

AGENDA ITEM 6

APPENDIX 3

2015/0316/DET

KINGUSSIE AND VICINITY COMMUNITY COUNCIL RESPONSE



KINGUSSIE AND VICINITY COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Cairngorms National Park Planning
14 The Square
Grantown on Spey
PH26 3HG

Replies to:
KVCC Secretary,
Drumlins
Newtonmore Road
Kingussie PH21 1HD

Tel.: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

22nd October 2015

Amended route of temporary haul road and siting of contractors compound for the servicing and construction of Phase 1 Housing Development etc. Ref: 2015/0316/DET

Dear Ms Donnachie

Kingussie and Vicinity Community Council object to this application, to vary condition 4 of the original consent. We expect all of the conditions attached to the current planning consent to be met in full, as they were attached for very good reasons.

1. This particular condition was attached in the interests of road safety and residential amenity, and to ensure safe access for construction vehicles and pedestrians. We do not believe that re-siting the temporary haul road to run from Kerrow Farm track would be in the interests of either construction vehicles or pedestrians, due to its close proximity to the northbound junction of the A9 and the increased level of traffic that implies. This was an issue when the original application was made, and permission for the haul road access was only granted when its proposed route from the A86 was shown s being a safe distance away from the A9 junction. Given the future dualling plans for the A9, this issue is even more pertinent.
2. Although welcoming the fact that some of the Kerrow Farm lands will be fenced off to allow the continuance of agricultural activities, we wish to emphasise that besides servicing the farm, Kerrow Farm track is a public right of way. It forms part of the core path network, and is heavily used by walkers and horse riders. Although the applicant is aware of this and has said that they will provide temporary access for walkers and horse riders while the new entrance is under construction, we are not clear as to how this can be achieved without closing part of the existing General Wade's Military Road access. If the access previously granted consent was to be implemented, this would not be an issue.
3. If this variation is permitted, we note that the whole of the temporary access road will be constructed without any landscaping being put in place, as this would not be scheduled until: "the first planting season following the formation of the haul road". This would seriously affect the amenity of existing properties for some considerable time, as they will be left exposed to

the inevitable noise and dirt associated with a large construction site, even if construction vehicles are required to: "maintain a low speed and follow good driving practices". (exactly who will be responsible for enforcing this?). We do not believe that the existing dry stone dyke on the north east edge of the site will be sufficient on its own to offer existing properties adequate protection from disturbance by site traffic.

4. We are concerned that the haul road will be formed by merely scraping off the top layer of soil, with "rough areas or depressions filled in with hardcore as necessary". The combination of wet weather and heavy construction vehicles is likely to result in an increase in the width of those areas of road not contained by bunding. The application does not indicate what measures if any are in place to combat this, which raises concerns that a significant portion of the road could end up being covered in hardcore. This raises further concerns as to what will become of the hard core once the haul road is no longer required and the ground has been reinstated. Will it end up just being buried beneath the reinstated topsoil?
5. The drawings submitted with the application do not give sufficient clarification as to the exact route proposed for the whole road which we expect to be located as far from existing residential properties on the site boundary as possible. This is in order to minimise disturbance to nearby residents and protect the amenity of their properties, given that the lifespan of the whole development could last for up to 20 years.

We note that paragraph 2.4 of the Planning Statement submitted with this application indicates the applicant's concern regarding the availability of funding for the affordable dwellings. While understanding these concerns and the applicant's obvious desire to commence construction as soon as possible, given the general push for affordable housing which exists at present we have little doubt that funding will still be available whether this is in 2016/17 or 2017/18. Rather than place the emphasis on funding availability we feel that it is more important to concentrate on getting things right, as once this development is underway there will be no going back.

The comment regarding "shop closures and loss of local services are already evident in Kingussie as a result of the lack of housebuilding in recent years" is complete nonsense, as anyone with local knowledge knows that businesses on the High Street have closed for a number of reasons, none of which have anything to do with a lack of house building. Most of the shops on the High Street have either reopened or are due to reopen with thriving new businesses.

We see no merit in this application, as it seems to relate more to financial concerns rather than the creation of a quality development. It also indicates a serious lack of regard for existing residents and their quality of life while the site is under development. Consequently we ask that this application be rejected, as we do not feel that it to be in the best interests of Kingussie.

Yours sincerely,



Ailsa Schofield
Chairwoman
Kingussie & Vicinity Community Council