

## **SPR Planning Local Review Body**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 July 2024 20:27  
**To:** SPR Planning Local Review Body  
**Subject:** Re: LRB-2024-29

**CAUTION:** This email originated from an external organisation. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you have verified the sender and know the content is safe.

### **Town & Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997**

### **The Town & Country Planning (Schemes of Delegation & Local Review Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2013**

**Application Ref: 23/01987/FLL – Siting of ancillary accommodation unit (in retrospect), The Walled Garden, Garth, Fortingall, Aberfeldy, PH15 2NF – Mrs A Pigny**

#### **Further representation in relation to the review of the original decision.**

I have already objected to this application and wish to comment on the review by the Perth and Kinross Local Review Body, which has been requested by the applicant.

A key point is that the decision to refuse the application clearly quotes the PKC Planning policies which the application fails to comply with. If this review finds in favour of the applicant, this would appear to render these policies redundant. As these policies are intended to ensure that inappropriate buildings, with negative impacts on the neighbourhood, are not permitted, this could create a dangerous precedent. If this application is allowed to go ahead and key planning policies over-ridden, it would be difficult to exercise control over future similar developments. This cannot be an acceptable outcome.

A further point concerns the approach taken by the applicant. It appears that very clear advice on the PKC Planning website, concerning which types of buildings do / do not require planning permission, was ignored. It was clearly the responsibility of the applicant to comply with this advice.

It also appears from other objections, that some neighbours appear to have felt misled by the applicant's description of the purpose of the building i.e. as an office. As has already been pointed out, a more open, collaborative approach could have averted the costs, time and distress that this application has caused.

Regards,

Ron Alexander