

Issue 9	Area specific - Aberdeenshire	
Development plan reference:	17 Ballater 20 Braemar 26 Dinnet	Reporter:
Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):		
081 Alison Day 209 Aberdeenshire Council 183 Adrienne Robertson 154 Alan Milne 031 Ballater and Crathie Community Council 093 Ballater Royal Deeside Ltd 152 Braemar Community Council 243 Charles Smith 224 David Cobban 181 David Sherrard 232 Dinnet Estate 175 Eva Robinson 077 Invercauld Estate 092 Jane Angus 182 John Lovie 220 Linda Forman 079 Mar Estate	153 Mary Laing 221 Michael Forman 219 Mr and Mrs Barns 189 Mrs R Lovie 230 NHS Grampian 215 Norman Cattananch 171 Peter Dranfield 104 Phil Swan 236 Rory Bruce 216 Rosemary Cattananch 063 SEPA 040 SNH 247 Susan Walker 198 Whit Romilly 196 Woodland Trust for Scotland	
Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:	Community Information chapters 17 Ballater 20 Braemar 26 Dinnet	
Planning authority's summary of the representation(s):		
<p>BALLATER</p> <p><u>Site H1</u> Alison Day (081), Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) Charles Smith (243) David Cobben (224) John Lovie (182) Linda Forman (220) Michael Forman (221) Mr and Mrs Barns (219) Mrs R Lovie (189) Norman Cattananch (215) Phil Swan (104) Rosemary Cattananch (216) and Whit Romilly (198) object to the housing site H1 in Ballater for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not deliver community aspirations for more rented homes, affordable to local people, and a small number of new homes for local workers and local retirees • Development is not supported by the community • Likely poor quality of design • Lack of need for large scale development • Landscape and visual impact and loss of amenity and recreation space • Impact on village character and special qualities 		

- Impact on walking routes and loss of country paths
- New housing should be located closer to the village centre
- Risk of flooding
- Loss of agricultural land
- Continuation of car-dependency
- Development would not stop at 50 houses
- Undermine tourism economy
- Lack of employment opportunities for new residents
- Already have too many expensive houses, second and holiday homes and new development would exacerbate this
- The work by the Princes Foundation indicated 90 units, not 50 would be needed to make it viable
- Focus should be working, ideally with housing association, on small sites
- Need only for affordable housing, not open market housing
- Only low cost housing for local people should be built and this should be on a number of small sites within the development boundary
- The 25 sites within the settlement suggested at MIR stage should be considered for affordable housing, as well as land owned by Aberdeenshire Council this would result in easier access to services, better match housing need, better integrate with the village both visually and economically, offer potential to bring redundant buildings back into use, offer more opportunities to use local tradesmen, and avoid insurmountable legal inhibitions to use council land for housing.
- Protecting land for only affordable housing development would reduce land owner expectations

Invercauld Estate (077) endorse site H1 as being effective but request Masterplan is used to define boundary of first phase, and object to removal of housing land which is now allocated as open space suggesting this must be included within the Masterplan area.

Jane Angus (092) - Supports H1 but requests it includes a ground heating scheme, the provision of workshops, highest possible affordable housing percentage and accommodation for the elderly and flats.

Charles Smith (243) - If H1 remains allocated accessibility to the Park should be improved and the site for Highland Games and associated car-parking must be retained and suggests any new houses boarding the A93 should include a 5m strip to avoid the impact of recent development which should have their gardens reduced by 5m or re-align the A93.

Phil Swan (104) – Should revisit the whole issue of housing in Ballater, returning to Option 2 of the Main Issues Report and starting again from there.

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) are concerned the plan will continue monocultural development that ends up as second and holiday homes.

Ballater Royal Deeside Limited (093) share concerns about high need for affordable housing and although not objecting to housing section, share concerns that additional executive homes may exacerbate current problems, they suggest more than the 25% affordable housing policy requirement may be needed.

Masterplan Issues

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) concerned developer will not pay for Masterplanning process, and that any such plan must consider the whole village, ensuring links to centre, reflect conservation area, secure rented housing in perpetuity, allow for only a limited amount of open market housing for local workers and retirees, accessible by walking, cycling, skating and for those with limited mobility. Lower speed limits in village and show how mixed use will be developed.

Site H2

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) only support H2 if it is affordable housing for local people to rent. Ballater Royal Deeside Ltd (093) welcome the 100% affordable housing proposed on Site H2.

Other Housing Issues

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) request the Plan is less general and more definitive and that it address the issues of second homes and prevents unnecessary development.

Alison Day (081) Charles Smith (243) John Lovie (182) Linda Forman (220) Whit Romilly (198) request infill sites within the development boundary are used instead, and the Park is extended. Charles Smith (243) requests housing for local people should be prioritised.

Mr and Mrs Barns (219) request a method to raise funds to supply affordable housing is included.

Ballater Royal Deeside Ltd (093) request development appraisal toolkit should be revised/applied in a way that considers Ballater's high levels of second homes and high need for affordable homes.

Site C1

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) object to the continued allocation of the Old School site for community use, as this is not securing its future.

Site T1

SEPA (063) object to site T1 unless wording is amended to reflect flood risk issues.

Allocation of Land for Other Uses

Aberdeenshire Council (209) - Request land is allocated for a recycling centre.

Rory Bruce (236) - Requests the Plan does more for young people and land is allocated for a skate park on land beyond the existing Park.

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) request the Plan allocates land for

bike and skate park. Aberdeenshire Council (209) - Request the allocation of additional land for business and employment use within the settlement and a site for recycling centre. Suggest land west of Aberdeen Cottage on A93 would be suitable. However, Ballater Royal Deeside Limited (093) request this land is allocated as open space and protected from development for business purposes. This would support community aspiration for a wildflower garden, arboretum or community garden on the site. Ian Ritchie (166) and John Lovie (182) and Ballater Royal Deeside Limited (093) requests this land is allocated as open space to enhance village setting, mitigate flooding, and enable a community arboretum, wildflower meadow or memorial garden.

Natural Heritage Designations

SNH (040) - National and international designations and SSSIs within each community should be specifically named. Para 17.7 should recognise the importance of SPAS within the Deeside/Donside area and therefore list all of the European designated site in this area in para 17.7 and the connections made by non-designated woodland. Also the wording of para 17.7 is not accurate in relation to Habitats Regulations and that the Plan needs to make it clear that the Natura sites listed are those HRA has identified as likely to be significantly affected by proposals in the Plan and so they have been screened in and thus require high level mitigation. The Plan should adopt a precautionary approach.

