

Addendum 2

LA01/2023/0615/F

1.0 Update

1.1 This application was originally presented to the March meeting of the Planning Committee. It was then deferred and following the submission of amended plans was deferred again at the April meeting to enable assessment and neighbour notification to take place.

1.2 The drawing below illustrates the overall changes from the scheme originally presented to Members in March 2025 (indicated in red) to the scheme now under consideration, with the drawing highlighting the overall reduction.

Proposed Elevations



- 1.3 While there has been a reduction in the overall footprint of the proposed dwelling this is very slight, and there has been a reduction in the ridge height of the main element of the dwelling. The overall front elevation still presents a long frontage onto the cliff path which is exacerbated by the large horizontal windows presented across two floors.
- 1.4 The revised proposal has been considered against ENV1 and PTL 06, and PPS 7. This has included an assessment of the Planning Statement submitted by Donaldson Planning, the site layout and contextual elevations having regard to the original and revised submissions. The proposal now under consideration seeks to increase the footprint over the existing dwelling, with a further (second) storey of development. Overall, the proposal seeks to replace the existing bungalow with a significantly larger 2 storey dwelling.
- 1.5 Having regard to the previous scheme which was considered not to be comparable in footprint and height to the existing, the overall changes only make a marginal difference. In this context the Planning Department remains of the view that the proposed dwelling is not of a comparable footprint and height with the existing building. This is particularly evident on the north and south elevations which illustrate how much larger the current proposal is relative to the existing.
- 1.6 Due to the limited overall reductions, and the proximity of the proposal to No.38, it will have an unacceptable impact on the property at No.38 Strand Road. The proposal not only comes closer to this property but is substantially higher and is of a greater bulk and massing to the existing. This creates a relationship that will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of No.38 as it will be overbearing due to the dominance and overshadow it. The proposal is unacceptable when considered against PPS7 and concerns in this regard remain as set out in 8.14 and 8.23 of the PCR.

1.7 The concerns set out in the PCR remain and the revised scheme fails to meet the policy requirements for the reasons set out and recommended in the PCR.

1.8 2 further letters of objection were received from one objector since the scheme has been amended. The first objection was regarding the limited time in which to comment on the amended scheme prior to the Committee. However, it was agreed by Members at the April meeting of the Planning Committee to defer the application to allow notification to take place; which has now happened. A summary of issues raised in the second objection are:

- Footprint is overdevelopment.
- As the site abuts a public right of way (PROW), the impact of the scale and massing must be considered in relation to those using PROW.
- Proposed massing and scale would negatively impact the character of the immediate area.
- The scale and design of the proposal is not in response to the constraints of the site but rather to provide the scale of accommodation required by the applicant.
- The proposed scale of the dwelling necessitates bringing the dwelling forward on the site and closer to No. 38.
- The proposal is not of comparable footprint and height.
- The amenity of No.38 will be compromised due to dominance of the proposed dwelling.
- Rock Castle should not be used as a precedence as context is totally different.
- Applicant erroneously takes the view that the text (LLPA Policy) requires replacement buildings to be of comparable foot print and height to those which already provide local context for the development.

- 1.9 The matters raised by the objector have been noted and considered. The proposal remains unacceptable for the reasons set out above in Paras 1.5-1.7 and in the PCR.

2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to Refuse the application in accordance with Sections 1 and 9 of the Planning Committee Report for the reasons set out in Section 10.