

EAST AYRSHIRE COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE : 03 AUGUST 2004

**04/0289/OL: PROPOSED NEW BUNGALOW AND GARAGE AT LANDS AT
REDGATE FARM, SORN**

APPLICATION BY MR J S HODGE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SHEET

1. DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION

1.1 Planning permission is being sought in outline for the erection of a bungalow and detached garage. It has been submitted on the basis that it is required for a full time employee of the collective farms of Redgate, Catrineshaw, Shawwood and Kenstey Farms.

1.2 It is proposed to take access off a minor road from the B743 and drainage would be disposed of by a septic tank to a soakaway arrangement. No elevational details of the proposed house have been submitted but the site plan shows a rectangular floor plan measuring 123 square metres with a small conservatory to the southwest gable. A detached single garage is also shown.

1.3 The applicant has submitted a report from SAC Farm and Rural Business Division which concludes that there is a labour requirement for the farming operations of 3.75 labour units which justifies the equivalent of 4 full time workers. Since this application was first considered by the Southern Local Planning Committee on 28 May, the applicant has confirmed that the lands of Redgate farm were sold to him in 1984 and that Redgate farmhouse was sold, on the open market, in 2002. The applicant's labour market assessment verifies that he has two houses on the unit at Kenstey one of which is on a long term let to a family member who works part time on the farm. He also has a farmhouse at Catrineshaw which means that in total he has control over 3 houses, albeit one is leased.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 It is recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions stated on the attached sheet.

3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1 As indicated in section 5 of the report, the application as now clarified is considered to be in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, given the terms of Section 25 and Section 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, the application should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As is indicated at Section 6 of the report, there are material considerations relevant to this application. It is considered that these have been sufficiently addressed and would not merit refusal of the application.

3.2 Outline planning permission is being sought for the erection of a dwellinghouse in the Rural Protection Area of the countryside. The applicant has submitted a report from the SAC which states a requirement for 3.75 labour units which it equates to 4 full time employees is required to efficiently operate the collective farm unit comprising Catrineshaw Farm, Kenstey Farm, Shawwood Farm and Redgate Farm. There are a total of three dwellinghouses on the unit. The applicant, Mr JS Hodge, lives in a dwelling at Kenstey Farm while Mr Hamish Hodge, the applicant's son, resides in a property at Catrineshaw Farm. The third dwelling is at Kenstey Farm and this is rented out on a long term let to a family member. The agent has advised that this family member's full time employment is as an agricultural contractor but that he helps out on the farm in the evenings and at weekends. With only two available dwellings on a farm unit with a labour requirement of 3.75 it is considered that a third dwellinghouse is indeed justified.

3.3 The question of how and when Redgate Farmhouse was sold is pertinent to the consideration of this application. The background to this has been explained in Para 4.22 and it is accepted that this house has at no time been available to the applicant, other than when it was on the open market. In the absence of any policy stipulation to require the applicant to purchase any properties which may appear to be a suitable residence for the farm unit, the sale of this house is not considered to negate the need for a new house on the farm unit.

3.4 It is considered that a site specific locational need case has been sufficiently demonstrated and there are no other material planning considerations which would indicate the recommendation should be anything other than one of approval.

Note: This document combines key sections of the associated report for quick reference and should not in itself be considered as having been the basis for recommendation preparation or decision making by the Planning Authority.

**Alan Neish
Head of Planning, Development and Building Standards**

EAST AYRSHIRE COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE : 03 AUGUST 2004

**04/0289/OL: PROPOSED NEW BUNGALOW AND GARAGE AT LANDS AT
REDGATE FARM, SORN**

APPLICATION BY MR J S HODGE

Report by Head of Planning, Development and Building Standards

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present for determination an outline planning application which is to be considered by the Development Services Committee following a decision to do so at the Committee on 29 June 2004.