SNH (040) Para 17.8 - There is a need to strengthen policy caveat to make it clear that if a planning authority is unable to conclude there would be no impact on the integrity of European site(s) the proposal would not be in accordance with the Plan. They highlight that the mitigation proposed in draft HRA must be picked up in the Plan. There is also a need to reference the requirement to consider the impact of development on Capercallie as part of the Appropriate Assessment.

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) - Believe measures to protect Capercallie in Pannianich and Criag Collich areas of Ballater are required.

Development Boundary

Peter Dranfield (171) - The development boundary should be amended to include the full extent of the garden at Iona on Old Line Road.

Explanatory Text

Phil Swan (104) – Believes the Ballater Community’s visions for housing has been misrepresented.

Phil Swan (104) requests wording is added to the end of para 17.1. saying “quality affordable housing to meet local needs will be supported. This should be done using existing real estate and redevelopment where possible, to avoid harm to the visual and natural environment”.

Ballater Royal Deeside Ltd (093) Para 17.5 - Welcome prioritisation of affordable but concerned affordable housing is last on the list.

NHS Grampian (230) Para 17.15 - Contributions will be needed towards dental and community care provision and pharmacy enhancements.

BRAEMAR

Site H1

Braemar Community Council (153) David Sherrard (181) Adrienne Robertson (183) Susan Walker (247) Eva Robinson (175) Woodland Trust for Scotland (196) object to the housing site H1 in Braemar for one or more of the following reasons:

- Contrary to first aim of National Park
- Impact on ancient woodland
- Will not support thriving businesses and communities
- No need for any more housing in the village, especially as recent development have been difficult to rent and sell
- Braemar is not a priority location for new housing in Aberdeenshire, and recent Masterplan found no evidence of need or demand.
- Landscape impact, loss of open nature of site and impact on character of the village
- Road safety and traffic issues
- Conflict with natural heritage, landscape, cultural heritage policies and supplementary guidance on new housing development and design
- Harm to conservation area
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Loss of site used for parking for Braemar Games
- Alternative sites should be considered
- More Second and holiday homes are not needed there is already an overreliance on the tourism economy
- Only affordable housing should be provided on a small scale to ensure resident contribute to thriving local economy
- To make it affordable, affordable housing will be of low quality
- Sites elsewhere would provide 100 houses, including affordable housing percentage, once the market improves
- The land should be retained for community use and allocated as such

Mar Estate (079) request open market is allowed for on H1 Chapel Brae for flexibility.

Site ED1

Alan Milne (154) -As part owner of site ED1 requests the area currently housing a shed remain underdeveloped.

Request for Additional Housing and Employment Allocations

Mar Estate (079) and Invercauld Estate (077) both support the work undertaken on the community Masterplan for Braemar and request that the Plan allocates more land for housing and employment in line with strategic options study. They suggest relying on exiting permissions will not ensure a vibrant community, as it does not give direction for the future, promote growth, or provide longer term choice.

Site C1

NHS Grampian (230) - Support the approach to maximising existing local services and infrastructure but seek a more explicit support for healthcare facilities in para 20.5. They observe plans for a health care facility on Site C1 will not now be taken forward and request their deletion from the Plan.

SEPA (063) - Object to C1 unless the wording is amended to include reference to floodrisk.

Mar Estate (079) - Suggest that C1 is no longer required is deleted and reallocated as more housing.

Site T1

Woodland Trust for Scotland (196) - Object to T1 due to impact on ancient woodland and request is development does occur sufficient buffering and species surveys will be needed.

Additional Tourism Allocation

Invercauld Estate (077) - Suggests land to the south of the caravan park should be allocated for more tourist accommodation.

Natural Heritage Designations

SNH (040) - National and international designations and SSSIs within each community should be specifically named. Para 20.7 should recognise the importance of SPAS within the Deeside/Donside area and the connections made by non-designated woodland, and so the Plan should adopt a precautionary approach. The detailed impacts are likely to vary and this can be assessed when individual proposals are assessed against the Natural Heritage SG. The wording is not accurate in relation to Habitats Regulations and that the Plan needs to make it clear that the Natura sites listed are those HRA has identified as likely to be significantly affected by proposals in the Plan and so they have been screened in and thus require high level mitigation. Para 20.8 - There is a need to strengthen policy caveat to make it clear that if a planning authority is unable to conclude there would be no impact on the integrity of European site(s) the proposal would not be in accordance with the Plan. They highlight that the mitigation proposed in draft HRA must be picked up in the Plan.

Settlement Boundary

Invercauld Estate (077) - Settlement boundary should be amended at Balnellan and to include land north of Invercauld Arms which should be allocated for major investment including some housing to enable cross-subsidy. Mar Estate (079) question how housing need and demand is calculated and suggest the settlement boundary is extended to allow for more housing and employment growth.

DINNET

Site H1 SEPA (063) – There is an error wrongly identifying H1 and not H2 as needing an FRA is corrected, this must be corrected.

Site H2

SEPA (063) – There is an error wrongly identifying H1 and not H2 as needing an FRA is corrected, this must be corrected.

Additional/Alternative Site for Housing

Dinnet Estate (232) Support the designation of Dinnet as a settlement and inclusion of a housing site within the Plan, but concerned current site extends rather than consolidates the village, suggest alternative site which could incorporate low density housing whilst protecting the woodland setting. The Estate is not against the current approach but would suggest that their alternative site located to the south east corner of the A93 and A97 is as suitable, is available and deliverable, and therefore could be included as an additional or alternative site.

Natural Heritage Designations

SNH (040) Para 26.5 – Wording does not accurately reflect Habitats regulations and needs amending. Also observe that there is no likely significant effect on Muir of Dinnet SPA/Ramsar Site and so there is no requirement for this reference .

SNH (040) Para 26.6 – A stronger policy caveat is needed and mitigation must be picked up in the plan.

Settlement Boundary

Mary Laing (153) - Development boundary should be adjusted to reflect that fact that the residential gardens at 'Stondhu' and 'Transy' stretch all the way back to the stream.

Explanatory Text

Nestrans (048) – Request reference is made to the opportunities to link development into the Deeside Way.

Modifications sought by those submitting representations:

BALLATER

Site H1: Alison Day (081) Charles Smith (243) David Cobban (224) John Lovie (182) Linda Forman (220) Michael Forman (221) Mr and Mrs Barns (219) Mrs R Lovie (189) Phil Swan (104) Norman Cattananch (215) Rosemary Cattananch (216) Whit Romilly (198) request H1 is deleted.

