

## Appendix 1: Response to Comments

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|-------------------|--|
| 1.   | Support for Council's general intention to improve the quality of housing design in the countryside and welcome the forthcoming publication of the guidance.  | Yes               | Accepted.  |
| 2.   | Document would benefit from having Council's main objectives stated explicitly in bullet points in introduction.  | Yes               | Introduction to include objectives of document.  |
| 3.   | It would be extremely helpful to define clearly at early stage what is meant by 'suburban' as it appears clear that much of the problem the spg seeks to address stems from the use of inappropriate house types and layouts in the countryside. Some of this definition could be drawn from the text already in the document, i.e. discouragement of low roof pitches, deep building footprints, horizontal glazing proportions, excessive soffit overhangs and fascia boards, integrated garages, etc. Layout styles discouraged are characterised by detached houses grouped around road and parking areas with houses setback behind long front gardens, a lack of defined public or semi-private spaces, arrangement of buildings which reflects neither the perpendicular or linear arrangement nor organic grouping found in traditional rural settings. More pictures of the kind of houses and layouts being discouraged along with examples that would be supported would help policy statements. | Yes               | The document implicitly defines 'suburban' as many will be fully aware of what this constitutes. However, where possible, the characteristics of a 'suburban' house will be made explicit within the text. Further images of positive and negative development will be sourced for the final document. |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|---|-------------------|---|
| 4.   | Spg should take a more positive view to encourage contemporary design approaches within the context of Moray's rural architectural tradition.   | Yes               | The spg seeks to encourage contemporary design based on the vernacular. There are limited examples within Moray, however, where possible, additional images will be sourced for the final document.   |
| 5.   | Diagram (bottom of page 8) – the annotation accompanying the diagram is unclear and does not adequately reinforce the message carried by the text that the approach shown is unacceptable as new build would dominate the existing traditional buildings (and in an inappropriate suburban form).   | Yes               | The wording pertaining to the diagram will be amended to provide clarity in the final document.   |
| 6.   | Last sentence in design considerations (page 10) needs clarified – does this mean domestic scale buildings or non-domestic buildings?   | Yes               | Conversion is the adaptation of non-domestic buildings for residential use. The wording in the final spg will be amended accordingly.   |
| 7.   | Diagram (page 14) – need to clarify meaning or purpose of building shown centre left? Is it intended to be an existing agricultural building which can't be renovated?  | Yes               | The diagram aims to illustrate the growth of the modern dwelling, in that the footprint is often significantly in excess of the vernacular dwelling it is replacing. The purpose of the diagram will be clarified in the final document.  |
| 8.   | Linear Extension – it may be helpful to mention in the title or text that this is often known as ribbon development. Some development which would infill between two existing houses to form a linear grouping maybe acceptable. For example, adding a new house might integrate the buildings to form a defined building group, rather than a fragmented series of individual houses. Could this be stated as a preference rather than an exclusion? | No                | The guidance will continue to refer to the term 'linear extension' to correspond with the wording of the policy to avoid confusion. The wording of the final document will be amended to reflect that the addition of a dwelling to an existing grouping or linear extension may be acceptable providing it does not detract from the character or setting of the existing buildings or their surrounding area. Therefore, infill development may be acceptable providing it meets the provisions of the Local Plan and reflects the settlement pattern of the locality. However, there will be a presumption against development that results in the accumulation of houses in a linear pattern, i.e. along a road or track, where it results in a buildup of development that is not typical of the |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|--|-------------------|---|
|      |  |                   | traditional settlement pattern in the locality.                         |
| 9.   | Development that will result in a linear extension including infill will not be permitted. This alters the policy as policy H8 allows for infill where they do not 'detract from the character or setting of existing buildings, or their surrounding area'. The policy makes allowance for the possibility of adding to a linear extension. Gap sites can often be developed without any significant impact on the character or setting of existing buildings or their surrounding area. This is allowed under policy H8 and should not be precluded through the spg. This piece of guidance should be dropped and advice provided on its interpretation. | Yes               | Refer to response provided to comment no.8.                             |
| 10.  | Policy H8 (Linear extension): The plan/diagram does not provide assistance to the interpretation of the guidance. The guidance does not explain what the Council's view would be of infill where there are more than two existing buildings.   | Yes               | Refer to response provided to comment no.8.                             |
| 11.  | Linear Extension (page 16): The restriction of any 'linear extension' is at odds with policy H8, which allows linear extensions in its siting criteria. This needs to be softened to reflect the policy.   | Yes               | Refer to response provided to comment no.8.                             |
| 12.  | Typo – diagram on page 17. Replace 'accestable' with 'acceptable'.   | Yes               | The text of the final document will be amended.                         |
| 13.  | Trees Section. There is an opportunity to promote the  | Yes               | The Council's Spg 'Trees and Development' sets out the species that are |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|-------------------|--|
|      | <p>use of larger species which are characteristic of the Moray estate landscape originating in Georgian and Victorian periods. Few opportunities to locate larger trees in urban areas, despite being a feature of some of the best historic townscapes. Overshadowing and proximity to buildings need not be an issue in the countryside where there maybe adequate land available to accommodate larger trees.</p>  |                   | <p>native to Moray. This includes larger trees such as ash and Scots pine. Applications that propose the planting of larger trees will be required to have plot sizes that can accommodate these trees when they reach maturity without causing adverse effects, such as overshadowing.</p>  |
| 14.  | <p>Design Section (page 23) embodies much of the main message contained within the spg, i.e. much of the problem stems from standard kit houses drawn from manufacturer brochures. These house types are often used in suburban development but they are not anymore acceptable in that context. It is important that the Council shows commitment to this part of the policy and takes decisions which uphold the position that 'suburban' kit houses are not acceptable in the countryside. Raising this point when the spg reaches Committee might help drive home the implications of this policy and ensure ongoing support for decision making on this basis amongst Members.</p> | Yes               | <p>The spg sets out the Council's commitment to discourage standard kit houses with suburban characteristics that are alien to the rural environment.</p>  |
| 15.  | <p>Dualchas may be able to provide better images than those shown on page 23.</p>   | No                | <p>The images contained within the spg have been supplied by Dualchas.</p>   |
