#### Andrew McCracken

From:

eplanning@highland.gov.uk

Sent:

06 May 2010 14:43

To:

Andrew McCracken

Subject: Application Comments for 10/01529/FUL

Calmgorma National Park Authority 17 MAY 2010 -RECEIVED PW

Planning Application comments has been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 2:43 PM on 06 May 2010 from

# **Application Summary**

Address: Strathspey Hotel High Street Grantown-On-Spey PH26 3EL

Proposal: a. Re-development of existing hotel and erection of new extension. b. Conversion of part of existing hotel to dwelling house. c. Erection of eight flats. (Phasing proposals to support variation of condition 13 of 08/0147/CP (08/102/FULBS)

Case Officer: Andrew McCracken

Click for further information

#### **Customer Details**

Name: Mr Graeme Stuart

Address: "Riverway", Spey Avenue, Grantown-on-Spey PH26 3EJ

# Calmgorms National Park Authority Planning Application No. 10 112 CP REPRESENTATION ACKNOWLEDGED [7 MAY 10

### **Comments Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Customer objects to the Planning Application

#### Comment Reasons:

Comments: Dear Sir, I write as owner and occupier of "Riverway", Spey Avenue, Grantown-on-Spey and as owner of 1a Spey Avenue, Grantown-on-Spey. For the third time this application has been submitted with a fundamental flaw which I believe to be a substantial misrepresentation of the proposals and merit its rejection. Spey Avenue is not virtually flat (as shown on the drawings) but rises to such a level that if you stand at the far end of the site and look towards the High Street, the level equates to just under one whole storey in height at the other end. The proposed flats are shown with the eaves and ridge levels following that of the Hotel, and if that were the case, it would be acceptable to me. However, my concern is that it is almost technically impossible for the developer to construct the development as shown, with doors off Spey Avenue, and he will almost certainly "step" the buildings to a greater degree at two points, resulting in substantially higher eaves and ridges than shown, and this will have a substantially detrimental effect on the amenity of those in its shadow. If he is to maintain the same ridge and eaves level, with the different depth of the blocks shown, the roof slope will change. I believe that it would be incompetent of any Committee to consider these proposals without clarification of this issue and would ask that this is done before the meeting so that committee members are properly informed. Yours faithfully Graeme Stuart.

(c) IDOX plc