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) request H1 is not developed before an approved Masterplan has been prepared, and that this Masterplan must cover the whole village and fully involve the community.

Jane Angus (092) requests H1 includes a ground heating scheme, the provision of workshops, highest possible affordable housing percentage and accommodation for the elderly and flats.

Charles Smith (243) requests accessibility to the Park should be improved and the site for Highland Games and associated car-parking retained if H1 remains allocated, and a 5m buffer to the A93 included.

Phil Swan (104) requests revisiting the whole issue of housing in Ballater returning to Option 2 of the Main Issues Report and starting again from there.

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) seek assurances that the plan will not continue monocultural development that ends up as second and holiday homes.

Ballater Royal Deeside Limited (093) suggest more than the 25% affordable housing policy requirement may be needed.

Masterplan Issues: Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) are concerned that the cost of preparing a Masterplan will make it unviable and request that any Masterplanning process should consider the whole village.

Site H2: Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) say H2 must only be developed with full community engagement.

Other Housing Issues

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) request the Plan is less general and more definitive and that it address the issues of second homes and prevents unnecessary development.

Alison Day (081) Charles Smith (243) John Lovie (182) Linda Forman (220) Whit Romilly (198) request infill sites within the development boundary are used instead, and the Park is extended.

Charles Smith (243) requests housing for local people should be prioritised.

Mr and Mrs Barns (219) request a method to raise funds to supply affordable housing is included.

Ballater Royal Deeside Ltd (093) request development appraisal toolkit should be revised/applied in a way that considers Ballater's high levels of second homes and high need for affordable homes.

Site C1: Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) seek the removal of the C1 allocation and the development of alternative approach to secure the future of the Old School site.

Site T1: SEPA (063) require T1 to be amended to read "The site lies wholly within SEPA's indicative 1:200 year flood risk area. No additional site capacity and no development which results in a loss of floodplain capacity will be supported. A detailed FRA will be required to accompany any further development proposal for the site".

Allocation of Land for Other Uses: Aberdeenshire Council (209) request the allocation of land west of Aberdeen Cottage on A93 additional land for business and employment use within the settlement and a site but Ballater Royal Deeside Limited (093) and Ian Ritchie (166) and John Lovie (182) suggest this is allocated

as open space. Aberdeenshire Council (209) request land is allocated for a recycling centre. Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) request the Plan allocates land for bike and skate park. Rory Bruce (236) requests land is allocated for a skate park beyond the existing Park.

Natural Heritage Issues:

SNH (040) request that SACs, SPAs, Ramsar Sites, NNRs and SSSIs are specifically named.

SNH (040) seek an amendment to para 17.7 so it says "In addition, development on land allocated in the Plan has potential to have significant effect, directly or indirectly, on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination" and seek the addition of Cairngorms SPA, Ballochbuie SPA and Glen Tanar SPA as additional bullet points at the end of the para.

SNH (040) seek an amendment to para 17.8 to read "...to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan and planning permission will not be granted. Specifically your proposal must address..."

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) request the Plan includes measures to protect Capercallie.

Development Boundary: Peter Dranfield (171) request the development boundary is amended to include the whole garden of Iona on Old Line Road.

Explanatory Text: Phil Swan (386) suggests that the Ballater Community's vision for housing has been misrepresented and should be quoted correctly.

Phil Swan (104) requests wording is added to the end of para 17.1. saying "quality affordable housing to meet local needs will be supported. This should be done using existing real estate and redevelopment where possible, to avoid harm to the visual and natural environment".

Ballater Royal Deeside Ltd (093) requests greater prioritisation is given to affordable and that it is not last on the list in para 17.5

NHS Grampian (230) request one of the bullets in para 17.15 is amended to read "health care provision, particularly dental and community care services" and another bullet point added requiring contributions from developers to extend pharmacy provision in the community.

BRAEMAR

Site H1: Adrienne Robertson (183) Braemar Community Council (20) Susan Walker (359) Eva Robinson (175) request site H1 is removed from the Plan.

Adrienne Robertson (73) and David Sherrard (68) wish H1 to be designated for community use and requests land identified in Braemar Masterplan (SDXX) as W4, W5 and W10 to be designated as open space. Braemar Community Council (20) wish to see land north of Chapel Brae allocated as open space

Woodland Trust for Scotland seek the deletion of Site H1 if development does occur request sufficient buffering and species surveys.

Site ED1: Alan Milne (154) request that his part of ED1 is not developed

Additional Sites for Housing and Employment: Mar Estate (079) and Invercauld Estate (077) request the Plan allocates more land for housing and employment uses. Invercauld Estate (077) land north of Invercauld arms is allocated for major investment including some housing to enable cross-subsidy.

Site C1: NHS Grampian (230) request C1 is deleted from the Plan.

SEPA (063) request and amendment to C1 so that it reads “Part of the site is likely to be constrained by the risk of flooding. A FRA will be required to identify the developable area, capacity for the site and/or development layout which could be limited. There may be constraints due to the presence of wetland. A NVC survey may be required to accompany any development proposals for the site”

Mar Estate (079) request C1 is deleted from the Plan and allocated for housing.

Site T1: Woodland Trust (146) request that if development at T1 is to occur the appropriate species surveys will be needed and a buffer should be used.

Additional Sites for Tourism: Invercauld Estate (077) request land to the south of the caravan park is allocated for tourist accommodation.

Natural Heritage Designations SNH (040) - National and international designations and SSSIs within each community should be specifically named. Para 20.7 – Need to recognise the importance of SPAS within the Deeside/Donside area and therefore list all of the European designated site in this area in para 20.7 and the connections made by non-designated woodland. Also the wording of para 20.7 is not accurate in relation to Habitats Regulations and that the Plan needs to make it clear that the Natura sites listed are those HRA has identified as likely to be significantly affected by proposals in the Plan and so they have been screened in and thus require high level mitigation. The Plan should adopt a precautionary approach.

SNH (040) Para 20.8 - There is a need to strengthen policy caveat to make it clear that if a planning authority is unable to conclude there would be no impact on the integrity of European site(s) the proposal would not be in accordance with the Plan. They highlight that the mitigation proposed in draft HRA must be picked up in the Plan.

Settlement Boundary: Invercauld Estate (077) request the settlement boundary is amended at Balnellan and to include land to the north of Invercauld Arms. Mar Estate (079) request the settlement boundary is extended to allow for more

housing and employment growth.