| 16.  | <p>Spg appears to be tightening up what was believed to be an enlightened policy to take pressure off housing in the countryside and allow hard-pressed rural managers to realise some capital for the benefit of the rural economy. The spg is confusing, i.e. debate as to</p>  | No                | <p>Rural managers will be able to realise capital gain from developing their land through appropriate and sensitive development. The document provides guidance in order that development is managed to ensure that it takes place in the most appropriate locations and is not to the detriment of Moray's landscape which is a valuable asset in terms of the quality of</p> |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|--|-------------------|---|
|      | the distance at which a property is prominent is too speculative and does not add to the original local plan.  |                   | life it provides for local residents and the income it generates in tourism for the local economy.<br>The reference to distance will be removed from the final spg.   |
| 17.  | Groups of buildings at redundant farm steadings provides little clarity and will likely lead to more appeals than less.  | No                | It is important that the replacement of a number of buildings reflect traditional groupings in the locality rather than adopt a suburban layout that is alien to the rural environment.   |
| 18.  | Document needs to be clearer and more concise with sharper guidelines. Document needs to be readily usable if to be taken onboard easily by applicants. MLP 2008 moved in more concise direction but will be undermined if spgs are lengthy and open to interpretation. Reduce size of spg with less use of ambiguous language more closely tied to terms of policies. | No                | At the end of each section, the spg provides clear and concise bullet points on the rules for renovation, design, siting, etc. This summarises the text contained within the document to make the document user-friendly to the reader. |
| 19.  | It is important that the spg does not undermine the clearer and simpler approach taken to the MLP 2008.  | Yes               | The spg does not attempt to undermine the clearer approach taken by the MLP 2008; the spg simply provides further guidance on the relevant policies.  |
| 20.  | Planning Act 2006 and (Development Planning) Regulations 2008 (section 27) limit what can be covered by supplementary guidance to 'the provisions of further information or detail in respect of policies and proposals' set out in the plan. This is reinforced by guidance set out in Circular 1/2009 – Development Planning.  | Yes               | The aim of the spg is to provide further guidance on policies H7 & H8.  |
| 21.  | Need to be clear about status of supplementary guidance so there is no ambiguity about the weight  | Yes               | The spg will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It will not become part of the adopted Moray Local Plan   |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|--|----------------------|--|
|      | <p>attached to it during the decision-making process on planning applications. The spg can become a material consideration in the decision-making process (para.5, Circular 4/2009, Development Management Procedures) but it cannot be regarded as part of the Local Plan once approved by Council as MLP 2008 is a Local Plan not a Local Development Plan. Therefore, it will have a lower status than supplementary guidance adopted under Section 22(1) of the 2006 Planning Act and this should be made clear in the document.</p>   |                      | <p>2008. The introduction within the spg sets out the status of the document. The weight attributed to the spg will depend on the merits of each case.</p>   |
| 22.  | <p>Supplementary guidance cannot be used to set new policy or to shift existing policy. It is limited to the provisions of further information or detail in relation to policies in the plan. A shift or new policy needs to be done through a review of the plan. There are some areas where the guidance appears to be attempting to shift or amend the adopted policies on Housing in the Countryside in the MLP 2008. For example, where the replacement of a number of buildings grouped together (e.g. farm steadings), the proposed group of new houses will be assessed against the dominant settlement pattern of the area and a cluster of new houses to replace a cluster of buildings may not be appropriate. This is not part of, and goes beyond the requirements of policy H7. Planning consent has already been granted under the new policy for a number of new developments involving the replacement of a group of existing steading buildings with an appropriately designed and laid out group of new houses. If allowed under the new policy but</p> | No                   | <p>The spg provides guidance on the interpretation of policies H7 &amp; H8. It does not shift the intent of these policies. One-for-one replacement may be acceptable where the existing building has been a 'permanent' structure, but the development must reflect the character of the locality. Therefore, a clear fell of existing buildings for multiple new houses may not always be appropriate. To The spg sets out how the policy should be interpreted to provide a consistent basis for decision-making.</p> |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|-------------------|--|
|      | <p>precluded by the spg then this confirms that the spg is seeking to change policy rather than provide 'further information or detail' allowed for in regulations. SPP15 allows more scope for clusters of houses in the countryside. 09/00120/OUT – the reason for refusal of 18 houses was 'development of multiple houses more appropriately directed to Rural Communities and the Reuse and Replacement of Existing buildings. If national, local and planning officer interpretations of policy H7 recognise scope to replace existing buildings with groups/clusters of new buildings then spg should not restrict but should focus on how groups should be designed and laid out.</p> |                   |  |
| 23.  | <p>Policy H7 (Replacement): It is unclear in what circumstances a cluster of houses to replace a cluster of buildings may not be appropriate. In most circumstances, the replacement of a cluster of buildings with new dwellings will have minimal impact on the landscape and character of the area, particularly if the design and siting advice in the guidance is adhered to.</p>  | No                | See response to comment no.22 above.   |
| 24.  | <p>A scheme proposing new build along with the renovation/conversion of existing buildings must include the renovation/conversion of a substantially intact stone and slate building. This is not a requirement of policy H7 and contradicts H7 in that the renovation/conversion of such buildings is only required when evidence cannot be produced to justify replacement. The spg states that proposals that do</p>   | No                | <p>Where a re-use or rehabilitation scheme does not include the renovation of an existing building, then new build will not be permitted. This means that where an existing building is to be clear felled because it cannot be renovated or converted, then only the dwelling that is replacing it will be permitted, subject to the provisions of the Local Plan and any other relevant material considerations.</p> |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|--|----------------------|--|
|      | not propose such renovation will not qualify under H7 and are unlikely to be supported under H8. This is an attempt to alter the policy as such proposals are allowed under policy H7 where evidence is provided to justify the replacement of existing buildings.   |                      |  |
| 25.  | It is difficult to understand what is being put forward as acceptable and unacceptable in terms of prominence. This is opening the door for sites to be rejected for a variety of reasons beyond the criteria set out in the policy which creates considerable uncertainty. A building viewed at different distances makes it difficult to understand how guidance will be interpreted. There is a need to explain what constitutes 'overtly prominent' with precision and clarity. This section needs to be reconsidered and expressed with less scope for interpretation otherwise problems experienced with previous policy will re-emerge. | Yes                  | More clarity will be provided in the final spg. As a general rule, a 'prominent' development will be noticeable within the landscape, but the landscape will always dominate, i.e. the building will be tucked within the landscape setting. An 'overtly prominent' development will be where the building stands proud in the landscape, i.e. a confident piece of architecture that can command such a site. Reference to varying distances will be removed. |
