



**POS REFERENCE: -**

**POS-P-0090---Land 100 Metres North West Of  
Inchadney Old Amulree Road Kenmore Aberfeldy  
PH15 2HE24/00695/FLL**

**OBJECTION TO LOCAL REVIEW BODY ON BEHALF  
OF MR J NEVIN**

**REFERENCE: - LRB-2024-36 or 24/00695/FLL**

**ADDRESS: - Land 100 Metres North West Of  
Inchadney Old Amulree Road Kenmore Aberfeldy  
PH15 2HE24/00695/FLL**

**APPLICATION DESCRIPTION: - Erection of a  
dwellinghouse and associated works**



## Document Preparation

Prepared for	Contact Details	
John Nevin		

Prepared by	Qualifications	Title
J Russell	MRTPI AssocRICS	Director

Approved by	Qualifications	Title
J Russell	MRTPI AssocRICS	Director

## Document Control

Issue	Date	Version
1	13-09-2024	Draft
2	13-09-2024	Final

## Copyright

Copyright of this report is vested in Planning Objections Scotland Ltd and no part of it may be reproduced or copied by any means without prior written permission from Planning Objections Scotland. If you have received this report in error, please destroy all copies in your possession and notify Planning Objections Scotland immediately.

## Disclaimer

The findings and recommendations of this report are for the use of the client named on the Document Preparation section of the report and relate to the project described in this report only. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by Planning Objections Scotland no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of this report. No liability is accepted by Planning Objections Scotland for any use of this report, other than the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 To assist the Local Review Body, Planning Objections Scotland has been instructed by John Nevin of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to prepare a summary of the original objection lodged with the Planning Case Officer. This is to pinpoint the main issues that warrant refusal of application 24/00695/FLL for the erection of a dwellinghouse and associated works on land 100 Metres North West Of Inchadney Old Amulree which is on the south side of Loch Tay.
- 1.2 For the avoidance of doubt the Planning Officer's recommendation to refuse the application is endorsed.

## 2.0 COMPETENCY OF THE SUBMISSION

- The application lacks necessary details and contains errors, making it difficult to conduct a comprehensive assessment. It does not meet the validation standards set by the Heads of Planning Scotland (HOPS), see detailed POS objection paragraphs 2.1- 2.16 and 2.24 - 2.35
- There are concerns with the redline application boundary as the works to achieve the site access visibility splay is located out with the application site and would likely require third party land, see detailed POS objection paragraphs 2.17 - 2.23.

## 3.0 POLICY ASSESSMENT

- **Climate and Nature Crises, Biodiversity and River Tay SAC designation:** The proposal underplays the potential impacts on biodiversity, it fails to enhance biodiversity or integrate nature-based solutions. It does not provide significant biodiversity enhancements or strengthen habitat connectivity, and does not incorporate climate mitigation and adaptation strategies, such as minimising lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions or enhancing passive solar heating , see detailed POS objection paragraphs 3.10 - 3.23.
- **Forestry and Woodland Issues:** There are inaccuracies within the Tree

Survey as some trees are not correctly identified, undertaking works to this steep sloping site will result result in a greater impact on the tree resource which has not been adequately demonstrated. The proposal does not support the enhancement of woodland and tree cover, see detailed POS objection paragraphs 3.23 - 3.28

- **Setting of Historic Assets/Listed Building:** The competency of the submission/ lack of information means an assessment on the setting of Listed Buildings cannot be undertaken, see detailed POS objection paragraphs 3.29 - 3.31
- **Sustainable Transport and Access:** The ability to achieve visibility splays appears to be limited by third party land and the requirement to significantly recontour the land. Accordingly Road safety and the relationship with the National Cycle Route has not been addressed, see detailed POS objection paragraphs 3.32 - 3.35.
- **Design and Placemaking:** The dominance of the structure is not considered to create a 'pleasant' and attractive built space, it is not 'distinctive' or taken account of local architectural styles or interpreted them in a way to reinforce local identity, it is not 'sustainable' by integrating nature positive and biodiversity solutions. It fails to meet the six qualities of successful places criterion, see detailed POS objection paragraphs 3.39 - 3.43.
- **Rural Homes and Housing in the Countryside:** This proposal does not relate to a building group, is not infill development or relate to the garden ground of an Estate House. The recommendation to refuse is the correct policy interpretation and this is consistent with the historic refusal at the site, application 15/00536/IPL refers. See detailed POS objection paragraphs 3.44 - 3.55.
- **Flood Risk, Drainage and Ground Stability:** The case officer's report of handling acknowledges that there is insufficient information on drainage and flooding which aligns with the concerns raised in the POS Objection, see paragraphs 3.56 - 3.59. Ground Stability is also a concerns, See detailed POS objection paragraphs 3.60 -3.61.

#### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 The proposal fails to comply with the National Planning Framework 4 and Local Development Plan Policy. There are no material considerations that warrant approval of the Application. Taking account of the issues raised above the reasons for refusal identified within the Case Officer's report of handling could be expanded.
  
- 4.2 It is respectfully submitted that the appeal to the Local Review Body should be dismissed and the application refused.