

Darren Westmacott

From: Steve Briggs [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 February 2016 14:30
To: Darren Westmacott
Subject: Planning Application 15/0201/APP - Notice of Review

Categories: MLRB

Dear Mr Westmacott

I have today received the Notice of Review in relation to the above application and have reviewed the documents available on the Moray Council website. As far as I can see, nothing has changed, except that the appellant does not seem to accept the Council's reason for rejection of the original application. That reason is that the proposal "*...is contrary to the provisions of the adopted Moray Local Development Plan 2015 (Policies H7 and IMP1)...*". The application is still contrary to those policies. The rejection goes on to state that "*...when added to other existing and recently approved dwellings, this additional house would result in an incremental but further cumulative build-up and accumulation of dwellings extending along the U64H road. As a result, the proposal would be detrimental to the rural character of the open countryside surrounding Craigellachie, this area having been identified as one in which there has been significant growth in housing proposals and where further development, such as this proposal, would detract from the amenity and appearance of existing development and irreversibly alter the character of the countryside in this locality.*" Clearly, the Council's view is that there are already enough developments on the road in question. That position has not changed, yet the appellant seems to be seeking an exception on the grounds that 'just one more' will not make any difference. I cannot see that there would be any point in the Council adopting such policies, and taking its position on over-development, if it were to allow the appeal. At what point is enough actually enough?

My original objection to the application included the point that the single-track road (the U64H) is already busy with local and agricultural traffic, and the location of the site entrance is in a particularly dangerous spot. The application is for a property with a double-garage, implying at least two additional vehicles, and the site plan shows the drive extending beyond the site in application, presumably to service a further site (with even more vehicles) which will no doubt be the subject of a further application if this one is granted.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Briggs
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

SAVE PAPER - Please do not print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary.