

Objection to Planning Appeal – Erection of 2no. self catering apartments (east wing) at Norland, Stotfield Road, Lossiemouth ref 21/01206/APP.

Representation on behalf of [REDACTED]

A letter of objection to application 21/01206/APP was previously submitted on behalf of [REDACTED]. The grounds within that objection remain unaltered. That letter is provided as an addendum to this objection.

See below our comments relating to the statement of appeal.

1 Introduction

- 1.2 The east wing (extension), is not thought to provide balance or rounding off of the development, but rather an over-powering of the original dwelling, with the resulting development being of a scale, density and character inappropriate to the surrounding area (DPI).
- 1.2 In relation to being a key tourist property in the town, it would be only one of over 100 self-catering properties in Lossiemouth.
- 1.4 The revised design has not prevented loss of views from all neighbours, and is of similar massing to the initial application. It is understood that the change had more to do with lack of daylighting.
- 1.6 Mr & Mrs McPherson strongly object to the suggestion that there is no impact upon neighbours. The neighbours Culane immediately to the east of the proposed development would be most affected.
- 1.8 This is neither accurate nor relevant.
- 1.9 This is comparing with larger properties. The basis of building use is questioned in our previous letter of objection.
- 1.10 This cannot be accepted. The original property was a dwelling. It does not need to be converted as proposed due to its location.
- 1.12 The provisional letter of objection highlights issues in relation to Accuracy of Information and Parking. It is not known if these matters have been reviewed further by Transportation.

2. Background

- 2.6 The area to the south left for car parking is very tight and there would appear to be inadequate space for vehicle manoeuvring. Figure 3 plan does not accord with drawing no. 015PP, also submitted with the original application. This may have misled Transportation.
- 2.7 The additional extension would not improve the massing. The combined impact would be unsympathetic to the original dwelling.
- 2.8 As 1.8.

3. Statement of Case

- 3.2 (a) Economic need would not justify development which would damage the assets of the area by inappropriate or unsympathetic development (DP8 and EP3).
- (b) The additional extension would be over development (DD1).
- (c) A change to the south elevation does not justify the scale density and character being inappropriate for the area (DP1).
- (d) There is significant impact both from Stotfield Road, (south elevation), and particularly when viewed from the shore (north elevation) affecting the Special Landscape Area (EP3). The building has a prominent location when viewed from the shore.
- 3.5 It is an attractive building currently from the north but the scale and character would be completely changed by the proposed extensions.
- 3.7 As 2.6.
- 3.8 This is contradicted by dwg no 015PP.
- 3.9 The combined extensions would overpower the existing dwelling.
- 3.10 As 1.2

4. Reasons for refusal – Policy Compliance

- 4.1 Over development could be caused by the additional extension.
- 4.3.1 As 4.1.
- 4.3.2 The character of the area, particularly to the east of the Moray Clubhouse is of private dwellings not businesses.
- 4.3.3 As 4.1.
- 4.3.4 The example is new built, not an existing traditional dwelling.
- 4.3.5 Amenity would be affected by a business of this scale with traffic movement, increased commercial use and outlook onto neighbouring properties.
- 4.4.1-3 The Special Landscape Area would be damaged by the inappropriate and unsympathetic development.
- 4.4.5 Policy EP3 is not compliant as DP1 is also non-compliant. The proposed development has a prominent setting from the north which would be damaged.

In summary, there is clear non-compliance with policies DP1, DP8 and EP3. These departures are not outweighed by any material considerations.

It is therefore requested that the appeal should not be upheld.

Addendum:

Planning application – Erection of 2no. self catering apartments (east wing) at Norland, Stotfield Road Lossiemouth ref 21/01206/APP

Representation on behalf of [REDACTED]

It is wished to object to the above application on the following grounds:

1. Building use

The drwg no.180048.HARRIS.015PP refers within the parking schedule and plan to '*existing house*'. The existing property has 4 bedrooms advertised for bnb, suggesting that the application should be considered under Class 7, with 'Class 9 – Houses' only allowing use as a house within that Class as a bnb or guesthouse with a maximum of 2 bedrooms.

2. Accuracy of information

There is a discrepancy between drwg no.180048.HARRIS.015PP and drwg no.09PP D affecting space available for parking and turning to exit in a forward gear. The single storey part of the proposed East Wing (to the south), has been omitted from drwg no.015PP.

There is also no scale bar shown to allow sizes to be reviewed.

It is therefore very difficult to assess the proposals, and as such it is suggested that this needs to be referred to the applicant and proposals re-notified to allow accurate assessment.

It is noted in the consultation comments from Transportation that the parking and manoeuvring requires entry and exit in a forward gear and that drwg no 015PP is the plan provided to verify this requirement. This needs review.

3. Parking.

It is understood that 13 parking places as required as a condition for East Wing to be approved. Should this also have minimum disabled parking added if Class 7?

The manoeuvring of the parking space to the south west corner seems particularly tight for exiting in a forward gear.

4. Scale of development

The West Wing as approved is already a significant extension, though has been designed to be relatively sympathetic to the existing scale, detailing and appearance of the original dwelling. That cannot be said of the East Wing however where the design is contemporary with large glazed areas which are a dominant feature and out of character.

If the East wing is approved and built along with the West Wing, the two extensions will be of a combined scale which will have an overpowering impact and not be subservient to the original dwelling.

This is seen as over development of the site, taken together with the extent of parking required, three vehicular accesses and lack of distancing between extended Norland and neighbouring properties.

The north elevation is also in a prominent location viewed from the ENV6 designation to the foreshore.

It is requested that these concerns are taken into account when determining.