| 26.  | Prominence: This section should be expanded upon a little further to help planners/designers differentiate 'prominent' from 'overtly prominent' sites. Describing some more examples of unacceptable/acceptable sites may be helpful. In practice, examples of refusals tend to be those sites that occupy open 'elevated' positions, which have no discernible backdrop or enclosure within reasonable proximity to offset their prominence. Approvals tend to be those sites (many of which are prominent) that are located alongside or near to trees, buildings or landform.   | Yes                  | Refer to response to comment no.24.  |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|---|-------------------|---|
| 27.  | <p>The section on design for policy H8 starts with advice about location and siting. This needs to be relocated within the document and kept to guidance with specific siting requirements referred to in H8, i.e. prominence, existing groupings, etc. This also introduces criteria about obtrusiveness which is not referred to in the policy. Mixing location and phraseology related to criteria in policy sets the scene for confusion and varying interpretations, i.e. sites should be unobtrusive but policy allows for prominent sites provided they have a natural backdrop.</p>   | No                | <p>Location and siting are generic design considerations and are relevant to all sites, not just those that are considered prominent. Phraseology will correlate with policy, where possible.</p>   |
| 28.  | <p>'Scale' suggests that applicants may have difficulty finding a site for a larger house because they are usually more suited to large open area where the house can be absorbed in the landscape. Many of Moray's larger houses are not located in large open areas and are often within enclosed and discreet locations, e.g. Arndilly, Glenrinnen Lodge, Gordon Castle, Letterfourie. There is a creeping assumption against larger houses and a preference for smaller houses in the guidance. The spg does not explain 'larger' which makes it impossible for applicants to know. There is nothing in policy H8 to preclude larger houses and presumption goes beyond policy. This should be removed and the spg should focus on explaining what is being looked for in terms of scale related to setting and surrounding buildings rather than presume against larger buildings.</p> | No                | <p>Policy H8 sets out exceptions to the design requirements. 'Big' houses (i.e. mansions), will be exceptions, i.e. confident or statement architecture of a high quality will be allowed to stand proud in the landscape. Country mansions have appropriate settings for their scale of development.</p> |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|--|-------------------|---|
| 29.  | Scale: Reference to 'larger' houses being suited to 'large open areas' is dangerous and could lead to an increase in applications for larger houses. Large or '2-storey' dwellings can rarely be described as 'low-impact' and usually jar with their surroundings unless hidden. More emphasis should be placed on the need to encourage dwellings or single or one and a half storeys, of simple form, with L, H or T shaped footprints. | Yes               | The guidance encourages single and one and a half storey dwellings based on a simple, vernacular form. As referred to in the response to comment no.28, large houses which will generally be dominant in the landscape, due to their size, will require to be of an architectural standard that commands such a location. For example, large historical houses, need 'policies' around them to fit with their scale of development. |
| 30.  | Issues raised are substantive so spg should be amended and reissued for consultation prior to adoption by Council.   | No                | The opportunity for comment has been provided through the consultation process. Further consultation on the spg would create delays in formalising a much-needed guidance document.   |
| 31.  | The spg states that precedence will not be accepted as a relevant material consideration in the determination of planning application. Can the Council confirm that 'precedence' will also not be used as a reason for refusal as so often has been the case?  | No                | Precedence is used within the spg in the same context as undesirable precedent is used in the refusal of planning applications, i.e. bad examples of development will not be allowed to be repeated. The wording of the final spg will amended to reflect this.   |
| 32.  | Is the layout of Muirton Steading an appropriate example? Development was necessitated by the need to get rid of a sub-standard residential caravan site in that development around the steading was required to facilitate proper drainage for renovation of the latter, so it could be considered an acceptable pragmatic solution.  | No                | Whilst some development may have been acceptable in this case, a suburban layout is inappropriate to a rural location, particularly where new build dominates the vernacular buildings, and a more traditional pattern of development should be sought.   |
| 33.  | Para.4 should read 'two' additional dwellings located on undeveloped land adjacent to a rehabilitation scheme may comply ...' as policy H8 states that   | Yes               | The wording in the final document will be amended to read 'one, or two, houses'.  |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|----------------------|--|
|      | multiple house applications 'are more appropriately directed to... the reuse and replacement of existing buildings (H7)'. Reducing the number to one is an amendment to the Local Plan and outwith the scope of this spg.   |                      |  |
| 34.  | Photo of rendered gable of steading conversion at Alves looks a bit 'suburban'.   | No                   | Not accepted. It is difficult to understand how the gable of a former traditional rural building can be considered 'suburban'. The render is an appropriate colour and type for this type of development.  |
| 35.  | There is a danger that farm steadings will be treated like listed buildings without going through the proper formal procedures that would be required to implement such a policy. The best steadings should be listed and preserved with the remainder offering an interesting stone built shell for modern conversion. Possibilities for creating interesting openings more suited to the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century sustainability should not be ruled out in every steading conversion. Good substitute slate tiles and modern materials are suitable. Porches should not be denied. All elements can be well chosen and designed to provide a modern solution that is sensitive to the history of a building and the character of its surroundings. | Yes                  | The supplementary guidance does not suggest otherwise and cites examples of contemporary houses based on the vernacular.   |
| 36.  | Industrial or religious buildings are not necessarily difficult to convert. The best buildings should be listed and the remainder available for sensitive conversion without overbearing restrictions.  | No                   | Industrial and religious buildings can be more difficult to convert because of the internal height of the building and inserting floor levels that do not compromise windows, etc. The spg encourages sensitive development of these buildings and does not suggest there will be restrictions akin to listed buildings. |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|--|-------------------|---|
| 37.  | The guidelines appear to be condemning those who choose to live in replacement houses in the countryside to accommodation that is cramped and possibly below the expectations of the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century. It is suggested that the last sentence of para.1 on replacement (p.14) is amended to: 'a dwelling of a size significantly in excess of the dwelling it is replacing or of additional properties in the local area may or may not be acceptable'.  | No                | No comment.   |
| 38.  | The guidelines do not define traditional or suburban convincingly in terms of how they have been arrived at or why they are appropriate. There are older, stone houses, both large and small and of differing styles in the Moray countryside. Most of these house types can also be found in Moray towns and as such they are not part of an exclusively rural tradition. It appears that some loosely defined historical period has been selected to represent the 'tradition'. Post 1950s houses and bungalows are to be found in towns and countryside alike, they are not exclusively suburban. They provide decent accommodation and are representative of our recent environment. They are also what the market provided and what people largely aspire to. | No                | The purpose of the spg is to encourage good design that is appropriate to the rural environment. The characteristics and location of traditional rural housing will reflect its rural setting and origin, being tucked into the landscape; urban and suburban housing does not.<br>The desirability of suburban kit houses is an academic debate that focuses on whether take-up is due to personal preference or because this is largely what the market provides. |
