

Darren Westmacott

From: Liz and Andrew Campbell
Sent: 21 July 2016 01:32
To: Darren Westmacott
Subject: Response to Notice of Review, 16/00660/APP, Roseisle Neuk

Dear Mr Westmacott

Thank you for your recent letter offering me a further opportunity to comment on this application now that it has come up for review. Please find my comments below.

Review of Planning Application – 16/00660/APP at Roseisle Neuk.

I would again like to register my objection to this planning application and to the applicant's grounds for seeking a review of the council's decision.

As the applicant notes, Policy H7 says that houses in the countryside must reflect the traditional pattern of settlement in the locality. They must also not contribute to a build-up of development such that the number of houses has the effect of changing the rural character of the area. In the applicants evidence, he stresses that this is an application for a "single house" and yet he then proposes that the house forms a cluster with his 2 house plots to the south.

In the diagram he presents on page 6, "Clusters C & E" are the original pattern of development of settlement in the locality. They are small areas, widely spaced from each other. "Clusters A, B and D", all developed by this applicant, are a significantly different character of settlement to the original 2 settlements. They consist of large plots covering many acres of original woodland. In the current case, Cluster D, the plots don't even form a cluster – they are a straight row.

In addition, it could be said that other "clusters" are not even clusters – "Cluster A and B" are actually 1 area, the division into 2 areas is arbitrary. The extension of Cluster B means it is now directly adjacent to original Cluster C. There are houses plots currently being built on, which are not shown on the map, connecting Cluster C and Cluster D. There are 2 plots directly to the north of Cluster D, almost in the same ribbon line. The traditional pattern of settlement is certainly not being maintained.

All these houses are contributing to a build-up of development and changing the rural character of the Buthill area. Even the tree cover on the diagram of the surrounding housing estate is seriously over-estimated. On the finished house plots, the land is now much more open with far fewer trees than depicted.

The applicant also makes reference to the policy which says that particular attention should be given to proposals where there has been a significant growth in the number of new house applications. It should be noted that the demand for houses in this area is driven by the provision of plots with planning permission, not because this area is particularly sought after, it is a circular argument.

I am not averse to building in the countryside absolutely. I see a number of other small hamlet – type developments which contribute to the attractiveness of Moray. The applicant himself owns and has planning permission to turn West Buthill Farm into an attractive little grouping of houses which would follow the traditional pattern of settlement for this area.

My last point is one of semantics. The plot in question here is to the east of Mid Buthill Farm, almost in Easter Buthill. It is definitely not part of Wester Buthill. It is difficult to know whether the applicant is confused about his own maps or is mis-addressing plots in order to cause confusion.

Yours sincerely
E Campbell