

Hello Mrs Rowan

In reply to your letter dated 30 January 2018 I wish to add further points to my earlier submission, mainly in connection with the information supplied in the two letters from Moray Architectural Services dated 14/11/17 and 18/12/17.

1. The 7 parking spaces shoe horned onto the amended site plan are merely 'boxes' on a plan and are not a practical solution for ready access and manoeuvring of vehicles. It is unlikely that vehicles will be parked neatly and if a single vehicle is parked on the entrance driveway and the owner is not available, all vehicles in the car park plus any tenants trying to access or leave the designated parking spaces will not be able to do so.

2. South Guildry Street is populated with houses and flats suitable for families. The proposed internal modifications, plus the demolition of the garden and the two garages could mean that in future number 18 may never again be attractive as a family home. Garages are at a premium in South Guildry Street and to demolish two on one site is in my opinion a poor decision.

3. The suggestion that number 18 generated much more casual parking when it operated as a B & B is untrue. Having lived across from number 18 for 23 years it only ever attracted 2 or 3 cars at most and one of them belonged to Mr & Mrs Munn, the owners.

4. It is clear that Moray Architectural Services have simply not done their homework re who parks in South Guildry Street during the weekdays and the suggestion that a permit scheme be introduced is more complicated and anything but simple. Introducing permits will merely push the parking into adjacent streets which are already oversubscribed. The local Constabulary employees park in the street on a regular basis. Congested parking in South Guildry Street has been a well known fact for decades.

5. The suggestion that one tenant, (presumably also a student), will be in control of the behaviour of fellow tenants, also students, is in my view inadequate and unworkable. A student responsible for behaviour of other students does not in my opinion meet the requirement.

6. This application is a poorly thought out attempt at cramming as many paying bodies into a house with a view of extracting maximum revenue whilst potentially having inadequate control of the tenants (17 are planned), destroying existing facilities and introducing inadequate parking facilities.

7. If Moray Architectural Services are granted permission to speak at any meeting connected with this application I also request permission to speak on behalf of the local residents accompanied by one other resident.

8. The proposal for 17 persons to be living in one dwelling plus occasional visitors raises the potential for a fire incident to occur. At what stage in the Planning Process will a fire risk assessment be carried out to determine the fire hazards, fire prevention, detection and response?

Kind regards

████████████████████