

## Kirsty Mackenzie

---

**From:** Rosy Wood [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 February 2018 17:54  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** CPN - Local Development Plan. A Response to Braemar Consultation Questions  
**Categories:** Kirsty

Hello,

Here are my thoughts on the Braemar LDP consultation questions.

### 1) Issues for Braemar

I agree with need for affordable housing, particularly rental accommodation, and the need for a strong local economy. However I feel there is an over emphasis throughout the report on tourism and not enough on community. A strong local economy based largely on tourism needs to be supported by provision of affordable housing. The high quantity of second home and holiday lets in the village mean insufficient housing to met the needs of the growing tourist industry where the employment is generally low paid. I agree with the CPN objective for Braemar for mixed housing and 35% affordable in any development scheme. Perhaps the CPNA should be bolder and seek a mechanism to deter 2nd home ownership in the park?

### 2) settlement objectives

The settlement objectives are generally fine.

a) Braemar's position as a local service centre is already pivotal to the area.

b) Economy should be diversified beyond tourism which is putting the village under stress. Here are 2 examples...

i- current tourism plans of the Fife & Invercauld Hotels and Highland Heritage Centre have all failed to consider the impact availability of staff and accommodation for staff. Planning could be far more rigorous in their testing of staffing models before approving large scale developments. The Fife development in particular has resulted in high stress on property in the village as they acquire B&B businesses and land to develop as their staff needs have become clear.

ii- conservation of wildlife, scenic beauty and wild spaces are key for the continuation of the park. Tourism is an essential feature, but the park is under increasing pressure, not least from mobile homes and camper vans who sometimes abuse their right to roam. Should the CNPA be thinking more strategically on how to protect our wild places from inconsiderate wild campers and camper van users who litter and fowl in the park. Maybe consider bringing in some limitations within the park, complemented by an increase in campsite provision.

c) Conserving the integrity of the Braemar conservation area is absolutely critical. There is a disconnect between this aim and the proposed development preferred site options which could damage the environment and the nature of the village. In addition, the scale of developments needs to be better considered by planning, particularly height and size relative to plots... The allowed scale of some recent developments have surprised the community.

d) Affordable private and rental housing is a must of we are to maintain a healthy age profile in the village. However, the the nature of the position and unique geography of the village and local environment limits the amount of land appropriate for any scale of development. It may be that there is enough provision in the existing relatively large housing site in Ballater (H1) as a more appropriate place for any additional housing needs for this area, coupled with more frequent public transport between the villages.

### 3) preferred site objectives

See above - the nature of the position and unique geography and environment limits the amount of land appropriate for development. Specifically

**AB009** should be reclassified as a protected open space. It is a material scenic area: the mature larch is iconic in the landscape, the deer graze on the meadow in spring, the views and access to the Dee valley are outstanding. This a key public amenity space which should not be developed for housing.

**AB023** is a flood risk area and would be better served as tourism/caravan use with housing for **AB019**

**AB022** you may wish to consider adding in part of this land for housing development if required, however the previously approved sites of EP2 and EP3 have stalled in their development, so not sure that large scale housing development is appropriate for Braemar.

**4) Protected open spaces**

These should be increased in order to maintain the look and feel of the village. I would include **AB009, AB006, EP3, AB003, AB008** as protected open spaces, in addition to the areas outside the settlement boundary.

**5) Settlement boundary**

I would agree in keeping it as shown with the minor extensions and perhaps with inclusion of part of **AB022**.

Regards,  
Dr Rosy Wood

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]