

Muckle Hoose

Birnie

Elgin IV30 8SW

Tel [REDACTED]

18th May 2011

Dear sir/madam

Review of planning application 10/0093/APP

We would like the following points to be considered when reviewing the above application.

The original application was rejected to avoid causing a ribbon development by amalgamating the County Houses area of Birnie and the Birnie Inn area. This is still the case, the plan drawing on the first page shows just how much buffer land would be lost if this went ahead. Additional photographs show tree and shrub cover that would mostly be removed by the proposed house plot.

Far from supporting this appeal, the fact that there is planning consent at the eastern end of County Houses and at the Birnie Inn, would increase the effect if the two developments were stitched together.

The recent planning approval mentioned at 2.3 is in line with the existing outlines of the current usage in that the approved plan to the east squares off the group at county houses and does not act to link to anywhere else. Discrete development at Birnie Inn would have little effect on the existing roadside appearance.

Once the new house was built, similar arguments could be used to develop the land opposite (enclosed by the same type of boundary to the east and west) and then the land beside. This would ruin the present rural atmosphere of the area.

The distance separating the two areas is at present about 100 metres that would be reduced to about 50 metres (about the same as the proposed building plot). This is estimated as I am working offshore and cannot return to measure exactly.

The description in 5.1 is inaccurate as the proposed site is not located within a cluster of nine houses but to the side of them.

The description in 5.2 is inaccurate in the 'site' will not be clearly defined on the east side by substantial tree cover.

The description in 5.3 is inaccurate in that adding another house to one side of the end of a group of houses does not make it an 'integral part' of that group.

Point 5.5 is accurate in that two previous applications have been refused (and one additional on appeal). The grounds for refusal have not changed.

Point 7.4 states that low impact development should be encouraged, this is not low impact, linking the areas is a high impact.

Point 8.4 . Policy H9 sets out the requirement not to detract from the character and setting of existing buildings. This would - by extending the group linearly to the west; by necessary removal of trees and shrubs inside the site in question; by more closely linking the two groups of houses.

Point 11.2 We disagree that the proposal would not detract from the character and setting of existing buildings.

Point 11.4 The EXISTING group of houses IS very well separated from the group of houses at Birnie Inn. It would not be after this building. One small 50m field and one 1m wide (at best) burn does not constitute a significant separation.

Yours faithfully

Gordon Nicol and Sheila Scott

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]