

**Subject:** FW: INTIMATION TO APPLICANT/AGENT OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED,  
Received Friday 21st September 2012.

---

**From:** John Wagner  
**Sent:** 25 September 2012 11:39  
**To:** localreviewprocess  
**Subject:** INTIMATION TO APPLICANT/AGENT OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED, Received Friday 21st September 2012.

I wish to comment regarding this representation particularly regarding the two applications as follows

12/00914/PP – Erection of extension to dwelling house – Refused 15 June 2012

12/01405/PP - Erection of extension to dwelling house – Refused 22 August 2012

Page 8 of the 13 page document, item (L) has the application been subject of statutory pre-application consultation (PAC): N

The above statement should read Y. The agent met with and consulted Mr. Jim Reid, Planning Technical Officer before each of the above applications were lodged. For example meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2012 at Blairvadach.

Despite advice from the Planning Technical Officer regarding size, roof design and finishing materials the first application was refused.

So at a further meeting after this refusal, Mr. Reid suggested the proposed area of the extension should be reduced. Again the planner's advice was positively acted on.

On Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> September 2012 the agent spoke with Mr. Howard Young, Senior Development Controller, who agreed that the statement (L) is incorrect.

At these several consultations, a misleading impression was given to the applicant and his agent. This appeared to suggest "*if you make these changes the application has a good chance of success*".

Thus essentially this planning appeal to the Local Review Body is motivated by the same positive interpretation by the applicant.

John Wagner Architect Limited