



Transportation

Richard Gerring

SENIOR ENGINEER (TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT)

The Moray Council, Academy Street, Elgin IV30 1LL

Telephone: 01343 562551

Fax:01343 545628

Chief Legal Officer
Per Mr R Ritchie
Committee Services
The Moray Council
High Street
ELGIN
IV30 1BX

E-mail: richard.gerring@moray.gov.uk

Website: www.moray.gov.uk

Your Reference: RR/LRB/Case 029

Our reference: DA/RJG/CEA - 923631

G R Holland
Transportation Manager

22 March 2011

Dear Sir

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (SCHEMES OF DELEGATION AND LOCAL REVIEW PROCEDURE)(SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2008
REQUEST FOR REVIEW : PLANNING APPLICATION 10/01693/APP
12 SEAFIELD PLACE, CULLEN – REMOVAL OF PLANNING CONDITION 11 OF PREVIOUS CONSENT 07/00758/FUL**

I refer to your letter dated 9 March 2011.

I respond on behalf of the Transportation Manager with respect to our observations on the applicant's grounds for seeking a review of the planning authority's decision to refuse the above planning application.

Transportation's reasons for refusal were on the grounds that the provision of the pedestrian link through this development is required to ensure that any future pedestrian linkage to the R1 Seafield Place allocated residential site is not compromised. The appellant has argued in their Local Review Submission that alternative pedestrian routes are available via core path CU05 some 100 metres to the north-east of the site, along with further connections to a private road/track to the south of the site which passes through Seafield Farm. The Scottish Government document "Designing Streets" encourages the provision of connected or 'permeable' networks to encourage walking and cycling by residents of new developments.

The key locations which pedestrians from the R1 site would be seeking to access in Cullen are the shops on Seafield Road and around Cullen Square along with the Primary School, to the north west and west of the R1 site.



2

22 March 2011

Chief Legal Officer
The Moray Council

A pedestrian connection from the R1 site to Seafield Place in the vicinity of No 12 Seafield Place, would provide a direct walking route for those seeking to gain access to the shops and local facilities on Seafield Road. The use of the two alternative pedestrian routes suggested by the appellant would result in pedestrians walking a longer distance to those local facilities. This additional distance may deter some of the future residents of the R1 site from walking to the local facilities.

Whilst it is acknowledged that there are differences in level between the R1 site and Seafield Place, the developer of the R1 site would have the resources to facilitate the provision of any pedestrian connections.

I have no further comments at this stage.

Yours faithfully

Richard Gerring
Senior Engineer Transport Development

