



Kirkhillhead
1 Walkers Crescent
Lhanbryde
Elgin
IV30 8PB

28th December 2009

R Ritchie
Senior Com Services Officer
The Moray Council
Elgin

Dear Sir

REQUEST FOR REVIEW: PLANNING APPLICATION 09/00963/OUT

What a 'clever' time to be asking for a review – just before Christmas, when people could be away from home, very busy and limited postal deliveries! Am I being cynical?

I would like to make the following points with reference to the appeal.

- 1.2 Nothing has changed; 'a safe and suitable access cannot be provided'.
- 2.2 It is a matter of opinion; 'The appeal site - will not detrimentally affect either of these designations'.
- 2.6 'all services are readily available' I was informed some years ago that Walkers Crescent cannot sustain any more, so I assume the connection for all services would go elsewhere.
- 3.1 I am surprised that: 'The Council Planning Service raised no objections' in 2005. I wonder if they and the Transportation Section had examined the access to the site thoroughly.
- 3.2 I am suspicious of back door tactics:
 - outline planning for three houses - withdrawn
 - outline planning for one house - permitted
- 3.3
 - outline planning for two houses - withdrawn
 - resubmitted - for two houses - refused

If this new request is successful I wonder if the applicants will submit another request for the three houses they wanted originally.

- 4.4 Nothing has changed

- 4.7 I disagree strongly that planning approval 'will not have significant impact on the condition and/or safe usage of this road'.
- 4.15 7.30 am – 9.00 am on Thursday 10th December 2009 was a short time giving I feel, a limited observation. I live here! Many shoppers, dog walkers, mothers with young children, teenagers and elderly people use Walkers Crescent. Children, in better weather, cycle and play.
- 4.22 Space here is limited. The walls of two homes would be vulnerable. Balnakyle's garage space leads on to it.
- 4.23 I dread to think of the impact of 'larger vehicles' manoeuvring into this site!
- 4.24 This fact is wrong. Most mornings I see four or five utilising Walkers Crescent.
- 4.25 I would question this observation.
- 5.2 I would disagree strongly with this opinion.
- 5.5 I wonder if houses were built on the site how sympathetic would they be to the character of the area. Does conservation play any part in the development?
- 7.5 Contrary to what is written here, this junction is hazardous. The T junction affords very little visibility and turning space, especially as cars are often parked here.
- 7.9 This surprised me. I feel re-consideration should be given to:
'character privacy amenity'.

The Statement of Case prepared and presented on behalf of the appellant is impressive. My concern is that a large successful business, with a great deal of money, will be able to override any local anxieties and therefore finally get what they want ... two houses on the site, and maybe eventually three!

Yours faithfully



Mrs June Taylor

FROM: Dan Taylor, Kirkhillhead, 1 Walkers Crescent, Lhanbryde

TO: Moray Council (Contact Ron Ritchie)

DATE: 28 December, 2009

REF: Council Refusal Notice – 8/10/09
Decision Notice – Document O1, Items 1.0 to 7.11

- 1.2 Italicised sentence in 1.2 still relevant – ‘cannot be applied’.
- 2.2 ‘will not detrimentally affect’ – mere opinion.
- 2.6 Views expressed are unsubstantiated. Other opinions have cast doubt as to whether water and sewage services are capable of increased use.
- 3.1) ‘have no objection to two house plots’ – ‘later withdrawn’ -
- 3.2) Devious tactics and not substantiated by the facts.
- 3.3)
- 4.6 Simply stating that this is the case (‘is not uncommon’) proves and justifies nothing.
- 4.7 Probably the most negative and devious sections of the whole paper.
- 4.11 Was the influence of parked traffic on the Crescent considered?
- 4.19 ‘outwith the remit of the Council’ – The ‘track’ is not only part of vehicular access but is also access and route for services. This means that it is a ‘material consideration’ in this application.
- 7.4 West and South junctions are difficult because of proximity of houses – NOT just hedges. There are also aesthetic and conservation aspects to be considered about removal of hedges.
- 7.9 It is not surprising that the appellant concurs when ‘the Planning Officer raises no objections’. All of the factors are integral to the proposals and all are the Planning Officer’s responsibility. In particular it is unsatisfactory that no alternative use of the site as an amenity seems to have been considered.