2. APPLICATION DETAILS

2.1 **Site Description:** The application site is an area of agricultural land extending to 0.19 hectares and located approximately 46 metres north of the B743 public road. It comprises the southwest corner of a flat area of land bound by a copper beech hedge and there are no significant features on the site.

2.2 Immediately to the front of the site is a modern bungalow known as High Cumdoon which is bound to the rear by a 2 metre high screen fence. The property known as Redgate Farmhouse is situated adjacent to High Cumdoon and is currently undergoing rehabilitation as approved last year (Planning Permission Ref : 03/0048/FL).

2.3 **Proposed Development:** Planning permission is being sought in outline for the erection of a bungalow and detached garage. It has been submitted on the basis that it is required for a full time employee of the collective farms of Redgate, Catrineshaw, Shawwood and Kenstey Farms.

2.4 It is proposed to take access off a minor road from the B743 and drainage would be disposed of by a septic tank to a soakaway arrangement. No elevational details of the proposed house have been submitted but the site plan shows a rectangular floor plan measuring 123 square metres with a small conservatory to the southwest gable. A detached single garage is also shown.

2.5 The applicant has submitted a report from SAC Farm and Rural Business Division which concludes that there is a labour requirement for the farming operations of 3.75 labour units which justifies the equivalent of 4 full time workers. Since this application was first considered by the Southern Local Planning Committee on 28 May the applicant has confirmed that the lands of Redgate farm were sold to him in 1984 and that Redgate farmhouse was sold, on the open market, in 2002. The applicant's labour market assessment verifies that he has two houses on the unit at Kenstey one of which is on a long term let to a family member who works part time on the farm. He also has a farmhouse at Catrineshaw which means that in total he has control over 3 houses, albeit one is leased.

3. CONSULTATIONS AND ISSUES RAISED

3.1 East Ayrshire Council's Roads and Transportation Division has deferred making a recommendation on the application. This is to enable the applicant to submit an amended plan showing the following :

- (i) the recommended visibility splays of 2.5m by 90m to the west and 2.5m by 120m to the east (which can be achieved by removal/cutting back of shrubs/trees to either side of the access);
- (ii) widening of the road to 5.5m or provision of a service layby should also be shown along with a 2 metre, kerbed pedestrian refuge verge.

Noted. It is reasonable to impose these requirements as suspensive conditions on the consent if the Committee are minded to approve the application.

3.2 Scottish Environment Protection Agency has no objections in principle to the proposed development. It is recommended that a sub-soil soakaway system is used for effluent disposal and a suitable designed Sustainable Urban Drainage system for surface water.

Noted.

3.3 Scottish Water has advised there is water apparatus within the site which may be affected by this application. There are no known sewers to which a connection may be made.

Noted.

3.4 PowerSystems has no objection to the proposed development.

Noted.

3.5 The Coal Authority were sent a consultation letter but have advised that they no longer wish to be consulted on applications where there is no definite requirement for them to make comment.

Noted.

3.6 Sorn Community Council had not responded to their consultation letter at the time of writing this report.

Noted.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 This application had attracted five letters of third party representation, all of which have objected to the proposed development. The objections can be summarised as follows.

4.2 The proposed house is on a very narrow road more than a mile long and, as the verges are very soft, meeting traffic already involves lengthy reversing. The entry would involve a further opening onto this road between two corners where traffic sighting is already difficult and people using the road as a shortcut are often driving too fast. I think there are something like six or seven field accesses between Little Blackdyke road end and the corner at High Cumdoon at present.

The public road from which it is proposed to access the site is indeed a narrow unclassified road. However, pending the receipt of amended plans to illustrate the sightline requirement the Council's Roads Division will impose appropriate conditions to ensure that the proposed development does not exacerbate any existing hazards to an unacceptable level. In any case it is the responsibility of individual drivers to pay due care and attention when driving on side roads to enable them to pull in safely as and when required.