| 39.  | 'Contemporary design based on traditional characteristics must be introduced and encouraged'. Draconian statement that fails to acknowledge aesthetic that is likely to result from efforts to counter global warming. The appearance of the Moray   | No                | Contemporary design based on traditional characteristics can incorporate energy efficiency through the use of modern materials (i.e. turf roofs, solar panels, glazing on south facing elevations, etc). The guidance encourages energy efficiency in modern buildings where it is sensitively incorporated into a design that is based on the vernacular. Examples are   |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|--|-------------------|--|
|      | countryside is changing through the need to accommodate windfarms, and we suspect at new or converted buildings will be likely to look less traditional as they are forced to meet the needs of climate change and sustainability. This should be addressed in these guidelines. |                   | cited in the guidance of kit houses where this has been achieved. This statement will be substituted with 'should' rather than 'must' given this is guidance.  |
| 40.  | The Guidance should make it absolutely clear that an application for two houses will not be considered a departure on the grounds of the number of units. This is currently unclear.   | No                | The guidelines clearly state that a sole application for more than 2 houses will be a departure from policy H8 of the MLP 2008.  |
| 41.  | The guidelines should provide examples of buildup of houses that does detract from the rural character and a buildup that doesn't as there is likely to be a high demand for guidance on this matter.  | No                | The guidelines show in a diagram an example of unacceptable buildup that detracts from the rural character of the locality.  |
| 42.  | 'Planting is a requirement of policy H8 and cannot be used as a mitigating factor ...' This cannot be correct as planting is intended to mitigate all new development to some extent. Some allowance should be made for this in the guidance.                                    | No                | Planting can be used to help integrate a building with its landscape. However, with a prominent site there is a requirement that some planting exists, such as a natural backdrop, to initially integrate the development with its setting. The additional planting can be used to help further integrate the building overtime. A development that is overtly prominent is unlikely to have a natural backdrop and will jar with its landscape setting. Unless the architecture is of outstanding quality and worthy in dominating the landscape then it is unlikely to be able to command such a site, and no planting will mitigate against this. |
| 43.  | Site boundaries – not a good photo of recently formed track.   | Yes               | An alternative image will be used in the final spg.  |
| 44.  | 'Avoid the use of fencing...' Agreed that some forms of fencing in the countryside are not desirable – this  | Yes               | The guidance illustrates examples of boundary treatments that are acceptable and unacceptable in a rural environment.  |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|-------------------|--|
|      | should be made clear.   |                   |  |
| 45.  | It would be helpful if the Council could give guidance on what they consider to be 'truly inspirational' in terms of design.  | No                | It is not the role of a planning authority to provide proposals for innovative, inspirational architecture but rather the parameters within which this will be assessed. |
| 46.  | 'To understand proportion is to understand existing buildings'. This statement is at odds with Naismith's Analysis of Design Principles in his book Buildings of the Scottish Countryside. He concludes his Analysis of Design Principles by concluding, 'architecture denotes more than well disciplined arrangements of elevations, however, and in the Scottish heritage of country buildings it does not simply consist of fine proportioning'. | No                | This is an academic debate. Proportion is fundamental to being able to 'read' or understand a building and the diagram within the spg illustrates this point.            |
| 47.  | The example of ranch style fencing is not an example of what is normally described as ranch style fencing which is usually a variant of post and rail.  | Yes               | The diagram will be amended in the final spg.  |
| 48.  | The example of 'random rubble' is reasonably coursed and not unlike the material detail found in many older stone built buildings in the Moray countryside.   | No                | The example of random rubble contained within 'inappropriate materials' has pastiche characteristics, which should be avoided in modern design.                          |
| 49.  | Planning permission is not currently required to replace windows and doors in buildings in the countryside. People appear to replace their doors and windows to satisfy their own tastes. Is the Council going to impose and enforce styles illustrated and treat housing in the countryside like listed buildings in a conservation area?  | No                |  |
| 50.  | The guidelines should acknowledge sources of  | Yes               | Statements from published research will be duly acknowledged in the  |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|-------------------|--|
|      | statements as assertions in the usual manner.   |                   | finalised document.  |
| 51.  | The document contains more drawings and photographs than the previous guidance of what is generally acceptable and unacceptable. The illustrations summarising approval and refusal and examples of innovative design are easier to understand than pages of text. Further examples using photographs and drawings would be beneficial.   | Yes               | Where possible, diagrams will be used to illustrate the information contained within the text in the document.   |
| 52.  | Policy H7 (Replacement): Further clarification as to what is meant by one-for-one replacement should be given. It is unclear if this is one-for-one replacement of the building/footprint or if only a single dwelling can be created. Some larger buildings may successfully be replaced by a number of terraced units and therefore it should be a one-for-one replacement of the building/footprint. | Yes               | One-for-one replacement refers to the replacement of an existing building with a single dwelling. The policy refers to the replacement of an existing building with a house or existing buildings with houses.   |
| 53.  | Policy H7 (Replacement): It would be appropriate to note that the replacement of structures defined as temporary with a new dwelling may be permissible where this is proposed along with a reuse and rehabilitation scheme, as discussed in the reuse section.   | No                | Replacement of temporary structures will not be permitted unless the existing structure meets the criteria set out in the guidance.  |
| 54.  | Policy H7 (Reuse): The reasons pertaining to the requirement for a building that is converted to be finished and suitable for occupation before completion of all accompanying new build units is recognised. However, it would be more appropriate to review the level or number of completions on the   | Yes               | As a general rule, the renovation/conversion of a substantially intact stone and slate building will require to be complete before occupation of 50% of the accompanying new build units. However, if financial evidence is conclusive that a larger percentage of new build units requires to be complete and sold prior to completion of the renovation/conversion, then this condition may be relaxed. The wording in the final spg will be |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|---|----------------------|---|