DINNET

Site H1: SEPA (063) request that the wrongly identifying H1 and not H2 as needing an FRA is corrected is corrected.

Site H2: SEPA (063) request that the wrongly identifying H1 and not H2 as needing an FRA is corrected is corrected.

Additional/Alternative Site for Housing: Dinnet Estate (279) request that their alternative site located to the south east corner of the A93 and A97 is included as an additional or alternative site.

Natural Heritage Issues: SNH (040) seek an amendment to para 26.5 so it says "In addition, development on land allocated in the Plan has potential to have significant effect, directly or indirectly, on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination", and request the deletion of the second bullet point referring to the Muir of Dinnet.

SNH (040) seek an amendment to para 26.6 to read "...to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan and planning permission will not be granted. Specifically your proposal must address..."

Settlement Boundary: Mary Laing (153) requests the development boundary is extended to include the full residential gardens at 'Stondhu' and 'Transy'.

Explanatory Text: Nestrans (048) request reference is made to the opportunities to link development into the Deeside Way.

Summary of responses (including reasons) by planning authority:

BALLATER

The CNPA's long term vision for the National Park is set out in the Cairngorms National Park Partnership Plan (CNPPP) which was approved by Scottish Government on 30 May 2012 (SDXX). Page 13 of the CNPPP sets out the long term vision for the Cairngorms National Park as "An outstanding National Park, enjoyed and valued by everyone, where nature and people thrive together". The CNPPP (SDXX page 14) goes on to explain that the vision of "success in being a sustainable economy supporting thriving businesses and communities" would include a growing and diversified economy, more jobs and a wider range of employment opportunities, thriving and sustainable communities, a growing workforce, people working in the Park finding it easier to access housing that meets their needs, safe route to travel and sustainable new development with good design. All of these outcomes will help to deliver the vision for the National Park.

The relationship between the CNPPP and the Local Development Plan is set out on page 40 of the CNPP (SDXX) which states “The Local Development Plan and planning services will support the delivery of this long term outcome by providing: sufficient land for housing to meet identified need and demand, including inward migration of workers; the necessary land and support for business development and diversification; site for future development that support attractive, vibrant communities and that minimise the need to use energy; clear guidance on where, when and how the best development will be supported.”

The CNPA is therefore keen to support the sustainable development of all of its communities. Policy 1.1 of the CNPPP (SDXX page 41) sets out how a sustainable economy of the National Park will be supported which includes “increased provision for business land where there is an identified need and demand; and to support the use of land for small business, particularly within settlements”. Chapter 4 of the Proposed Plan (SDXX, page 20) explains in para 4.1 that “Sustainable Growth in the economy of the Park is at the heart of supporting our communities, helping them become and remain vibrant and attractive places for people to live and work”. As para 4.2 and 4.3 explain delivering successful economic growth for the future “is not just about identifying sites for new development”

Policy 1.2 of the CNPPP (SDXX page 42) sets out how sustainable patterns of settlement growth, infrastructure and communications will be achieved, including consolidating the role of the existing main settlements including Ballater as they are “the most sustainable places for future growth and the focus for housing land supply while maintaining the integrity of designated sites”. This settlement hierarchy is illustrated by a diagram on page 43 of the CNPPP (SDXX) identifying Ballater is a ‘Main Settlement’.

As paras 17.1, 17.2, 17.3 and 17.4 of the Proposed Plan (SDXX) explain Ballater is the largest settlement in the Aberdeenshire part of the Park and plays a strategic role in Upper Deeside. The allocation of land for development in Ballater therefore seeks to consolidate its role as main settlement in the settlement hierarchy. The housing numbers and locational strategy in the Proposed plan is supported by the evidence (SDxx MIR Evidence Housing) and the CNPA believe this continues to be the correct approach.

Site H1: Alison Day (081) Charles Smith (243) David Cobban (224) John Lovie (182) Linda Forman (220) Michael Forman (221) Mr and Mrs Barns (219) Mrs R Lovie (189) Phil Swan (104) Norman Cattananch (215) Rosemary Cattananch (216) Whit Romilly (198) request H1 is deleted. A number of issues have been raised in support of this request. CNPA do not agree that these issues should result in the removal or amendment of this allocation for the following reasons:

- Regarding the assertion that the development will make little contribution to community aspirations, CNPA do not agree this to be the case. The community sought quality and affordable housing to meet local needs. Whilst they clarified this to be achieved through redevelopment, CNPA would look to past attempts to redevelop various vacant and derelict sites

in the village which have not resulted in successful development, such as the Old School. Redevelopment sites are recognised to carry with them issues which add complexity and cost to housing developments, and in the search for affordable development, CNPA remains convinced the best way to achieve this, in this market location, is on a Greenfield site where a comprehensive view can be taken of the needs of the whole of the village and its hinterland. CNPA has set out in evidence to support the Main issues Report why it considers there to be a need for housing in Ballater, and considers the provision of 50 units within the plan period to be a reasonable goal. This will allow for the mixed tenures sought, and help support the sustainability of the local community.

- Regarding the design, the CNPA is committed to raising the quality of design in new development across the Park. Policies and supplementary guidance exist to ensure this is the case. CNPA do not therefore accept the assumption that design quality will be poor.
- Regarding the scale of the development, the CNPA do not consider the allocation of land to provide 50 units during the life of the plan to be excessive, a rate of 10 units per year. The CNPA have clarified in text associated with H1 that future release of land to provide more development would only occur should future needs require.
- In relation to landscape and visual impact loss of amenity and recreation space and any impact on village character and special qualities, bullet point 3 and 4 of Proposal H1 require this issue to be addressed in the masterplan required to guide the development of the site.
- Regarding walking routes and loss of country paths, bullet points 6 and 9 require this issue to be addressed in the masterplan required to guide the development of the site.
- Regarding the location of development closer to the heart of the village, bullet point 6 requires this issue to be addressed in the masterplan required to guide the development of the site.
- Regarding risk of flooding, bullet point 1 requires this issue to be addressed in the masterplan required to guide the development of the site.
- Regarding loss of agricultural land, CNPA accepts that the full development of the site into the long term will result in the loss of agricultural land. The largely rural nature of the National Park means that many housing and other sites allocated in the plan are currently agriculture in nature, albeit that the land is generally of low agricultural classification. This is the case in most rural areas. In order to meet the housing needs of the area some development of agricultural land is therefore inevitable and so concerns raised about the loss of agricultural land, do not alter the CNPA's position that the land should be allocated for housing.
- Regarding continuation of car-dependency, bullet point 6 and 7 require this issue to be addressed in the masterplan required to guide development of the site.