4.3 A further point is that the water supply would have to come from my water at the rear of Redgate house, and the supply is so poor that if I run one tap at Little Blackdyke, the house on the corner, High Cumdoon, gets no water at all. In addition my water supply runs directly under the proposed development.

Scottish Water has advised that there is water apparatus within the site which may be affected by the development and the developer will therefore require to contact their Developer Services to discuss safeguarding measures. The applicant has not stated what the intended water supply is to be for the proposed dwellinghouse. If it

is to be private it should not affect any existing water supply in the vicinity but this would be a matter for the developer to resolve with the neighbouring properties. It is therefore not considered that this is a material planning consideration which has any weight in the determination of the planning application.

4.4 As the farmhouse has been recently sold and changed to a private house, I see no reason why we need a farm bungalow to be built on this site.

Redgate Farmhouse was indeed sold as a separate unit from the lands at Redgate in 2002. The applicant had previously purchased the land in 1984 and the vendor, Mr Gallacher, remained the owner of Redgate Farmhouse. Subsequently the farmhouse was sold on the death of Mr Gallacher. It is not reasonable to say that the applicant should have bought the farmhouse, especially given its state of significant disrepair and therefore this point made by the objector would not justify a recommendation of refusal.

4.5 Violation of the Council's policy for Housing in the Countryside : RES13.

A full policy assessment is provided in Section 5 of the report and it is considered that the proposed need case has been sufficiently demonstrated to meet the relevant policies.

4.6 Loss of prime agricultural land.

The report prepared by the Scottish Agricultural College (SAC) states that the land at Redgate is not prime agricultural land. It is therefore not considered that this objection is of sufficient materiality to indicate the application should be refused for this reason.

4.7 The proposals would create "ribbon" development on a single track road contrary to the Local Plan.

The site on which it is proposed to erect a dwellinghouse is immediately adjacent to an existing dwelling. However this dwelling is situated on a bend and it is therefore not considered that if this site was to be developed it would constitute ribboning. Hence it is not considered that this is a valid objection of any weight in the determination of this application.

4.8 Redgate is not a working farm and I now own the former farmhouse. I recently obtained both planning consent and building warrant to renovate and alter, to form a private dwellinghouse. I would suggest that if Mr Hodge requires a house for a farmworker it should be sited nearer to one of his other farms as it

is estimated 50% of land owned by Mr Hodge at Redgate is in fact tenanted by Mr Linton, Lochlea Farm, Mauchline. Prior to my purchase Redgate Farmhouse was formerly owned by a family relation of Mr Hodge who now rents Kentstey Farmhouse from Mr Hodge. Why did Mr Hodge not purchase Redgate Farm Steading to serve his alleged needs? Mr Hodge is semi-retired and presumably intends full retirement, so would not be using it as a working base and already has a house, separate from the farmhouse at Catrineshaw Farm.

Redgate Farmhouse was indeed sold off but not by the applicant as it was not in his ownership nor his control.

4.9 Has Mr Hodge looked at the option to either purchase or rent Little Blackdyke Farmhouse, which is unoccupied and approximately 300 yards from his proposed site?

Irrespective of whether or not Little Blackdyke Farmhouse is occupied or not this is not of materiality in the consideration of the planning application. It is only properties which pertain to the farm unit or which have recently been disposed of that are considered to have any weight when determining the need for the proposed dwelling. It would not be reasonable nor competent to expect the applicant to buy a property not contained within his own farm unit.

4.10 Since I came here some thirteen and a half years ago two bungalows have been built with their access being taken from the Redgate Farm access. This present application does not have an access to either of the Redgate Farm accesses and, accordingly, cannot meet the criteria laid down for the two existing bungalows. Since being built it may be of interest to note that one bungalow has changed ownership once and the second bungalow has changed ownership twice.

The matters of access and ownership in relation to the two existing bungalows are not material planning considerations which carry any weight in the determination of the current planning application.

