



Mr Darren Westmacott  
Legal and Domestic Services,  
The Moray Council  
Council Offices  
High Street  
Elgin,  
IV30 1BX

29 December 2016

Your Reference: DW/LR175  
Planning Application: 16/01599/APP

Dear Mr Westmacott

Having reviewed the 'Local Review Body Statement of Case to Support the Planning Application to erect an extension at 10 Church Place, Findhorn' I can confirm that we still wish to object to this planning application and have a number of points to raise in response to the document.

#### Section

- 2.2 We do not support their suggestion that this is a relatively small extension. A quick calculation using dimensions obtained from the ground floor plan show the extension to have a floor area equal to approximately 36% of the original property and is therefore in our view a significant forward extension of the property.
- 3.4 The Scottish Government web page on Guidance on Householder Permitted Development Rights dated 24 June 2016 still links to circular 1/2012 so I assume this document remains the current and best guidance available to the public and therefore the restrictions on building forward of a wall forming the principal elevation and length of the extension are still valid.
- 3.5 We disagree with this statement in that we feel that although the property may be relatively small the plot in which it is located is relatively large and does therefore support other options for extension of the property which:
- would significantly reduce the overshadowing and maintain the current levels of both the natural and sun light reaching the only window for the primary living area of our property (9 Church Place), namely the combined living/dining room. This room only receives direct sunlight during the late afternoon/early evening and this extension will result in us losing this period of natural brightness
  - would have a less significant negative impact on the appearance and character of Church Place.

3.6 and 3.7 From consideration of the photographs submitted, and from a rough estimation of the depth, none look to be the same depth as the proposed extension to 10 Church Place.

This statement also contains errors in that:

- only the example in Moray Av is in a cul de sac which bears any similarity to Church Place and even then the Avenue is significantly larger.
- for two of the examples (Covesea Road, Lossiemouth and High Street, Archiestown) the extension is not hard on the boundary and
- from a rough estimate I do not believe that any of the examples extends beyond 4m.

Additionally, for most of the properties the extension has a more south facing orientation which the neighbours may have considered to have a less detrimental effect on the level of natural sunlight reaching their windows.

3.9 We disagree with this statement and consider that both our property and a number of the other properties in Church Place would be confronted from the gardens by an approximately 4.5m x 3.6m wall of roughcast brick and tile which would, in our view, have a significant negative effect on the character and appearance of the Place.

3.10 The current boundary hedge, although high does not currently significantly affect the level of light reaching the living room, but it is not 6 feet high in the region nearest the house and a hedge can be cut back if it gets any higher. Additionally, from the elevations diagram the top of the roof will be twice the height of the hedge, in the vicinity of the window.

We remain very concerned that as the extension is on the primary elevation of the row of houses in a small cul-de-sac, is fronting the road to the property and will extend significantly beyond the line of the front wall. We believe this and any precedence it may set will significantly and negatively alter the appearance and aesthetics of Church Place.

Yours sincerely

P Hancock