|      | <p>new build on a case by case basis. In certain circumstances, where the new build is enabling the redevelopment and preservation of the stone and slate buildings, it may be necessary to complete a greater number of the new build units before requiring the stone and slate to be completed. As each site will have different circumstances and associated costs, it should be the Planning Officer who determines at what stage the conversion/rehabilitation should be completed. Therefore, the wording should be amended to delete reference to 50% and the final part of this sentence should be changed to 'a percentage of the accompanying new build units to be determined by the Planning Officer'.</p> |                      | <p>amended to reflect this.</p>   |
| 55.  | <p>Policy H7 (Reuse): It is unclear if the photographs in the design considerations section are to be good or bad examples of conversion.</p>   | Yes                  | <p>The photographs/diagrams will be annotated in the final spg to show whether these are good or bad examples.</p>  |
| 56.  | <p>Policy H8 (Multiple House Application): It is unclear why this section makes reference to applications within or adjacent to an existing group of recently constructed dwellings. If the aim was to note that applications adjacent to relatively new dwellings would be considered favourably, surely this section should also point out that the same is true for older groups of dwellings. This section should also state applications of one or two houses rather than just one.</p>  | Yes                  | <p>This paragraph will be amended as the reference to recently constructed dwellings means that the rate of buildup will be a consideration in the determination of planning applications. For example, successive applications for one or two houses adjacent existing houses will have an impact on the character of the area and ability of the grouping to absorb the scale of the additional building. The wording in the final spg will be amended to refer to 'one or two' dwellings in accord with the provisions of policy H8.</p> |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|---|-------------------|---|
| 57.  | Policy H8 (Site boundaries): Long-established fence lines should be included within the examples of acceptable boundaries. It is accepted that newly formed fence lines do not meet the criteria. However, where a replacement fence is erected on a long established fence line, the boundary remains long established, despite the fence being of new materials.                | No                | There has to be visible evidence onsite that the boundaries are 'long-established', i.e. watercourses, dykes, roadways.   |
| 58.  | Policy H8 (site boundaries): The photo of a 'recently formed track' is misleading as this appears to be an established track that may have been used infrequently. The base structure of such a track could be very similar to the picture shown adjacent but it is described as a long established track.  | Yes               | An alternative image will be sourced for the final spg.   |
| 59.  | Policy H8 (Trees): 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph states 'the planting is a requirement of Policy H8 and cannot be used as a mitigating factor to justify an otherwise intrusive development'. This statement contradicts an earlier paragraph within the Prominence Section which states, 'the required 25% planting can be subtly used to minimise overt elements of visual impact'. | Yes               | Refer to response to comment no.38. Further clarity will be provided in the final spg.  |
| 60.  | Policy H8 (Trees): 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph is difficult to follow and unclear.  | No                | The spg provides guidance on matters pertaining to differing growth rates and canopy covers of existing and proposed trees. The spg does not provide further detail as this can be found within the Council's spg on 'Trees and Development' and where necessary, professional advice can be sought at the time of the application. |
| 61.  | Policy H8 (Trees): Final paragraph, last sentence, is unclear. This should be amended to read 'without  | No                | The sentence within the spg provides adequate clarity on this matter.   |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|---|-------------------|---|
|      | adequate planting, an otherwise prominent site but for the backdrop of a commercial plantation, may become obtrusive in the landscape where its plantation backdrop is removed’.  |                   |   |
| 62.  | Design Considerations: The second bullet point of the Siting Section appears to be missing text in the final sentence. This should be amended to read ‘by siting new houses in a similar manner, the traditional pattern and form of houses in the countryside is retained, as well as responding to any environmental problems’. | Yes               | The wording in the final spg will be amended.   |
| 63.  | Design Considerations: The third bullet point in the Siting Section which refers to trees and shrubs should be cross-referenced to Section (vi) Trees and the requirement to have 25% of the plot area planted with native species trees highlighted.   | Yes               | This will be cross-referenced in the final spg.   |
| 64.  | Design Considerations: The final bullet point in the Siting Section states ‘avoid the use of fencing’. This contradicts the advice given later in the guidance under Other Design Considerations. Post and wire fencing is a common boundary treatment in rural areas and should be acceptable.                                   | No                | Other Design Considerations provides advice on other aspects of design that are relevant to building in the countryside. Post and wire is generally used for agricultural rather than domestic purposes.  |
| 65.  | Design Considerations: Disappointment that examples of contemporary design based on the vernacular are illustrated by photographs courtesy of Dualchas Building Design only. Whilst it is accepted that it is an open market, there are many examples of good contemporary design built in Moray by architects                    | No                | Where possible, local examples will be sourced for the final spg. However, there may be limited examples within Moray and developments outwith the area, such as Dualchas may be required. Alternative examples of good contemporary design based on the vernacular within Moray have not been provided by the commentator. |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|--|-------------------|--|
|      | based in Moray and in order to support the local economy, it is suggested that local examples are included as well as those offered by Dualchas.   |                   |  |
| 66.  | Design Considerations: In order 'to restore the direction of modern domestic rural architecture in Moray', the Local Authority support is welcome and essential so that unimaginative standard of suburban houses are not accepted.  | Yes               | Agreed.  |
| 67.  | Materials: The photographs on pages 50-52 of the previous guidance documents, in particular, the ones on page 51, Related Contemporary Equivalents are easier to understand and more acceptable as alternatives in terms of cost to traditional materials. The use of sandstone and natural slate is, unfortunately, no longer cost effective for building new houses. Perhaps suggest new alternatives, such as the use of metal roofs as an alternative to slated roofs and timber cladding left undecorated.      | Yes               | It is accepted that the use of traditional materials within new developments is limited due to cost implications and appropriate alternatives, including contemporary and energy efficient materials that are in keeping with the rural environment, are welcomed. There may be some scope for inclusion of traditional materials within developments, particularly where these can be salvaged from existing buildings.   |
| 68.  | Concerned that the advice on multiple site development is too lenient as the new guidelines do not actually state that the Council will not approve developments of more than 3 houses in the countryside – it simply says that any such applications will be advertised as a departure from policy H8. Also concerned that the definition of multiple houses has risen from two to three properties. Lastly the guidelines almost seem to encourage developers to add on more housing to clusters of recently built | No                | In accord with the policy H8, the guidelines state that a sole application for more than 2 houses will be considered as a departure from the development plan. Whilst there is a presumption against multiple house applications, there may be cases where other material considerations outweigh the provisions of the policy and development may be permitted. However, it is likely that these exceptions will be rare. |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|---|-------------------|---|