4.11 Redgate Farm like the one I bought, Blackdyke Farm, has been systematically split up over the years and there is therefore the possibility of each individual landowner making a similar application.

The fact that Redgate Farm has been split up would only be relevant if the applicant had disposed of the farmhouse. This is not the case and each application must be considered on its individual merits and therefore the possibility of each landowner making an application is not considered to carry any weight in the determination of this application.

4.12 The application refers to a proposed development at Redgate Farm – Redgate Farm is not owned by the applicant but by a Mr Kerr. The address of the location given in the architect’s letter refers to it as being at “lands at Redgate” which is proper as the land is no longer Redgate Farm. In such circumstances it is strange the architect should then refer on his drawing to the “erection of new farm bungalow at Redgate Farm”.

The application has been made for lands at Redgate Farm but in any case it is not considered that this point is of materiality in the consideration of the proposed development.

4.13 The address of the applicant is given as Catrine Shaws Farm, Catrine – I believe, from a conversation with another person, the applicant in fact does not reside at the Farm itself.

The report prepared by the SAC advises that it is Mr Hamish Hodge who resides in the farmhouse at Catrineshaw Farm. It is reasonable that the applicant, Mr J S Hodge, has given this as his contact address. This is not a material planning consideration and has no weight in the determination of this planning application.

4.14 We feel that this proposal is completely unnecessary for the reasons given as it will not provide employment or benefit to the community in any way which, in our opinion, would provide the only valid reason for building on this particular area.

The objector makes a valid point in stating that the proposed development will not provide employment or benefit to the community. However, the application has not been made on this basis and the proposal is not required to meet this element of the policy as well as demonstrating a site specific locational need case. This point would therefore not indicate that the application should be refused.

4.15 The only time the gates have been left open were by the farmers themselves when they removed the cattle from the field concerned, when they were slurring the fields and when they were cutting the considerable crop of silage.

This is not a material planning consideration which has any weight in the determination of the application.

4.16 Also, in our eight years here, we have never known of cows calving in the adjacent fields, nor have we seen a calf in the fields. The fields were simply used for grazing and the cattle were removed during the winter months

presumably to one of their other farms where they must have the appropriate shelter, since there are no buildings here suitable for that purpose, or for calving.

The SAC report states that the applicant is now concentrating on rearing and selling youngstock and that cattle are sold either in calf or newly calved. The objector makes a valid point that this particular aspect of farming does require a shelter of some sort and there is no such shelter in the fields immediately adjacent to the site of the proposed dwelling. This casts doubt over the requirement for a dwelling to enable a supervisor to live in close proximity to the herd and is therefore a material consideration in the determination of this application. This however has to be weighed up against the labour market report that concludes a requirement for 4 full time employees (3.75 labour units).

4.17 The four existing houses are in a row which means that no house obstructs another and since Mr JS Hodge owns all the surrounding fields, if his need for a house here was deemed absolutely necessary, a situation at either end of the row would be more acceptable and would cause considerably less obstruction and distress. There is existing access at both of these sites which provides a greater line of sight in both directions. This would obviate the need to close an existing access and open a new one at the designated plot.

It is only the site which has been applied for which is under consideration and in any case forming an addition to either end of the existing row of houses would constitute ribbon development which is not considered acceptable. Hence this is not a valid consideration which would merit refusal of the application.

4.18 We cannot understand the choice of this particular plot in all the land available as it would mean our entire garden and rear windows would be overlooked by them as would their house and garden be overlooked by us. Not a very desirable situation for either party, when, it seems, other options are available.

The application has been made in outline only and it is therefore not known if it is intended to build a single or two storey dwelling if outline consent is granted. It has however been described as a bungalow which is evidently single storey only. The objector resides in the property known as High Cumdoon which is some 24 metres from the indicative position of the dwelling. The lie of the land is level and would therefore not be predisposed to creating an overlooking issue, regardless of storey height. It would however be reasonable to impose a condition requiring that the dwellinghouse be no closer to the existing house or no greater than one storey in

height if the Committee were minded to approve the application and were of the view this was a necessary restriction.

