

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park Authority

Planning Register

APPLICATION NUMBER: LT/2004/0080/HAE/S

Application **VALID** on: 24 March 2004

APPLICANT: Mr S McGhee
10 Croftbank Gate
Bothwell
G71 8AF

AGENT: Arena Architects
37 High Barholm
Kilbarchan
PA10 2EG

PROPOSAL: Alteration and extension to existing dwellinghouse

LOCATION: Loch Vennachar House Callander Perthshire

TYPE OF APPLICATION: Household Alteration/Extension

GRID REFERENCE: Easting: 259871
Northing: 706320

OFFICER: Aedan Smith

TELEPHONE: 01389 722600

CONSULTATIONS ISSUED:

The following organisations have been consulted about this application:

Letter Code	Consultee	Date Sent	Date Reply
-------------	-----------	-----------	------------

For Office Use

APPLICATION FEE: £110.00

DATE PAID: 24 March 2004

ADVERTISEMENT FEE: £0

DECISION: REF

DATE: 3 June 2004

**DATE APPEAL
LODGED:**

**DATE OF
DECISION:**

APPEAL DECISION:



**Loch Lomond
& The Trossachs
National Park**

Decision Notice

Pàirc Nàiseanta Loch Laomainn
is nan Tròisichean

APPLICATION NUMBER LT/2004/0080/HAE/S

Refusal of Planning Permission

Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park Authority
The Old Station, Balloch Road, Balloch, G83 8SS
Tel No. (01389) 722600 Fax (01389) 722633

Loch Lomond & The Trossachs National Park Authority **refuses** planning permission for the proposal described below, on the application form and on the accompanying plans.

To: Mr S McGhee
C/o Arena Architects
37 High Barholm
Kilbarchan
PA10 2EG

Description of the proposed development:

Alteration and extension to existing dwellinghouse

Location of the proposed development:

Loch Vennachar House Callander Perthshire

The National Park Authority's reasons for refusal are:-

- 1 The proposed extension is considered to be contrary to policies E15 and H11 of the Stirling Council Local Plan, policy NPH15 of the Stirling Council Local Plan Alteration 1B (a material consideration), and the Stirling Council Development Advice Note - House Extensions (which has been adopted by the National Park Authority as design guidance), mainly due to a combination of the following reasons:
 - a. The scale of the proposed extension does not adopt the appearance of a secondary and subservient addition. The DAN states that: "normally an extension will be considerably smaller than the original house, and should be designed to look as if it is an integral part".
 - b. The proportions of the extension relative to the main house in terms of:

- i. The gable width of the extension, which is 6.75m, compared to the gable of the main house, which is just 5.0m wide.
 - ii. The shallow 25° roof pitch of the extension compared to the more traditional 40° pitch of the original roof. The DAN states that: "extensions should generally have pitched roofs at the same pitch as the original and of a minimum slope of 30° (unless the original is shallower).
 - iii. The extent of projection of the gable, which is 6.75m, compared to the width of the principal frontage of the existing building, which is 10.1m, and the gable of the existing building, which is just 5.0m.
- c. The introduction of large areas of glazing extending from floor to ceiling, at both ground and first floor levels (along with associated projecting balcony), contrasts unsympathetically with the traditional architecture of the existing house. There is also a lack of clarity as to the extent to which the mullions separating the glazed elements will produce a vertical emphasis to the openings which have a more horizontal emphasis overall. The DAN states that: "the proportion and size of windows and doors in your extension should compliment the design and proportions of the original building" and "if your house is a traditional building of vernacular style, windows should be kept fairly small and of a vertical proportion".
 - d. Similarly, to the sides of the proposed extension, the large areas of wall unpunctuated by openings adopt a different and unsympathetic character and architectural style in contrast to the existing house. The style of the proposed extension has stronger associations with a modern house in an urban context than a traditional property in a rural context.
 - e. The proposal would require the removal of two wall-head style dormers from the rear elevation for the building. These, in conjunction with the matching dormers to the front elevation, form an important design element of the existing house. The removal of the existing, less than sympathetic stair extension is welcomed but this does not compensate for the loss of the dormers.
 - f. When taken together with the existing extensions, the proposed extension substantially exceeds the original rectangular footprint of the building by more than 50%. This is contrary to the provisions of Policy NPH15 of the Stirling Council Local Plan Alteration 1B.

Scottish Planning Policy 1 The Planning System makes it clear that the design of a proposed development and its relationship to its surroundings is a material consideration in determining an application for planning permission. The Policy also states: "A proposal may be refused, and the refusal defended at appeal, solely on design grounds". In this context, for the reasons set out above, the proposal is not considered to fulfil the intent and aspirations of SPP1.

2. Notwithstanding the location of the extension to the rear elevation of the house, the proposal is considered to have an adverse impact on the AGLV due to its

massing and design. It would be visible from the more elevated sections of the A821, a major visitor route serving the Trossachs.

- 3 The proposal is not considered to accord with the first statutory aim of the National Park "to preserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area" on the basis of the reasons given above.


Director of Planning

Date 3 June 2004

This decision notice is issued under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Acts. It should be read together with the accompanying plans; if any details differ, then the decision notice takes priority.

This decision notice neither gives nor implies a decision on a **Building Warrant Application** or under any other legislation. If you have not already done so you should contact your local Council to ascertain whether a Building Warrant is required.