|      | dwellings. This section of the guidelines should be re-written in favour of the inhabitants of the countryside and not the developers.  |                   |   |
| 69.  | In line with the 2000 Local Plan, there should be a restriction on ridge height in the open countryside to ensure that housing remains traditional. Without a restriction on height there is nothing to stop people from building two or three storey homes instead of the traditional one and a half storey homes which are typical in Moray.  | Yes               | The design considerations of policy H8 limit the height of houses in the countryside to one and a half storey. The guidance emulates this throughout the advice given on design.  |
| 70.  | The known benefits of clusters of houses has not been acknowledged. There are economies of scale to be gained from using single transformers and utility connections. There are social benefits in mutual support, shared transport and local self-help which suggest that there should be a presumption in favour of approval, although there would need to be a test to prevent detracting from the rural character. This reason for rejection should have a high threshold.            | No                | In accord with policy H7, the guidance allows for clusters of houses where these are appropriately sited and do not detract from the character of the existing buildings or surrounding area.   |
| 71.  | Design Considerations: This section is helpful and I am in agreement with it, including the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph on page 26 which states that the Georgian period perfected balanced fenestration ... and the next paragraph advising that appropriate modern windows should maintain these simple designs ... However, this is not a justification for insisting on glazing bars and small window panes for new build in the countryside which was a feature of only a short period | Yes               | Contemporary design may be acceptable to allow energy efficiency to be maximised, i.e. through the use of passive solar gain, but this should not be to the detriment of the rural character of the building or area. For example, windows whether based on a traditional or contemporary design, should have a vertical rather than a horizontal emphasis, the latter being more typical of a suburban dwelling. |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|--|----------------------|--|
|      | <p>during a century of Georgian building. They were rejected during this period in favour of larger, lighter windows. The examples given on page 30 are too restrictive. The benefit of passive solar gain with these 'mock Georgian' windows are reduced by 15% and they restrict the view considerably from inside.</p>  |                      |  |
| 72.  | <p>The benefits of construction in timber are challenged if the carbon footprint over the 60 years expected life is taken into consideration. uPVC window are preferred for maintenance; they fit better, are less likely to warp, will never rot, are easier to replace and are infinitely easier and cheaper to maintain and keep looking good.</p>  | Yes                  | <p>The guidance does not prevent the use of good quality uPVC windows in unlisted rural dwellings.</p> |
| 73.  | <p>Design Considerations (Windows and Doors): The only acceptable windows appear to be the multi-pane variety, which would increase costs in as much as 9 or more small double glazed panes would greatly exceed the cost of a single double glazed pane (and because there is more frame more light is omitted). Wooden frames incur much greater maintenance costs as the life of a softwood frame regardless of the preservative used can be as short as two years; the frame itself requires paint or preservative frequently to upkeep the visual side of the property, and hardwood is not environmentally sustainable. The windows shown in the guidance appear to be the sash type, which can be draughty. Plastic and aluminium door and window frames are now made such that at 10 metres it is difficult to distinguish them from wood; houses in the</p> | Yes                  | <p>The guidance does not prevent the use of good quality uPVC windows in unlisted rural dwellings.</p> |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|----------------------|--|
|      | countryside are usually further apart than 10 metres, and the life of these is many years.  |                      |  |
| 74.  | Para.4 (ii) Local Planning Context: 'Although the development strategy allows for some new housing...', the use of the term 'some' implies a degree of restraint towards housing, whereas the justification text for both H7 and H8 refers to the 'encouragement' of housing in 'appropriate locations'. The term is out of tune with the siting criteria of H8, which states that a house can be acceptable if it is situated within the corner of any field, has a backdrop to offset any prominence, 50% established boundaries and is not overtly prominent. Also, the following sentence within the same paragraph is at odds with policy H8, 'although the development strategy allows for some new housing...should not be the primary means for the provision of rural housing...does not comply with the principles of sustainable development', given the aforementioned policy is being interpreted more positively towards new house sites than the guidance suggests. This is being borne out by the increase in the number of approvals and drop in refusals following adoption of the 2008 plan. | No                   | Whilst policies H7 and H8 are less restrictive than previous policies for housing in the countryside proposals, these policies do not provide a free rein for development in the countryside. Such development requires to be appropriately managed and is not the primary means for the provision of rural housing. This is set out in the development strategy of the adopted Local Plan.  |
| 75.  | Replacement (para.6): Reference to one-for-one replacement is inconsistent with policy H7, which contains the term house(s). The policy contains no reference to this and only requires the houses to sit on the footprint. There seems to be a great difference in one house being acceptable under the guidance   | No                   | This is a matter of correctly interpreting the policy, which this guidance seeks to establish, and the explanation of how this is to be interpreted will be expanded; it does not mean that several new houses can be fitted onto the footprint of, say, a large barn. The policy states that a replacement house must sit on at least part of the footprint of a previous building or, where there are multiple houses being proposed, that each of |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|----------------------|--|
|      | when several houses could easily fit into a footprint of large building. This introduces a significant change to the wording of the policy.   |                      | these dwellings must sit on at least part of the footprint of each building they are replacing. Each building being replaced must also be of a reasonable size (e.g. the footprint of a traditional detached cottage) and must not be a temporary structure. |
| 76.  | Replacement (para.6): In allowing replacements away from the original footprint it should be made clear that the application site should cover the proposed house and existing building. Also, even with mitigating circumstances such as contaminated land or flooding, if the proposed house position is so detached from the original building it may have to be assessed under policy H8. Exceptions to being sited on the footprint for reasons such as flooding should also include reference to other material planning reasons, e.g. retention of existing trees and landscaping (enable root systems not to be damaged), amenity reasons (overlooking/overshadowing), highway visibility concerns. | Yes                  | The text of the final spg will be amended to reflect this comment.   |
| 77.  | Replacement (page.7): The first paragraph states that a cluster of new houses to replace a cluster of new buildings may not be appropriate. Reference could be made to the need to satisfy policy IMP1(a).  | Yes                  | Reference to policy IMP1 will be made in the final spg.  |
| 78.  | Temporary Structures: Whilst most corrugated iron structures would certainly be temporary and not suitable for replacement, there is the odd exception. There are in Moray several substantial long-established 'Nissan' buildings with a block or concrete base and semi-circular corrugated metal construction.   | Yes                  | There should not be an assumption that because a non-residential building exists, it is necessarily suitable for replacement as a house. Permissions like the example given would be exceptions rather than the rule.  |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|-------------------|--|
