

The Moray Council
Development Services
Environmental Services Dept
High Street
Elgin

7th November 2014

Dear Sirs

**Subject – Application Planning Permission to provide rear extension at The 1629, 20 Clifton Road, Lossiemouth
Ref No 14/01759/APP & 14/01760/LBC**

In terms of our planning refusal and our submission to the Local Review Body (LRB) we note the following in support of our application

Policy BE2: Listed Building

The wording to the reads " *The Council will encourage the protection, maintenance, enhancement and active use of the Listed Building. Development proposals will be refused where they would have a detrimental effect on the character, integrity or setting of the Listed Building(s). Alterations and extensions to Listed buildings or new developments within the curtilage must be of the highest quality, and respect the original structure in terms of setting, scale, material and design.*"

Our original application was reviewed by Historic Scotland and their written response dated 21st August 2014 is enclosed This states " *we wondered if there was any scope for creating it in a more traditional form, perhaps using the aesthetic of timber walls and sloping corrugated sheet roofing which has been used successfully for the stair porches on the building*"

Our second application acknowledged Historic Scotland view that a change of material and a sloping roof would be suffice in their opinion. There was no issue on this letter that there was any further concerns in terms of size, scale or location.

This application has timber wall cladding and corrugated sloped roof . In fact there is a note upon the elevation drawing **PHOTO < FRONT STAIRWELL> OF TIMBER CLADD VERTICAL FACE AND SHEET FINISH TO PITCH ROOF TO BE REPLICATED TO REAR EXTENSION AS PROPOSED**"

The proposal requires to accommodate a stairs in compliance with Building Standards and to meet all the required Structural matters

Therefore in terms of policy BE2 and that previously of Historic Scotland that our aim was to replicate the front extension exactly the same to the rear and so see no reasons for this refusal

Policy IMP1

The wording reads " *new development will require to be sensitively sited, designed and serviced appropriately to the amenity of the surrounding area* "

This policy is more akin to new housing / commercial developments rather than an extension to an already established building.

In terms of the setting to the Listed Building there are many structures already attached to the rear of the 1629 as per the noted photo below and our proposal in no way has any detrimental impact to the Listed Building. Flat roofs etc etc



The officer has made a comment in relation to the

" visually intrusion and uncharacteristic feature into the historic streetscape detracting from the character, amenity and appearance of the surrounding environment "

"Key views of the Listed Building, when viewed from the public road, would not be protected due to the unsympathetic design and prominent nature of the rear extension"

I will continue with a few photos and comments

In terms of the setting of this extension, I would refer to the Lossie Inn buildings in the location, a flat roof extension which has a greater intrusion to the Listed Building setting



There is no views as you drive / walk from the West along Clifton Road, therefore this proposal is not visible

In terms of the views as you drive / walk from the East along Clifton Road is limited to a very small window and our proposals in no way gives a prominent feature as your views are taken by the other buildings and the flat roofs to the Lossie Inn

The reasons identified for refusal points 2 & 3 of the notice is in our opinion not a visually intrusion and there are not any key views and certainly not any prominent nature all as per the above points and photos.

These points are taken out of content for this proposal and certainly in no means a planning reason for a refusal.

The case officer did make contact, though due to work related matters, we only managed to return call to discuss application the following week. It would seem that the decision had already been sanctioned to ensure that this was made within the target Decision Date.

It would have been helpful that further dialogue could have been provided on this occasion prior to any decision being made

We note that there are no Statutory Consultee objections including those from Historic Scotland, nor any from Lossiemouth Community Council .

The 1629 is a thriving business and needs to keep abreast of the modern times and to enable demands to be met we need to establish further areas within the existing fabric to maintain our business. This could not be met with say extensions as the cost benefit would out way the requirements.

To enable this to be met and to ensure that the business continues to grow and to maintain the level of service and that of the great number of employees that currently exist then we hope that the LRB over turn this refusal to a positive outcome.

On this basis we feel that there is sufficient justification to support this application for approval and hope that the LRB over turn the Officer recommendation.

Documents enclosed

- LRB application form
- Development Block Plan
- Supporting letter dated 07/11/14
- Appendix A - Historic Scottish letter dated 21/08/14

Yours sincerely



1629 Restaurant
20 Clifton Road
Lossiemouth