

Lissa Rowan

From: Planning-Comments
Sent: 14 June 2018 09:32
To: Lissa Rowan
Subject: 18/00246/APP Grounds Of Torriston House, Torriston, Pluscarden, Elgin

Hi Lisa

Please see comment below re the above application which is with the Local Review Body.

Thanks

Lorraine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 June 2018 8:42 AM
To: planning
Subject: Re: Saved search results and Tracked Applications have been updated

I have read the appeal submitted by the architect and would like to make the following comments. I am very surprised the roads department find no problem with the extra vehicles using the access drive on to what has become a very busy and fast road. With the access near a blind corner and the speed cars are travelling at it would be an accident waiting to happen. The appeal claims no visual impact. From the west I would agree but coming from the other direction as soon as you round the corner it is right in your face and no way of hiding or muting the visual effect.

On 6 Jun 2018 10:34 am, planning@moray.gov.uk wrote:

The following results have been updated recently:

Tracked Applications

Erect 2no dwellinghouses within - Grounds Of Torriston House Torriston Pluscarden Elgin Moray

Ref. No: 18/00246/APP | Status: Local Review Requested | Case Type: Planning Application

Lissa Rowan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 June 2018 15:28
To: Lissa Rowan
Subject: Planning Application - 18/00246/APP

Erect 2 Dwelling-houses within Grounds of Torrieston House, Torrieston Pluscarden

As an interested party to the above application I wish to make further representations for the refusal of this planning application.

The reasons for the original refusal have not altered. They read as follows The proposal is contrary to policies IMP1 and H7 for the following reasons:

“The site is part of a large open meadow and would be visually intrusive roadside development. It would be a ribbon form of development diminishing the open separation of houses along the public road. The new house would not be integrated in the landscape and would contribute to a build-up of housing such that the open rural character of the Pluscarden valley setting would be diminished”.

The 2 proposed houses will be one of the first viewings as vehicles enter the Pluscarden valley from the Elgin direction and not “seen for an instant” as stated by the applicant.

The needs of Moray are for “affordable housing” which this development would not fulfil.

In the original planning application it was stated that the site would be used to house horses and for stabling with no mention of housing.

The access issues are still disputed. The access road is narrow with sharp bends, verges which are breaking up and speeding traffic frequently including large tractors with trailers and lorries moving livestock.

The planned extensive landscaping should not form part of the appellants application .

Indeed the applicant has not complied with the conditions to allow planning of Torrieston House i.e to plant beech hedging and native trees in the garden ground (lands condition 7).

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

18 JUN 2018



14/6/18

The Clerk
MLRB
Moray Council
Council Offices
High Street
Elgin
IV30 1BX

Your Ref: LR/LR 207 - Notice of Review
Planning Application 18/00246/APP
Erect 2 Dwelling Houses within grounds
of Tomieston House, Pevsersden.

With reference to above I wish to
highlight the following:

1) To confirm that the existing houses

etc in an open setting and building
of 2 houses would have an impact on
neighbouring houses.

- 2) Unmanageable land?
All plots have the same land and
have managed to landscape same.
- 3) Example of House @ Roseisle?
No comparison the topography is
completely different.
- 4) Torrieston Pleasarden is an area of
historic & outstanding beauty &
wildlife, and very much appreciated
by residents of Moray for recreation,
walking, running, cycling and
approved charity runs etc.
- 5) Torrieston House is situated within
one site with planning for four
houses (4 plots).

The Plot East of Tomiston House is of
similar size.

If this Planning application is allowed
it will encourage "Ribbon Development."

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.A single horizontal line redacting the signature.

Lissa Rowan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 June 2018 13:50
To: Lissa Rowan
Subject: Further to our conversation.

May I address the following concerns to the MLRB. I must be missing something in the documents so if I may I will list the following.

Ref.18/00246/APP

Technical problems.

Schools.

Transport. Lack of adequate public transport.

Traffic volume on the Pluscarden road is already a dangerous burden at times of day.

Amenities and services very limited.

Sewage and surface runoff will increase causing the burn to be at greater flood risk.

Management of risk that might be related to contractors in case building is approved. E.g. diesel or other oil spillage. The

Black burn does supply water to Miltonduff distillery just a couple of miles downstream and the only drainage of this valley is

the burn.

It is clear that the plan to build housing in the valley is being pushed as hard as possible. The proposed homes will not represent

easily affordable assets; each occupying half an acre. These large units with two car garages ,etc , cannot be defined as housing to fulfil the current gross needs.

It is also clear that if this bid to obtain permission to build is approved, then the prospect for the valley is bleak as it will certainly be

stuffed with lots of large highly profitable homes - not simply 'ribbon development' but eventually, complete development of the valley as

another village with the attendant ruination of much good agricultural land, just what Moray is based on.

My apologies if some of this communication falls outside the essential definition of material that can be considered in an appeal.