|      | Most have been present within groupings of farm buildings for decades and would be substantial enough to qualify for replacement.   |                   |  |
| 79.  | Temporary Structures: The reference to 'structures built for countryside uses such as agriculture and forestry, i.e. stone and brick built, doesn't reflect reality. The vast majority of new agricultural buildings approved are constructed with blockwork and metal profiled sheeting and are of a permanent construction. Can reference to these types of buildings be included? Policy ER6: Agriculture still requires new agricultural buildings to be subject to visual impact and amenity considerations and therefore emphasis in this guidance seems to dismiss the replacement of these buildings despite the fact that they would have had to comply with the visual impact policy in the first place. It would therefore be more helpful if reference could be made to specific location examples such as exposed hillsides, skyline locations, etc. | No                | Refer to response to comment no.78. Many buildings in the countryside for agricultural purposes have not required planning consent and therefore, there should not be a presumption that because there is a building then this can be automatically replaced by a house. In the determination of a planning application for an agricultural building, visual impact will be taken into consideration, but, should the application be for a new dwelling to replace it there will be other considerations taken into account that would not have been applied to the agricultural building which may render the site inappropriate for a house (e.g. settlement character). |
| 80.  | Reuse (page 8, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para): Need to add on end of paragraph ' and will need to be assessed against policy H8' to remove any doubt.  | Yes               | The final spg will be amended to reflect this comment.   |
| 81.  | Reuse (page8, 3 <sup>rd</sup> para): The proposal to impose conditions requiring the renovation/conversion to be finished before 50% of the new build units may be difficult to enforce once ownership changes occur. Many applicants sell plots separately, e.g.steading   | No                | The Planning, etc. (Scotland) 2006 Act requires that when a development is to be commenced, a Notice of Intention to Develop must be submitted to the planning authority beforehand. The enforcement of such a condition will be carried out through this process. Any plot sale will carry this condition with it.  |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|----------------------|--|
|      | conversion and the new building plots alongside.  |                      |  |
| 82.  | H7: Need to be careful when referring to the use of new planting to help integrate sites into their settings. Developers are already arguing that sites should be approved with a backdrop of trees not yet planted being conditioned. Its maybe worth adding to this paragraph, that additional planting will not negate the need for a backdrop to be present on or behind a site at the time of consideration. The reason being that it takes years for trees or shrubs to be mature enough to be a meaningful backdrop to a new house.  | Yes                  | The final spg will be amended to reflect this comment.   |
| 83.  | Policy H7 (page 15): States that developments that do not include replacement or reuse of buildings will be assessed against policy H8. It should be acknowledged that there will be numerous good house plots adjacent to existing steadings and buildings where there is no intent to replace or reuse under policy H7. Such applications should not be deemed to conflict with policy H7 where they are otherwise acceptable under policy H8. Their contribution (acceptable or otherwise) to the character and settlement pattern will be assessed under policy IMP1 as well as H8 anyway. This point is slightly different to the scenario addressed in para.4 of page 9 where a house may be built next to an application for rehabilitation of existing buildings. | Yes                  | The text of the final spg will be amended. Development proposals for housing in the countryside will be assessed against policy IMP1 and therefore impact on the character of the surrounding area, in terms of the settlement pattern, will be a consideration in the determination of planning applications under both policies H7 and H8. |
| 84.  | Multiple House Applications: Typo on first two lines '2' should be '3', as policy H8 allows for up to '2'. Also, in   | Yes                  | The draft spg refers to a sole application for 3 or more houses, therefore the first part of this comment is not relevant. 'Recently approved' will be   |

| Ref. | Comment  | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|--|-------------------|--|
|      | last sentence 'recently approved' should be inserted after 'constructed dwellings' to reflect what is actually happening on the ground.  |                   | inserted into the final spg.   |
| 85.  | Multiple House Applications: Many applicants do not submit applications for more than 2 dwellings in one application. For example, there is currently 3 separate applications for houses alongside each other submitted by the same applicant. In these circumstances it is difficult to say when dealing with each application that it doesn't comply with this aspect of the policy as it is just for one dwelling and has to be dealt with on its individual merits. Is it possible to address this scenario in the guidance? | Yes               | Given that policy H8 sets a general presumption against more than 2 houses in one location regardless of whether this is a sole application or not, it is reasonable to consider that any additional houses (above two) will lead to a build-up that will likely be detrimental to the rural character of the open countryside.            |
| 86.  | Policy H7: 'Impact on character...' – with regards to 'cumulative build-up' and the reference to the point when this occurs, unfortunately the guidance does not contain any further advice on how to assess this issue. This has proved to be a problem in the past as it is open to too much interpretation and should be clarified further, i.e. no more than 2 or 3 houses being permitted to be added to any existing grouping during the current plan period, unless site characteristics dictate otherwise.               | Yes               | Refer to response to comment no.83. Although cumulative build-up needs to be addressed on a case-by-case basis, it is reasonable to consider that the provisions of policy H8, in that there is a general presumption against the addition of more than two houses in one location, sets a benchmark on which to assess cumulative impact. |
| 87.  | Trees: The requirement for a tree survey is too strong and should be qualified by the term 'where mature native species trees are likely to be affected'. Without this, the requirement is too onerous and unreasonable, given the size of some rural sites and extensive tree coverage and is not being adhered to.   | Yes               | The wording of the final spg will be amended.  |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|----------------------|--|
| 88.  | Form: Presumably the term 'horizontal emphasis' is being used to describe the low key nature of many rural houses which tend to be single or one and a half storey buildings. This should be expanded upon a little further for clarification, as it is also usually used when describing architectural features of houses more suited to the urban setting. Also, the term 'narrow' should be inserted after 'rectangles' to try to achieve dwellings of more linear form to better reflect traditional Scottish architecture. | Yes                  | The term 'horizontal emphasis' is used to refer to architectural features such as windows in the draft spg. Where possible, further reference will be made to ensure that suburban features are discouraged. |
| 89.  | Materials: No mention of drydash, which is commonly used throughout the district. The text needs to be amended to include this. Champagne or white drydash can be very eye catching and should be discouraged in all but the rarest of cases.   | Yes                  | Reference to drydash will be made within the text of the final spg.  |
