

From: Thomas Fitzgerald [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: [OFFICIAL] 22/01612/FUL, Ratchill
Date: 17 November 2022 at 15:08
To: Dods, Ranald [REDACTED]
Cc: Susie Turley [REDACTED], William Tunnell [REDACTED]
Bcc: Jane Prady [REDACTED]



Dear Ranald,

There was nothing confusing about your original email. On the contrary we understood your assessment but, for all the reasons we very carefully set out, we are concerned that you have either misunderstood or misjudged the application, arriving an unreasonable and unrepresentative conclusion.

We are shocked that not only have you apparently dismissed all our information out-of-hand, but you are also refusing to enter into any form of constructive dialogue. You appear to have formed an extreme and final position that doesn't appear it can be influenced by evidence or argument. This is not a simple matter of whether the proposals are unsupportable for an obvious and objective policy reason, for instance a prohibited use class is being proposed for the site. Given that the only genuine policy objection you have raised relates to the highly subjective and flexible definition of "appropriateness" of design, how can you justify a total refusal to discuss the matter or to reflect on our further explanations of the design?

Is there no scope for a conversation about this? Or is your position entirely invulnerable to a reasoned discussion?

We request this matter is now escalated to one of your senior colleagues, since we have lost confidence in your ability to judge this application fairly. The inflexibility of your position, the manner in which you have expressed it, and your unwillingness to engage in any dialogue is, in our view, unreasonable and unprofessional.

Regards,

Tom

Thomas Fitzgerald
Senior Associate

WT ARCHITECTURE
www.wtarchitecture.com

WT Architecture Ltd. Registered in Scotland No SC493881. Registered Office: 4-6 Gote Lane, South Queensferry, Edinburgh, EH30 9PS

This transmission is subject to the terms of our email disclaimer, which can be found on our website by clicking [here](#).

On 17 Nov 2022, at 14:17, Dods, Ranald [REDACTED] wrote:

Tom,

My email of the 10th should have been clear. I apologise if it was not.

The proposal is not acceptable in its current form and there is little point in discussing the existing scheme. Any changes to make it acceptable would be significant and, as such, would require the submission of a new application.

I suggest the current application is withdrawn and more modest proposals submitted. A new application would be free of charge if made within 12 months of the date of the original submission. In this case, a new application would have to be submitted by the 19th of October 2023.

Ranald

From: Thomas Fitzgerald [REDACTED] >
Sent: 17 November 2022 13:05
To: Dods, Ranald [REDACTED] >
Cc: Susie Turley <[REDACTED]>; William Tunnell [REDACTED] >
Subject: Re: [OFFICIAL] 22/01612/FUL, Ratchill

CAUTION: External Email

Hi Ranald,

With respect, that is not what our letter said. We asked that you give a reasonable amount time for us to discuss the matter together before either determination or withdrawal. Are SBC willing to have a dialogue about this application?

Regards,

Tom

Thomas Fitzgerald
Senior Associate

WT ARCHITECTURE
www.wtarchitecture.com

WT Architecture Ltd. Registered in Scotland No SC493881. Registered Office: 4-6 Gote Lane, South Queensferry, Edinburgh, EH30 9PS

This transmission is subject to the terms of our email disclaimer, which can be found on our website by clicking [here](#).

On 17 Nov 2022, at 12:55, Dods, Ranald [REDACTED] wrote:

Tom,

I did indeed received your email.

From the contents of the attachment, I conclude that the application is not going to be withdrawn.

Ranald

From: Thomas Fitzgerald [REDACTED] >
Sent: 17 November 2022 12:06
To: Dods, Ranald [REDACTED] >
Cc: Susie Turley [REDACTED] >; William Tunnell [REDACTED] >
Subject: Re: [OFFICIAL] 22/01612/FUL, Ratchill

CAUTION: External Email

Good afternoon Ranald,

Given the deadline you initially set of end-of-play Friday 18th, we would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of the email below and whether or not you're able to delay any move to determination so this conversation can continue. Many thanks.