

Statement of appeal :

RESPONSE TO INTERESTED PARTIES' COMMENTS 28th November 2023

Appeal to Renfrewshire Council

Application: **23/0158/PP**

Decision date – 18th September 2023

Released to applicant on 2nd October 2023 (Effective decision date)

Appeal Against the Decision of the Planning Officer to refuse an application for Planning Permission in Principle for the Erection of detached dwelling house and livestock barn at Undercarig farm, by Galahill road , Langbank, PA146YS

Prepared by: Ciaran Bradley B.Sc. BArch. RIAS ARB
Director – AXN Architecture Ltd.

Supporting further documentation attached:

- Abbey Veterinarian group Undercraig support
- Appellants comments
- SAC consulting Open letter to planning officer

Further to the receipt of the planning officer's response to the above Review, we make the following comments on behalf of our client.

As a general point the Planning Officer's observations takes an extremely narrow and impractical view of the applicants evolving family situation in relation to existing suitable accommodation, oversimplifies the availability of suitable useful accommodation 'nearby' and significantly understates the need for the applicant to be present on site for her labour intensive and unpredictable livestock and experience business.

Additional supporting letters from ABBEY VETERINARIAN GROUP, SAC consulting and further comments from the applicant attached, clarify the applicants urgent need to move from the three bedroom parental home on site with her own growing family, whilst moving to suitable, appropriate accommodation on site that allows the applicant and her family to remain on site and tend to her growing business.

In terms of specific comments, we comment as follows.

Please note that there is no numbering of the Planning Officer's observations or pages, however we have referred to their paragraph numbering and added page numbers for ease of referring to responses.

Paragraph 2(page 1)– this paragraph speaks clearly in support of the application; Stating applications will only be supported if they are for "required residential accommodation" for a "key worker" in a "primary industry" where the presence of a worker is essential to the operation of the business. The applicants growing family (now with husband and child) that were not present at inception of the business, continuing to live in the 3 bed parental home shared with her sister, is simply no longer suitable. The fact this is now unsuitable must be recognised.

The applicant as business owner for some 4 years now and primary worker is the key worker in a primary business where her presence on site is required at unpredictable times

as noted by both Abbey Vets and SAC consulting letter of support. This will become increasingly important as the business grows.

Paragraph 3 and 4 (page 1) Policies 16 and 17 of NPF4 refer to limited circumstances where new dwellings will be supported where “it is demonstrated to be necessary to support sustainable management of available rural business and there is an essential need for a worker to live permanently at or near the place of work” this is clearly and demonstrably the case for the applicant

Paragraph 5 (page 2) re policy ENV1. Reiterates the need for a development to support an established activity. This clearly supports the applicants application. The particular evolution of the business on land the applicant owns in a place she grew up and developed the business on and within, supports the specific locational and operational need for the business and supporting accommodation to be in this particular location.

Paragraph 7 and 8 (page 2) makes the points that the applicant already lives on site, that the applicant is seeking additional accommodation to expand the business and that no policy provision is made for the splitting of a family unit in currently suitable accommodation.

This narrow view simplifies and overlooks the urgency and impracticality of the current accommodation situation and need for appropriate accommodation on site. The parental home on site is no longer suitable for 2 families and the evolution of a family, the need to leave the parental home would not be regarded as splitting a family. Additionally the requirement is not only to facilitate the business expansion, it is to support the natural expansion that is already occurring.

The planning officer appears to be taking a dim view of an enterprising young business persons’ attempts to settle and grow a rural business whilst providing independent and appropriate suitable accommodation for the growth of her family, business and local community.

Paragraph 9 (page 2) – The comments here belittle the SAC consulting labour requirement assessment and the applicants’ and Abbey VETS assertion that this labour requirement is required on site. The application and consultants are the experts in this regard. The comments also reiterate that the applicant already lives on site and that settlements nearby could “reasonably” accommodate the applicant.

Again this simple view overlooks the urgent need for the applicants growing family to leave the small parental home and be accommodated near to the livestock and growing business. ‘Nearby’ accommodation is expensive, unavailable, increase stress on Applicant and livestock, and severely increase risk to livestock due to unsuitable supervision and emergency care when required.’ Nearby’ overlooks availability, cost and the convoluted back roads networks that would leave the applicant remote and distant from her livestock at the unpredictable times she is required to tend to them,.

Paragraph 10 (page 2) clearly supports the labour requirement and activity of the business in this locational

Paragraph 11 (page 2) again states there is no justification for additional accommodation and that no site specific operational requirement has been established. This very simplistic

view ignores the fact that the applicant owns land and a business in this location, that she and her family with new husband and baby cannot live in the parental home indefinitely and that site specific operational need has been clearly established by expert consultants.

Paragraph 12. page 2The comments acknowledges periodic “rigorous demands” for an on-site presence , however belittles this to not be a constant throughout the year and that the applicant already has a presence on site.

The comments take no cognisance of the unpredictable and labour intensive nature of the work as outlined in the SAC report and supported by Abbey Vets. whilst the planning officer asserts the operation on site requirement can be achieve by remote accommodation in settlements within reasonable proximity, this is not the view of the applicant who cannot operate a labour intensive and unpredictable livestock business remotely.

Paragraph 13 page 3 states that no relevant policies support this application. However it is the opinion of the applicant, SAC consultants, the applicants VET (Abbey Vets) and the business growth data in support of the application that this is precisely the type of application that Renfrewshire council should rally behind in support of young family determined to grow a business in support of the local community. The application for planning permission in principle for a home and barn is exactly what is required to facilitate and help the applicants’ family and business to flourish and thrive in a location where they have grown and positively contributed to throughout their life.

-

- **Thorough Cleaning:** Start with a deep clean of mats, equipment, and surfaces using strong antifungal cleaners. Suggest this is after every session. Suggest creating a volunteer schedule using a 1st choice 2nd choice 3rd choice option for who will mop the mats. Appoint volunteer members to run the schedule. Ensure enough mops and hot water available.
Suggest requesting a one off voluntary payment to the club of say £10- £20. to buy signage , enhanced cleaning materials and initial purchases of sample soaps and wipes to be handed out.