- Regarding the limit of development to 50 houses, the text is clear that future release of additional land will only occur if future needs require and that within the Plan period only 39 houses are anticipated (see Schedule 3 Housing Land Supply).
- Regarding the impact on tourism economy, CNPA does not accept that this will be the case. A well designed and integrated development will help consolidate the village, and will help link existing modern developments into the village core. Bullet point 3 requires the masterplan to consider how development will reflect the special character of the village, and this includes an important role as a tourism centre for Deeside.
- Regarding lack of employment opportunities for new residents, bullet point 2 and 3 require the masterplan to consider the ways in which mixed use can be woven into the overall development.
- Regarding the abundance of expensive homes in Ballater, the masterplan is required to set out how development will meet the needs of the community.
- Regarding the work of the Princes Foundation, CNPA accept that it sought 90 units as a first phase. CNPA have, however set out in evidence (SDxx MIR evidence) that this is not needed for the plan period and have reduced this phase accordingly.
- Regarding working with housing associations, on small sites, CNPA is doing this already, as demonstrated by work to deliver housing site H2 in Ballater. CNPA will continue this work to bring forward development which meets the needs of local housing associations and in a way which meets the community needs. CNPA, as above, is not convinced that infill and redevelopment sites alone provide sufficient flexibility and cost efficiencies to deliver development which meets the needs of the community in a realistic way.
- Regarding the provision of only affordable or low cost development, CNPA, as above, is committed to supporting main settlements in the settlement hierarchy, and to improving the sustainability of communities. As such it remains committed to the provision of housing land to assist in this as set out in evidence (SDxx Main issues evidence paper)
- Regarding alternative sites suggested at the time of the Main Issues Report, CNPA has asked the community council for information regarding the availability of these sites. Sites were not suggested by land owners and were not therefore considered to be effective. As such, CNPA has not taken them forward at this time. If additional information is forthcoming to suggest all or any would be truly effective, CNPA would be happy to reconsider them.

Invercauld Estate (077) - The CNPA welcomes Invercauld Estate's (077) endorsement of H1 as being effective but do not agree that the Masterplan should be used to define boundary of first phase as, above, it has reassessed the need

for housing in Ballater in the Plan period and cannot justify a first phase of 90 units. CNPA do however support the work of the Prince's Foundation and hope work already carried out can be used to inform the final masterplan for the site.

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) - The CNPA agrees that a Masterplan is required to ensure the successful delivery of H1, and this is reflected in the second paragraph of the H1 Proposal (Proposed Plan SDxx page 74 which says the Masterplan will be required to "look at the long term expansion options for this part of Ballater. A Masterplan must however focus on a particular site and therefore although the Masterplan will need to consider the impact of the development on the wider area it would not be logical or practicable for the Masterplan to cover the whole village." The masterplan will be produced as either supplementary guidance (if prepared by CNPA) or in support of an outline application (if prepared by a developer). Both options require full consultation with the community. CNPA do consider there to be a need for further change to the plan.

Jane Angus (092) - The CNPA agree that the provision of renewable energy is important, and policies in the Plan (SDXXx page 35) seek to create a supportive framework to enable renewable energy to be considered. The suggestion that the development of H1 should include a ground heating scheme, is a matter best left to the Masterplan and detailed planning application. The policies in the Plan would not preclude such technology being included in any proposal but the CNPA is not convinced that requiring one would be reasonable as it may not be possible due to a variety of technical or other reasons, including community wishes and overall scheme viability. The CNPA is also supportive of Jane Angus's request for H1 to include the provision of workshops, the highest possible affordable housing percentage and accommodation for the elderly and flats. The CNPA believes different mixes of land uses, house types and design should form an integral part of the Masterplan preparation process, which should explore a variety of options for the site before reaching a preferred scheme. This is already set out in the first para on H1 – "Monaltrie Park – provides an opportunity for housing and mixed use". The CNPA does not believe any changes are necessary to the Proposed Plan to address this point.

Charles Smith (243) - The seventh bullet point of the H1 proposal (Proposed Plan SDxx page 74) already includes a requirement for incorporating and enhancing Monaltrie Park "ensuring adequate space for use of existing sports pitches and parking for events such as the Ballater Games. The site for Highland Games and associated car parking would therefore have to be retained as the H1 is developed. Any Masterplan would also need to ensure the accessibility of the Park, including the consideration of possible improvements. The CNPA does not believe that the inclusion of a 5m buffer to the A93 is necessary and the inclusion of such a buffer may serve to unnecessarily limit the opportunities to develop the site. The CNPA does not believe any changes are necessary to the Proposed Plan to address this point.

Phil Swan (104) – For the reasons listed above the CNPA does not believe there is any benefit in revisiting the whole issue of housing in Ballater by returning to Main Issues Report. CNPA has consistently set out its justification for housing in its main settlements, and remains committed to this approach. It is the opinion of

CNPA that the direction provided by the National Park Partnership Plan provides sufficient justification to find land for housing in all main settlements, and the continuity of this site provides some clear direction to prospective developers that the site, currently within the adopted plan, remains one supported by the CNPA. The CNPA does not believe any changes are necessary to the Proposed Plan to address this point

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) – The policies in the Plan as set out in both the Ballater community chapter and the overarching policies (pages 16 to 49) would ensure that any proposals that would create monocultural development would be refused. Regarding second homes, CNPA has considerable sympathy with the issue of second and holiday homes. While this is not something which can easily be controlled by legal mechanisms, it is the view of the CNPA that much can be done to control this through careful design. The CNPA does not consider the use of occupancy conditions to be effective. It has set out in evidence to support the preparation of the Local Development Plan its thinking behind the use of residency criteria, (SDxxxx) and remains of this view. The CNPA does not believe any changes are necessary to the Proposed Plan to address these points.

Ballater Royal Deeside Limited (093) – Current Scottish Government policy (SDxx SPP) places a top limit of 25% affordable housing. CNPA has not gathered any evidence to support an approach which goes above this limit and does not therefore support any change to this approach.