4.19 Following the receipt of new information on the sale of Redgate Farmhouse and farmland two further letters of representation have been submitted. These letters object to the proposed development for the following reasons.

4.20 The land at Redgate Farm, which consists of four grazing fields, cannot possibly employ a worker full time directly on the land concerned.

The applicant has submitted a report from the SAC which demonstrates a need for four full time employees on the collective farm unit, including land at Redgate,

4.21 Policy RES15 states that utilisation should be made of any existing buildings, of which there now none, or to utilize areas of derelict or degraded land in preference to the development of Greenfield land. There are several areas of degraded land adjacent to the proposed site.

The fact that there are no existing buildings which could be used actually strengthens the need for a new dwellinghouse to be built given that the need case has been demonstrated. Additionally the SAC report advises that this land is not prime agricultural land and therefore this is not material to the consideration of this application.

4.22 When the previous owner of Redgate Farmhouse died, the property fell heir to his two children, one of whom is Mr Hodge's daughter-in-law as demonstrated by a solicitor's letter supporting the objection. With half of this property, including purpose-built outbuildings and services, already in the family, and considering the stated importance of animal welfare, it is surprising this opportunity was ignored. Admittedly, the house would have to have been rendered habitable but, balanced against the cost of new build and installation of all services with the probable erection farm steadings it is felt to have utilised Redgate Farmhouse would have been the ideal solution.

Mr. Hodge's daughter-in-law was indeed the Executor Nominate for the late Mr. Gallacher and did reside at Catrineshaw Farm at the time Redgate Farmhouse was being disposed of. However, the prevailing family circumstances did not mean that Redgate Farmhouse automatically became readily available to accommodate a full time employee of the collective farm unit owned by the applicant. The farmhouse was then sold off and it is subsequent to Mr Gallacher's death that the need for a farmworker to reside at Redgate for purposes of supervision has arisen. It is considered therefore that the need case has been sufficiently demonstrated.

4.23 With regards to Policy RES15 any new farm buildings required to complement existing farm buildings, please note that Redgate has been completely renovated to a single dwelling with all outbuildings being demolished.

Redgate Farmhouse (inclusive of outbuildings) was sold separately from the land and thus did not necessarily provide an opportunity for the applicant to acquire the house or outbuildings which could have provided the required accommodation.

5. ASSESSMENT AGAINST DEVELOPMENT PLAN

5.1 Sections 25 and 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 require that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of this application the development plan comprises the Approved Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan and the Adopted East Ayrshire Local Plan (2003).

Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan

5.2 Policy G5 states that development proposals outwith settlements in the Rural Protection Area shall conform to the structure plan only where the development :

- A has a demonstrated site specific locational need;
- B can be justified in terms of social and economic benefit to the community;
- C contributes to rural land diversification; or
- D provides for the operational needs of agriculture and forestry.

The applicant claims that a new bungalow is required for an agricultural worker and has submitted an agricultural labour statement to justify this. It is considered that the justification has been sufficiently demonstrated so as to comply with (d) of Policy G5.

East Ayrshire Local Plan

5.3 Policy RES13 is supportive of residential development of houses in the Rural Protection Area only where it can be demonstrated that the houses are

required on a permanent basis for one of four stated purposes. One of those purposes is pertinent to the application under consideration, this being :

- (i) for a full time agricultural or forestry worker employed directly on the land to which the proposed house relates;

The applicant has provided an agricultural labour statement for the proposed house which states that, in total, Redgate, Catrineshaw, Shawwood and Kenstey Farms can justify 3.75 labour units and thus 4 full time employees. The collective farm unit does have a total of three dwellings at present. One of these is occupied by the applicant and one by the applicant's son. The third farmhouse is the subject of a lease to another family member who works full time as an agricultural contractor and helps on the farm on a part time basis. Hence there are only two units available for full time employees of the farm and one with a part time employee. This has to be assessed against the SAC Report which justifies 3.75 labour units. If it is accepted as concluded by SAC that this equates to 4 full time employers there is a need for a further house.

