



26/7/2016

Dear Darren Westmacott

Re **Notice of Review: Planning application 16/00555/APP Proposed House at Covesea Links Golf Course**

Thank you for the invitation to make representations.

I understand the Council's decision to refuse the application was made on the grounds that none of the exceptions provided for in this policy (I presume this is the Coastal Protection Zone) apply and the development would introduce a form of development that would be out of harmony in the sensitive coastal area involved. This was also the basis of my objection which I continue to hold.

The applicants appear to make two main points in their support:

1. The precedent of "previous residential use" on the site.

The "house" they refer to is the long ruinous salmon bothy, a much smaller building than their proposed house. More significantly, the bothy was not a home. Its use was seasonal, as a bothy, by unaccompanied salmon netting fishermen. It also predated the days of installation of electricity and water, the use of domestic appliances and other trappings of permanent habitation. It is the 24/7 human presence that comprises the difference between a house and the permitted golf/cafe-associated buildings. Secluded coves such as the Covesea amphitheatre are few and far between, and one of Moray's natural assets; the use as a golf course and café, while intrusive, still allow the area to retain a natural element when the facilities are not in use.

2. The developments's vulnerability to vandalism and the inflexibility of application of the CPZ policy.

I suggest that the CPZ and preceding AGLV were spelled out before any development on this site. If the development had actually been as basic as we were assured it would be at the outset in 1990, there would be nothing to attract vandals. With the context of the Council's published planning policies, reinforced by testing on previous appeals, any development on the site must surely be at the developers' own risk and without a residential presence. The CPZ is in place to protect the coast for the reasons stated with the policy. The original planning decision in this case, and those made previously with regard to houses on this site, therefore seem entirely reasonable.

I would suggest that the site is well known to the Planning Officers and that a further site visit would be unlikely to add anything to their evaluation of the application.

I hope that the original decision on this application will be upheld on review.

Yours sincerely

Janet (and John) Trythall ([REDACTED])

Darren Westmacott
Committee Services Officer and Clerk to the MLRB
Moray Council
High Street
Elgin, IV30 1BX