

AGENDA ITEM 7

APPENDIX 4

2015/0317/DET

REPRESENTATIONS

Comments for Planning Application 2015/0317/DET

Application Summary

Application Number: 2015/0317/DET

Address: Land To North And East And West Of Dunbarry Terrace And Kerrow Drive Kingussie Highland

Proposal: Application under Section 42 for variation or non-compliance with conditions 4 (Haul Road), 7 (Landscaping) and 8 (Re-seeding of Plots) for Phase 1 Housing Development of 37 serviced plots and 18 affordable dwellings granted under Planning Permission Ref 2013/0190/MSD

Case Officer: Katherine Donnachie

Customer Details

Name: Mr John Patchett

Address: Mandalay Old Distillery Road Kingussie

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I believe that the proposals to remove reseeding and landscaping requirements are more cost cutting measures against a clearly sensible series of requirements to protect the environment and the neighbourhood from unnecessary disfiguration over an indefinite period. There is no guarantee of any plot sales, other than possibly affordable housing. Allowing the scarring of the landscape in the hope that someone will come along to recreate what is currently a beautiful outlook is not in the interests of this community, in my opinion. Thus I believe the conditions should stand.

Ms K Donnachie
CNPA Planning
14 The Square
Grantown on Spey
PH26 3HG

7 Croila View
Kingussie
PH21 1PG

25th October 2015

Ref: 2015/0316/DET Amended route of temporary haul road etc

Ref: 2015/0317/DET Application under Section 42 for variation or non-compliance with conditions 4 (Haul Road), 7 (Landscaping) and 8 (Re-seeding of Plots) etc

Dear Ms Donnachie

I am writing to you on behalf of myself and my wife to object to the application to vary conditions attached to the planning condition granted for the housing development in Kingussie.

2015/0316/DET:

Condition 4 was attached for the reasons of "road safety and residential amenity", and to make sure that there was safe access for construction vehicles and pedestrians. I struggle to see how re-siting the temporary haul road to run from Kerrow Farm track would be in the interests of either construction vehicles or pedestrians, because of how close it would be the northbound junction of the A9 plus the inevitable increase in traffic. I know that this was a concern when the original application was made, which is why the original access was given permission only if it was to run from further run the A86 well away from the A9 junction.

If a variation is allowed there won't be proper landscaping to protect existing properties from the inevitable noise, dust, and dirt which existing residents will face once building work starts. As this building site could last for up to 20 years this is unreasonable and totally unacceptable, and would show complete disregard for the people living here. I notice that the developer would prefer to put the haul road as close to the boundaries of the site as possible, which would cause even more disturbance to existing properties

I am also concerned about the arrangements made for drainage, as the ground where the haul road is now being planned to go becomes wet and boggy in the winter months. There are several springs which pop up when the weather deteriorates, which won't help. Once the ground has been compacted by heavy vehicles, there are bound to be problems.

2015/0317/DET:

Condition 7 was attached to make sure that a proper landscape setting was established and kept for the new development. This is good, because it would help to give existing properties a bit more protection from the noise and dust while building is going on. If the condition is varied as per this application I suspect that minimal landscaping and planting will take place before work starts, which is not acceptable.

Condition 8 was attached to make sure that the private plots are kept in a tidy condition until they are sold. As it could be years before they are sold and finally developed, this is really important as no one wants to see the site turn into an eyesore.

It seems to me that the only advantage to any of these variations would be a reduction in cost to the developers. I strongly believe that if the haul road is not correctly sited and proper planting and landscaping isn't done at the beginning, it will never be done at all. It will be a misery for residents while construction is ongoing, the new development won't look as good as it could, and Kingussie will be permanently blighted as a result.

Yours sincerely,

Mr Peter Schofield

[REDACTED]
From [REDACTED]

Sent: Mon, 26 Oct 2015 23:42:02 +0000

To: Katherine Donnachie; Planning

Subject: Objection 2015/0316/DET, 2015/0317/DET Kingussie - Req to Address Ctte

Badenoch & Strathspey Conservation Group

Fiodhag, Nethybridge, Inverness-shire PH25 3DJ

Tel 01479 821491

Scottish Charity No. SC003846

Email info@bscg.org.uk

26 October 2015

Dear Katherine Donnachie

**Land To North And East And West Of Dunbarry Terrace And Kerrow Drive
Kingussie**

2015/0316/DET Amended route of temporary haul road and siting of contractors compound for the servicing and construction of Phase 1 Housing Development of 37 plots and 18 affordable dwellings granted under Permission Ref 2013/0190/MS

2015/0317/DET Application under Section 42 for variation or non-compliance with conditions 4 (Haul Road), 7 (Landscaping) and 8 (Re-seeding of Plots) for Phase 1 Housing Development of 37 serviced plots and 18 affordable dwellings granted under Planning Permission Ref 2013/0190/MS

I am writing to object to the above applications.

BSCG requests the opportunity to address the committee when they determine these applications.

Our reasons for objecting include the following:

We do not see that there has been any change in circumstances to warrant varying the conditions.

From the information that has been made available, we are particularly concerned that there has not been sufficient consideration given to the environmental implications of the proposed variations.

Condition 4: (The original condition includes the statement that “no development shall commence on the development hereby approved until the new access from the A86 trunk road and the construction of the haul road have been completed in accordance with the approved plans”).

The revised route takes the haul road closer to existing properties, with inevitable negative impacts of greater disturbance, noise and dust over potentially many years.

The revised site entrance would be significantly closer to the Glebe Ponds, which would create disturbance for people enjoying this attraction. The revised site entrance would also be closer to the A9 junction, leading to a greater traffic hazard as well as a larger barrier to wildlife movement.

The plans provided do not appear to specify the revised route of the haul road beyond the line of the dyke at the side of the shinty pitch. This inhibits informed public comment.

The existing borrow pit near Craig an Darach, which is in a sunny location, is to be impacted on. There does not appear to have been any survey for invertebrates, such as mining bees, and no mitigation measures proposed.

It appears to be unspecified what habitats would be encroached into, including whether trees would be felled, for the widening of the farm track to allow for pedestrian, equestrian etc. users, and for widening the junction of the farm track with the A86.

Widening the farm track at the junction with the A86 to allow vehicles to pass, and widening the farm track, would have negative landscape impacts. This would be at an important entrance to Kingussie and would be visible from the layby used by visitors to the Glebe Ponds.

We note that the applicant indicates that construction of the new access to the A86 will still be required in connection with the development of Phase 2 and 3. Therefore, environmental impacts are increased by this application to vary conditions.

We are concerned at the environmental implications of the drainage proposals involving the borrow pit adjacent to Craig an Darach.

The site offices/compound would be visually intrusive and have negative landscape and amenity impacts. They would be constructed in what is an area of establishing valuable wildlife habitat, that provides cover and prey habitat for wildcat, cover for brown hares, habitat for hedgehogs, prey habitat for some birds of prey, habitat for herptiles, sheltered bat foraging habitat and habitat for woodland birds and invertebrates.

Conditions 7 and 8, relating to landscaping, planting and re seeding: We do not consider that there is any justification for varying these conditions. The proposed variations would have negative impacts on landscape and visual amenity in what is a prominent location. Moreover these could be long-lasting. The proposed variations would not be in accordance with the high standards of landscaping appropriate for a national park.

The original conditions specified that all landscaping and planting should be undertaken in the first planting season after completion of the haul road. This timing for all landscaping should remain a requirement, to benefit the establishment of effective landscape screening and wildlife habitat and cover.

Yours sincerely

Gus Jones

Convener