5.4 Policy RES15 requires applicants for any new residential development in the countryside deemed acceptable in terms of Policies RES13 and 14 of the local plan, to meet two stated criteria, as follows:

- (i) to utilise any existing buildings which are considered capable of residential use in preference to the construction of new build housing; and

There are no existing buildings at Redgate which could be used.

- (ii) to utilise areas of derelict or degraded land in preference to the development of greenfield land;

The house is proposed on greenfield land which is not classed as Prime Agricultural Land and there is no land which would evidently be derelict or degraded within the lands farmed at Redgate.

The policy also states that, in all cases, any new housing development will be required to consolidate and compliment existing farm steadings or small groups of houses, in preference to being isolated in the countryside.

The application site is located adjacent to existing, though redundant, farm buildings at Redgate Farm, so complying with this aspect of the policy.

5.5 Policy RES16 is not supportive of proposals for additional agricultural workers houses in the countryside in two stated circumstances. One of those circumstances is pertinent to the application, this being where :

- (i) an existing farmhouse or other agricultural workers accommodation previously serving the agricultural unit concerned has been sold off separately from the unit to persons not employed on the farm, within the preceding five year period; or

The applicant has now confirmed that the sale of Redgate Farmhouse was not his to sell albeit he owned the farmland.

The applicant has submitted a report from the SAC which demonstrates a labour requirement of 3.75 units or at least four full time employees. There are only two dwellings on the unit which are available for full time employees of the unit and indeed are occupied by such persons, the applicant and his son. The applicant controls a third unit which is leased to a family member whom it has been clarified works part time on the farm. It is considered on balance therefore that the proposed dwelling has been sufficiently justified in terms of site specific locational need, and that the proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan. It is therefore evident that an additional dwellinghouse is required to accommodate another full time employee and given that there is no full time supervision of the lands and stock, it is considered that the proposed dwelling has been sufficiently justified in terms of a site specific locational need.

6. ASSESSMENT AGAINST MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The principal material considerations relevant to the determination of the application are the consultation responses and third party letters of objection.

Consultation Responses

6.2 None of the consultees have objected to the proposed development or raised any matters which would indicate the application should be refused.

Representations

6.3 The application attracted five letters of objection which were primarily based on the water supply, access to the site, justification for the house and the proposed location of the proposed dwellinghouse. These representations are outweighed by the new information submitted in support of the application in relation to locational need.

7. FINANCIAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no financial or legal implications for the Council in the determination of this application.

8. CONCLUSIONS

8.1 As indicated in section 5 of the report, the application as now clarified is considered to be in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, given the terms of Section 25 and Section 37(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997, the application should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As is indicated at Section 6 of the report, there are material considerations relevant to this application. It is considered that these have been sufficiently addressed and would not merit refusal of the application.

8.2 Outline planning permission is being sought for the erection of a dwellinghouse in the Rural Protection Area of the countryside. The applicant has submitted a report from the SAC which states a requirement for 3.75 labour units which it equates to 4 full time employees is required to efficiently operate the collective farm unit comprising Catrineshaw Farm, Kenstey Farm, Shawwood Farm and Redgate Farm. There are a total of three dwellinghouses on the unit. The applicant, Mr JS Hodge, lives in a dwelling at Kenstey Farm while Mr Hamish Hodge, the applicant's son, resides in a property at Catrineshaw Farm. The third dwelling is at Kenstey Farm and this is rented out on a long term let to a family member. The agent has advised that this family member's full time employment is as an agricultural contractor but that he helps out on the farm in the evenings and at weekends. With only two available dwellings on a farm unit with a labour requirement of 3.75 it is considered that a third dwellinghouse is indeed justified.