Masterplan Issues

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) - The CNPA note the Community Council's concerns about the cost of preparing a Masterplan, and the scope of it. However as explained above (see response to H1) the Masterplan for this part of Ballater is a requirement of the proposal. The required contents of that masterplan are set out under text associated with H1. This includes issues associated with the impact on the conservation area, access and circulation, and housing development which meets the needs of the community. The CNPA does not believe any changes are necessary to the Proposed Plan to address this point.

Site H2

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) - The CNPA agree with Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) that H2 must be developed with full community engagement. However this is a requirement of development in general, and affordable housing developers have a good history of meaningful engagement. The CNPA does not believe any changes are necessary to the Proposed Plan to address this point.

Other Housing Issues

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031); Charles Smith (243) - The CNPA has considerable sympathy with the issue of second and holiday homes. While this is not something which can be controlled by legal mechanisms, it is the view of the CNPA that much can be done to control this through careful design. The CNPA does not consider the use of occupancy conditions to be effective. It has set out in evidence to support the preparation of the Local Development Plan its thinking behind the use of residency criteria, (SDxxxx) and remains of this

view.

Through allocating specific sites for housing and other uses the Proposed Plan is very definitive about the kind of development that will occur. The issue of the need for development has already been addressed above (see H1).

Alison Day (081) Charles Smith (243) John Lovie (182) Linda Forman (220) Whit Romilly (198) - The rationale behind the H1 allocation is explained above.

The fact that H1 is allocated would not prevent applications for infill sites within the development boundary coming forward. Any such applications would be considered on their merits. As explained above, the text associated with site H1 already requires careful consideration of the public park, and this could include the possible extension of the public park boundary. CNPA does not however consider there to be a need at this time, to extend the public park boundary which is considered adequate to meet the needs of the local community.

Mr and Mrs Barns (219) – The requirement in the proposal for developer contribution to affordable housing is a method of raising funds to supply affordable housing. Other solutions may be possible, but will be confirmed once more detailed proposals come forward and investors for the site found.

Ballater Royal Deeside Ltd (093) – The Action Plan accompanying the Proposed Plan (SDXX) includes a commitment to review the development appraisal toolkit and this will include consideration of if and how it should be revised and applied in a way that reflects the different circumstances facing different communities. Although the CNPA recognises the high levels of second homes ownership in Ballater and the need for affordable homes the CNPA does not believe any additional text on this matter is needed in the Plan, as this would be best addressed during the review of the toolkit.

Site C1

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031) - The allocation of a community use for the Old School seeks to enable development of the site for any use which is able to demonstrate the support of the community. The CNPA believes this approach strikes the right balance between ensuring a proactive policy that would enable development to happen whilst at the same time protecting the site from unsympathetic development of the site. The CNPA remains committed to this allocation.

Site T1

SEPA (063) - The CNPA would not object to SEPA's (063) request to amend the last sentence of the text to read "The site lies wholly within SEPA's indicative 1:200 year flood risk area. No additional site capacity and no development which results in a loss of floodplain capacity will be supported. A detailed FRA will be required to accompany any further development proposal for the site".

Allocation of Land for Other Uses:

Aberdeenshire Council (209) ; Ballater Royal Deeside Limited (093) - The CNPA do not support the request to allocate land to the west of Aberdeen Cottage on the A93 for business and employment use as the site lies within the floodplain and therefore is unsuitable for any development. The site therefore remains outside the settlement boundary and CNPA would not support any amendment to this as

it may imply some form of development might be acceptable.

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031); Rory Bruce (236) – CNPA is supportive of the needs of young people in the village, and recognises a local aspiration for a skate park. CNPA however understand that no detailed work has been carried out by the community to consider site options. Rather than limit possible options, CNPA consider, at this time, that the best solution would be to include such development within areas identified as open space. This use may be considered acceptable within such area and may help consolidate play facilities which exist on the edge of the Park. CNPA do not therefore support the identification of a specific site at this stage.

Ballater Royal Deeside Limited (093); Ian Ritchie (166); John Lovie (182) – seek the identification of land opposite ED1 to be allocated as open space. However the area identified in the proposed Local Development Plan falls almost entirely within the SEPA 1 in 200 year flood risk area (see SEPA's interactive flood map http://www.sepa.org.uk/flooding/flood_extent_maps/view_the_map.aspx) As a result CNPA are not minded to allocate it for any form of development.

Natural Heritage Issues:

Scottish Natural Heritage (040) - The CNPA would not object to SNH's (040) request that SACs, SPAs, Ramsar Sites, NNRs and SSSIs are specifically named or the suggested amendment to para 17.7 so that it reads "In addition, development on land allocated in the Plan has potential to have significant effect, directly or indirectly, on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination".

The CNPA would also not object to the addition of Cairngorms SPA, Ballochbuie SPA and Glen Tanar SPA as additional bullet points at the end of the paragraph as this would aid clarity.

The CNPA also acknowledges that HRA may also need to be updated to reflect this latest information.

Ballater and Crathie Community Council (031); Scottish Natural Heritage (040) - The CNPA would not object to SNH's (040) suggested amendment to para 17.8 to read "...to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan and planning permission will not be granted. Specifically your proposal must address..." and this would aid clarity. Such a change would also address Ballater and Crathie Community Council's (031) request that the Plan includes measures to protect Capercaillie.

Development Boundary:

Peter Dranfield (171) - The CNPA would not object to Peter Dranfield's (171) request that the development boundary is amended to include the whole garden of Iona on Old Line Road as this would reflect the situation on the ground.
(SDxx include map)

Explanatory Text:

Phil Swan (386) - The CNPA do not agree with Phil Swan's (386) suggestion that the Ballater Community's vision for housing has been misrepresented and should be quoted correctly. The information in the community chapters draws on a variety of sources including the community visions which were created to help inform the National Park Partnership Plan (SDxx community visions). This is only one of a number of references which have helped inform the development of the proposed Plan. The visions are quoted in documents which support the NPPP, and CNPA took the view that they were useful to provide a context for the development of a land use framework for each community. They are not a direct quote, and text does not imply this to be the case. CNPA do not therefore support any change to para 17.1.

Ballater Royal Deeside Ltd (093) – the list is in no way prioritised. It includes a variety of infrastructure works where developer contributions reasonably related to the development of the site may be required. CNPA would not object to the reordering of the list, although it does not consider this to be necessary.

NHS Grampian (230) - The CNPA would not object to the request to amend one of the bullets in para 17.15 so that it reads "health care provision, particularly dental and community care services" and the addition of a further bullet point to read "extend pharmacy provision in the community".