| 90.  | The guidance whilst helpful for the most part, does deviate from the basic intent of some parts of policy H7 and H8. Any decision to refuse planning permission based on the stricter criteria suggested by the guidance might be undermined at appeal by the intent of the policy which is more relaxed. The policy, for better or worse, is relatively permissive so the guidance needs to reflect this general position.   | No                   | The guidance is aimed at avoiding lax interpretation of the policy and to that extent may appear stricter. The guidelines are a blend of interpretation of policy statement, and policy objective.           |
| 91.  | Layout of 'good' and 'bad' examples should be consistent, i.e. either good on left and bad on right, good on top and bad on bottom.   | No                   | The use of crosses and ticks illustrates adequately good and bad examples of development.  |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|-------------------|--|
| 92.  | Contents: Beneath 'Local Planning Context' there should be another sub-heading for 'Other Council documents'.   | No                | Reference to other Council policy documents such as those for Transportation will be referred to in the Background subsection 'Local Planning Context'.  |
| 93.  | Introduction: Include a reference to Transport Policy T2.   | No                | The spg is a planning not a transportation document. Reference to transportation policy would require additional reference to all other relevant policies in the text and this would detract from the primary purpose of the document; to provide advice on planning aspects for housing in the countryside. |
| 94.  | Background: New section required detailing other Council Policy references including 'Transportation Requirements for Small Developments in Rural Parts of Moray' which will be going out to consultation shortly.  | Yes               | Reference to this policy document will be made in the text of the final spg as it has a direct influence on rural development proposals. This will be included within the Background subsection on Local Planning Context.   |
| 95.  | Policy H7 (page 6, para.1, line 2 after 'policy H7'): subject to suitable access onto the public road.  | No                | This is not necessary as all proposals will be subject to transportation requirements.   |
| 96.  | Policy H7 (page 8, diagram showing steadings at bottom of page): The road network has not been adopted in the case of the site shown and this is possibly a controversial example. It is suggested that a diagrammatical example with correct proportions would be better and the use of 'good' and 'bad' example would also be beneficial. | No                | The diagram is for illustration purposes only.   |
| 97.  | Policy H8 (page 15, para.1, line 3 after '2008): subject to suitable access to the public road network.   | No                | Not necessary.   |
| 98.  | Policy H8 (page 15, diagram at bottom of page):   | Yes               | Amendment will be made in final spg.   |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|-------------------|--|
|      | spelling correction 'character'.  |                   |  |
| 99.  | Policy H8 (page 17, 3 <sup>rd</sup> diagram, 'Development in an open setting ...). Spelling correction 'acceptable'.  | Yes               | Amendment will be made in final spg.   |
| 100. | Policy H8 (page 22, diagram 'placing your house on your site'). See general comment on 'good' and 'bad' examples. The trees shown in the 'good' example might block visibility, recommend they be set back further from the road so as not to imply there might be poor visibility at the access.   | No                | The diagram is for illustrative purposes only. The finer detail will be considered at application stage. |
| 101. | Policy H8 (page 27, para.3, line 2 after 'requirements'). Insert 'for which reference should be made to the Moray Council document entitled 'Transportation Requirements for small Developments in Rural Parts of Moray'.   | Yes               | The reference will be included within the final spg.   |
| 102. | Policy H8 (page 31, new para after para.4): Insert 'gate pillars, walls, fences or hedges must be kept to the rear of the visibility splay area, or if that is not possible, must not obstruct the sight lines (a height of less than 0.85 metres is acceptable). Cattle grids if provided must be located outwith the public road boundary'. | Yes               | The text will be amended to reflect the comment in the final spg.  |
| 103. | Page 36 'Useful Contacts': Add in 'Transportation Development, Academy Street, Elgin, IV30 1LL, telephone: 01343 562500, fax: 01343 545628, email: <a href="mailto:roadsdevelopmentcontrol@moray.gov.uk">roadsdevelopmentcontrol@moray.gov.uk</a>   | Yes               | Transportation Services will be added to 'Useful Contacts' section in final spg.                         |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted (Yes/No) | Response  |
|------|---|-------------------|---|
| 104. | All applicants should be encouraged to discuss their proposal with the Moray Council Access Manager prior to the submission of their application. The Access Manager will be able to advise of where access rights currently apply and whether Core Paths, Rights of Way and other paths relate to or are near to the development site.   | Yes               | Contact details for the Moray Council Access Manager will be included within the Useful Contacts section of the final spg.  |
| 105. | Small Scale Housing Developments: Consideration should be given where possible to preserving/enhancing existing paths and creating new path links. This will include consideration of existing Rights of Way, Core Paths and other paths. It is recognised that most housing developments in the countryside will be small scale and opportunities for path enhancement/developments will be limited.   | Yes               | Most housing proposals within the countryside are unlikely to have a detrimental impact on existing or proposed path links. However, the Access Manager can request consultation on those planning applications he may wish to assess against the impact on paths through the internal consultee process.         |
| 106. | Any planning should include details of where access rights will and won't apply after development has taken place. This can be easily achieved by defining the area of 'sufficient adjacent land' where access rights don't apply. A definition for 'sufficient adjacent land' and the range of circumstances is given in Section 3.15 and 3.16 of the Scottish Outdoor Access Code (S.O.A.C). Normally the garden boundary of a house constitutes the extent of sufficient adjacent land. For farm conversions and developments in estates policies a specific boundary may be difficult to define on the ground. In such case prior consultation with the Moray Access Manager will help to provide clarity on what is a reasonable area around dwellings | No                | Where a new dwelling is approved and constructed it will be apparent where access rights do not apply to the public, i.e. within the curtilage of the dwelling. However, the Access Manager will be consulted on other larger developments, such as steading conversions, through the internal consultee process. |

| Ref. | Comment   | Accepted<br>(Yes/No) | Response   |
|------|---|----------------------|--|
|      | where access rights should be excluded.   |                      |  |
| 107. | <p>Larger Scale Housing Developments: Scottish Government guidance associated with the 2003 Act suggests that where appropriate Local Authorities should consider attaching a condition to planning consents requiring production of a Detailed Plan of Public Access. Such a condition should apply to larger scale housing developments. Larger scale housing developments are those of six or more units. The condition on such development should be as follows: 'A detailed plan of public access across the site (existing, during construction and upon completion) should be provided for the approval of the Council as planning authority. This will show: (i) all existing paths, tracks and rights of way and any areas currently outwith or excluded from statutory access rights; (ii) any areas proposed for exclusion from statutory access rights, for reasons of privacy, disturbance or curtilage, in relation to proposed buildings or structures; (iii) all paths and tracks proposed for construction, for use by walkers, riders, cyclists, all abilities users, etc; (iv) any diversions of paths, temporary or permanent, proposed for the purposes of the development'.</p> | Yes                  | For over 6 houses in number, this will have limited application to policies H7 & H8. |