8.3 The question of how and when Redgate Farmhouse was sold is pertinent to the consideration of this application. The background to this has been explained in Para 4.22 and it is accepted that this house has at no time been available to the applicant, other than when it was on the open market. In the absence of any policy stipulation to require the applicant to purchase any properties which may appear to be a suitable residence for the farm unit the sale of this house is not considered to negate the need for a new house on the farm unit.

8.4 It is considered that a site specific locational need case has been sufficiently demonstrated and there are no other material planning considerations which would indicate the recommendation should be anything other than one of approval.

9. RECOMMENDATION

9.1 It is recommended that the application be approved subject to the conditions stated on the attached sheet.

Alan Neish
Head of Planning, Development and Building Standards

7 July 2004
NM/NM/SMB/SA
FV/DVM

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Application Form and Plans.
2. Statutory Notices and Certificates.
3. Letters of Representation.
4. Consultation responses.
5. Adopted East Ayrshire Local Plan (2003).
6. Approved Ayrshire Joint Structure Plan (1999).

Anyone wishing to inspect the above background papers should contact Nicola Monroe on 01563 555485.

Implementation Officer: Dave Morris

Form TP24A

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (SCOTLAND) ACT 1997

Application No: 04/0289/OL

Location	Lands at Redgate Farm SORN KA5 6HL
Nature of Proposal:	Proposed new bungalow and garage
Name and Address of Applicant:	Mr J S Hodge Catrineshaw Farm CATRINE KA5 6LU
Name and Address of Agent	Stairhill Architecture Services Stairhill MAUCHLINE KA5 5HN

DPO's Ref: Nicola Monroe
PPO's Ref: Hugh Melvin

The above **OUTLINE** application should be approved subject to the following conditions:

01. The dwelling shall only be occupied by a person employed, or last employed on the lands at Redgate Farm to which the dwelling relates; or by a dependant of such a person residing with him or her (or a widow or widower of such a person).

REASON – The proposed development constitutes the construction of a dwelling house in the countryside which would otherwise be approved.

02. The further approval of the Planning Authority shall be obtained in respect of the undermentioned matters hereby reserved. The development of the site shall not commence until all these reserved matters have been approved :
- (a) the overall site layout/internal layout of the house plots;
 - (b) the size, height, design and external appearance of the proposed dwellinghouse;
 - (c) the means of drainage and sewage disposal;
 - (d) details of the access arrangements;
 - (e) the provision for car parking and turning within the site;
 - (f) the boundary walls/fences to be erected;
 - (g) a landscaping scheme for the site;
 - (h) finished site levels/floor levels.

REASON – The approval is in outline only.

03. The dwellinghouse hereby approved shall be no greater than a two storey unit with the second floor being accommodated in the roofspace with the use of dormers or rooflights only.

REASON – It is considered that a full two storey unit would be out of scale with neighbouring properties.

04. The dwellinghouse shall be traditionally designed following vertical proportions and using traditional locally found materials to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

REASON – In the interests of the character of the rural area and visual amenity.

05. Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall form visibility splays of 2.5m by 90m to the west and 2.5m by 160m to the east at the junction of the access with the public road and these areas, once formed, shall be kept free from any obstacle greater than one metre in height, and shall be maintained in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

REASON – To enable safe egress onto the public road in the interests of road safety.

06. Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall widen the public road to 5.5m or provide a service lay-by with a 2m kerbed pedestrian refuge verge to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

REASON – In the interests of road safety.

**DUE TO ORDNANCE SURVEY REGULATIONS AND COPYRIGHT
THE MAP IS AVAILABLE FOR VIEWING AT THE COUNCIL'S
PLANNING OFFICE IN KILMARNOCK. FOR INFORMATION ON
VIEWING PLEASE CONTACT (01563) 576790.**