BRAEMAR

The CNPA's long term vision for the National Park is set out in the Cairngorms National Park Partnership Plan (CNPPP) which was approved by Scottish Government on 30 May 2012 (SDXX). Page 13 of the CNPPP sets out the long term vision for the Cairngorms National Park as "An outstanding National Park, enjoyed and valued by everyone, where nature and people thrive together". The CNPPP (SDXX page 14) goes on to explain that the vision of "success in being a sustainable economy supporting thriving businesses and communities" would include a growing and diversified economy, more jobs and a wider range of employment opportunities, thriving and sustainable communities, a growing workforce, people working in the Park finding it easier to access housing that meets their needs, safe route to travel and sustainable new development with good design. All of these outcomes will help to deliver the vision for the National Park.

The relationship between the CNPPP and the Local Development Plan is set out on page 40 of the CNPP (SDXX) which states "The Local Development Plan and planning services will support the delivery of this long term outcome by providing: sufficient land for housing to meet identified need and demand, including inward migration of workers; the necessary land and support for business development and diversification; site for future development that support attractive, vibrant communities and that minimise the need to use energy; clear guidance on where, when and how the best development will be supported."

The CNPA is therefore keen to support the sustainable development of all of its communities and Policy 1.2 of the CNPPP (SDXX page 42) sets out how sustainable patterns of settlement growth, infrastructure and communications will

be achieved, including focusing new growth on the existing main settlements whilst also allowing for additional flexibility around a wider range of settlements. This settlement hierarchy is illustrated by a diagram on page 43 of the CNPPP (SDXX) that shows Braemar designated as one of the 'Other Settlements with sites for development'.

Site H1

Braemar Community Council (153) David Sherrard (181) Adrienne Robertson (183) Susan Walker (247) Eva Robinson (175) Woodland Trust for Scotland (196) - Site H1 is allocated as one suitable for the development of 100% affordable housing. A number of issues have been raised. CNPA do not agree that these issues should result in the removal or amendment of this allocation for the following reasons:

- The allocation of this site is not contrary to the aims of the Park. The site is providing some choice for housing development to support this community which is identified with the settlement hierarchy set out in the National Park Partnership Plan (SDxx page xx). The site sits within the village and is surrounded by existing built form. It forms a small site within an existing street, and CNPA are convinced suitable development will help to achieve the aims of the Park.
- Impact on ancient woodland – the site is not surrounded by built development and CNPA do not agree that its development would have an adverse impact on woodland.
- The development of affordable housing on this site will help create accommodation for people seeking to live and work in the village which will, in turn, help support the local economic and the sustainable nature of the community.
- Regarding the need for housing in the village, the CNPA accept that the HNDA for this part of the Park (SDxx MIR evidence page xx) does not demonstrate any need for additional housing. However, the CNPA is aware of community aspirations to create more affordable housing to help support the local community. The CNPA therefore remains committed to this site as one which could provide an excellent opportunity to create a number of affordable units to meet this aspiration.
- Regarding landscape impact, as above, the site is surrounded by built development and sits within the village. Its development will therefore sit well with the existing streetscape and landscape.
- Regarding road safety and traffic issues the site is easily accessed off Chapel Brae. Detailed discussions would be required with the roads authority to work out exactly how this might occur and what impact, if any, this would have on the junction of Chapel Brae at its east end. However CNPA do not consider these sufficient concerns to remove the allocation.
- Regarding possible conflict with natural heritage, landscape, cultural heritage policies and supplementary guidance on new housing

development and design the CNPA do not accept that any development would result in such conflict. These policies and guidance are set out to establish the way in which development should occur. This framework will be used by any prospective developer to devise a suitable scheme. CNPA remain convinced that with the application of these policies, a suitable scheme on this site is possible.

- Regarding the impact on the conservation area Policy 10 Cultural Heritage sets out criteria which must be followed. Use of this policy will ensure no adverse impact on the conservation area.
- Regarding overdevelopment of the site CNPA do not consider this to be an issue. The amount of development on the site will be assessed once proposals are submitted. The impact on neighbours will also be considered once details are known. The impact on neighbouring windows can then be fully assessed.
- Regarding the use of the site for parking for Braemar Games, the CNPA accept that almost every undeveloped parcel of land in Braemar is used for this annual event. CNPA supports the games, but does not consider this to be suitable justification to stop development in the future on this or any other site.
- Alternative sites were considered, as set out in evidence to support the Main Issues Report (SDxxx page xx). CNPA remain convinced that this is the most appropriate site to take forward at this time.
- Regarding second and holiday homes and tourism accommodation, the site is identified for affordable development and so none would be sold on the open market. CNPA do not accept the point raised that to be affordable it will be of reduced quality. Recent affordable development in the village is testament to this and CNPA will work with local housing associations to try and secure a scheme which meets the needs of the local community.
- Regarding the amount of sites already with permission, CNPA recognises this and accepts there is no need for any more land for open market development. It is not however convinced that there is no need for land for affordable development, and remains committed to helping the community achieve this aspiration.
- Regarding the option to retain the land for community use, CNPA consider the provision of affordable housing would meet the aspirations of the community. As stated in their vision for the future of Braemar (para 20.1) they seek a community which is vibrant and viable. CNPA considers the development of this site would help achieve this, and land should therefore be retained for community use and allocated as such.

Mar Estate (079) – it is for the reasons set out above that the CNPA would therefore not support Mar Estate's (079) request to allow open market on H1 Chapel Brae.

Alan Milne (154) - The CNPA would not object to Alan Milne (154) request that his part of ED1 is not developed and suggest removal of this part of the site from the settlement map. (SDXX map to indicate change)

Additional Sites for Housing and Employment

Invercauld Estate (077); Mar Estate (079) - The two key local land owners seek the addition of land for more housing and employment development. The CNPA has considered the addition of extra sites, but remains of the view that there are significant sites with permission which remain undeveloped or unfinished. CNPA does not therefore consider there to be a recognisable need or demand for additional land, and the objector has not provided any empirical evidence to counter this view. As a result CNPA does not support the addition of any more sites for development.

