning Authority to the Local Review Body  
Ref:10/0010/LRB

We feel that we have covered most of the planning authority's main points adequately in our original submission but would like to make the following additional comments to further explain our position.

Neighbour Support

We would like to comment on the request by the planning authority that the letters of support are not taken into consideration. The review board will note that in the original report of handling the planning authority state that we had claimed to have neighbour support. We would therefore argue that this is not new material, only evidence of what was previously stated.

At no point in this process were we informed that providing proof of support in writing would have changed the process of determination of the application. This is not stated on any of the application for planning permission in principle guidance. We therefore feel that if this was an option open to us then we should have been given this advice during the many discussions held between ourselves and the planning department in respect of this application over the past 18 months.

We had hoped that the planning authority would look favourably on our application due to the extenuating circumstances of which they were well aware and did not feel there was a need to consider what appeal process would be available to us. We had felt that stating we had neighbour support (in view of the absence of any objections) would be sufficient enough and we did not wish to inconvenience our neighbours by asking for written proof of their support unless it was requested by the planning department.

We would respectfully request that the review panel does take into consideration the letters of support. We believe the evidence of support, coupled with the extenuating circumstances explained in our previous supporting documentation, are material considerations which would indicate that some discretion could be used in the application of the local development plan should this be required in the determination of this appeal.

Determining Issues ect.

We note that the authority points out that there is no way to guarantee that the currently approved adjoining sites will ever be developed and we do agree with this, however, we would not be pursuing this appeal if we did not feel we had every chance of developing all three sites in the near future. While there is no guarantee that the sites will be developed there is also no guarantee that they will not! We feel that the LCS should take into consideration previously approved sites. However, discounting the adjacent sites we feel that the site currently under consideration is within an acceptable boundary of flexibility, being close to the area around the existing settlement which is designated as having capacity for development under the LCS.

Requirement for additional information and a hearing: Request for site visit.

We would like to also re-state our request for the review panel to undertake a site visit. We feel that only by standing on the site in question will the panel be able to make their own judgement on the positive or negative impact the development would have on the area (socially, economically, environmentally or visually). We feel that it is not possible to apply the policy without this firsthand knowledge of the site, since the policy uses terms (such as visual impact, semi-wilderness, isolation, panoramic quality, open landscape etc) that are difficult to define or explain on paper. Visiting the site would allow you the panel to decide for yourselves which terms apply to the site. It would also allow for a decision regarding whether the site is within the 'boundary of flexibility' requested by the members in approving the Landscape Capacity Study recommendations.

Yours sincerely



David Watson