Site C1:

NHS Grampian (230); SEPA (063); Mar Estate (079) – at the time of producing the proposed LDP the site C1 was considered suitable for the development of a community health centre. In the mean time, the opportunity to take forward such a development has been lost, and NHS Grampian no longer require a site in the village for such a development. CNPA accept this and agree that some alteration to this allocation would therefore be prudent. However, CNPA would seek to retain it in a use which would support the community. CNPA would therefore not object to a revision to the text in support of this allocation to read “A site north of St Andrew’s terrace presents an opportunity for development to support the sustainable economic stability of the community, and help meet their needs for enhanced community facilities. Part of the site is likely to be constrained by the risk of flooding. A FRA will be required to identify the developable area, capacity for the site and/or development layout which could be limited. There may be constraints due to the presence of wetland. A NVC survey may be required to accompany any development proposals for the site”

Site T1

Woodland Trust (146) - Other policies in the plan will ensure appropriate species surveys and appropriate design and layout, are considered as part of any development. The potential role of including a buffer within the scheme would be developed on a case by case basis and be informed by the latest information from species surveys etc. to support a planning application.

Additional Sites for Tourism

Invercauld Estate (077) - Detailed discussions with the local estates and communities considered the options for tourism development sites on the edge of the village to help boost the local economy. However, in considering in detail possible sites, the site suggested by Invercauld Estate, north of the Invercauld Arms, was considered to have landscape issues which resulted in CNPA rejecting it as an option (SDxx site analysis page 100). CNPA remain of this view and do not therefore support the inclusion of this site.

Natural Heritage Designations

Scottish Natural Heritage (040) - The CNPA would not object to SNH’s (040) request that national and international designations and SSSIs within each community should be specifically named, or the need in para 20.7 to recognise

the importance of SPAs within the Deeside/Donside area and therefore list all of the European designated sites in this area. The CNPA would therefore not object to the addition of “Cairngorms SPA and Glen Tanar SPA” as a new second and third bullet point in para 20.7 as this would aid clarity.

The CNPA would also not object to SNH’s (040) suggestion to amend para 20.7 to say “In addition, development on land allocated in the Plan has potential to have significant effect, directly or indirectly, on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination”.

The CNPA would not object to SNH’s (040) suggestion to amend para 20.8 to read “...to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan and planning permission will not be granted. Specifically your proposal must address...”

Settlement Boundary

Invercauld Estate (077) - Detailed discussions with the local estates and communities considered the options for a major development site on the edge of the village to create opportunity to boost the local economy. However, in considering in detail possible sites, the site suggested by Invercauld Estate, north of the Invercauld Arms, was considered to have landscape issues which resulted in CNPA rejecting it as an option (SDxx site analysis page 101). CNPA remain of this view and do not therefore support the inclusion of this site.

Mar Estate (079) – The Estate seek a more flexible approach to the settlement boundary to allow for more housing and employment development. The CNPA has considered the addition of extra sites, but remains of the view that there are significant sites with permission which remain undeveloped or unfinished. CNPA does not therefore consider there to be a recognisable need or demand for additional land, and the objector has not provided any empirical evidence to counter this view. As a result CNPA does not support the addition of any more sites for development.

DINNET

The CNPA’s long term vision for the National Park is set out in the Cairngorms National Park Partnership Plan (CNPPP) which was approved by Scottish Government on 30 May 2012 (SDXX). Page 13 of the CNPPP sets out the long term vision for the Cairngorms National Park as “An outstanding National Park, enjoyed and valued by everyone, where nature and people thrive together”. The CNPPP (SDXX page 14) goes on to explain that the vision of “success in being a sustainable economy supporting thriving businesses and communities” would include a growing and diversified economy, more jobs and a wider range of employment opportunities, thriving and sustainable communities, a growing workforce, people working in the Park finding it easier to access housing that meets their needs, safe route to travel and sustainable new development with good design. All of these outcomes will help to deliver the vision for the National Park.

The relationship between the CNPPP and the Local Development Plan is set out on page 40 of the CNPP (SDXX) which states “The Local Development Plan and planning services will support the delivery of this long term outcome by providing: sufficient land for housing to meet identified need and demand, including inward migration of workers; the necessary land and support for business development and diversification; sites for future development that support attractive, vibrant communities and that minimise the need to use energy; clear guidance on where, when and how the best development will be supported.”

The CNPA is therefore keen to support the sustainable development of all of its communities and Policy 1.2 of the CNPPP (SDXX page 42) sets out how sustainable patterns of settlement growth, infrastructure and communications will be achieved, including focusing new growth on the existing main settlements whilst also allowing for additional flexibility around a wider range of settlements. This settlement hierarchy is illustrated by a diagram on page 43 of the CNPPP (SDXX) which identifies Dinnet as one of the ‘Other Settlements with sites for development’.

Site H1

SEPA (063) - The CNPA agrees that the error between H1 and H2 should be corrected. This is a factual error correction and should be treated as a non-notifiable modification.

Therefore the text reading “Part of the site lies adjacent to SEPA’s indicative 1 in 200 year flood risk area. A detailed flood risk assessment may be required to accompany any future planning application for the site” will be moved from the end of the H1 Proposal to the end of the H2 Proposal on page 122 of the Proposed Plan (SDXX page 122).

Site H2

SEPA (063) - The CNPA agrees that the error between H1 and H2 should be corrected. This is a factual error correction and should be treated as a non-notifiable modification.

Therefore the text reading “Part of the site lies adjacent to SEPA’s indicative 1 in 200 year flood risk area. A detailed flood risk assessment may be required to accompany any future planning application for the site” will be moved from the end of the H1 Proposal to the end of the H2 Proposal on page 122 of the Proposed Plan (SDXX page 122).

Additional/Alternative Site

Dinnet Estate (232) – the support from the Estate is welcomed. CNPA has considered a number of options for housing development in the village, and realise that the estate are keen to progress something which helps create a more sustainable community. The estate suggested a number of sites at the time of the ‘Call for Sites’ and these were considered in evidence to support the Main Issues Report (SDxx page 67, 68, 69, 70). Survey work carried out at this time indicated the two most suitable sites are those which are now included in the proposed LDP. The others were considered inappropriate because of the visual and landscape impact they would have.

The estate, in their representations to the proposed LDP have maintained their desire to progress one site (SDxx page 70) adjacent to the cross roads of the

village. CNPA accept that, if it were possible to reduce the landscape and natural heritage impacts of development in this existing woodland, it could create new development which would fit better with the existing built form. Consolidation of development around the cross roads would, indeed, help create a sense of place currently lacking, and reduce the creep of development along A93.

CNPA realises that to achieve this considerable work will be needed to try and devise a scheme which mitigates the impact of development of the woodland. To justify such work the estate are seeking an indication that development on this site might be acceptable. CNPA remain committed to the sites identified in the proposed LDP but would not object to inclusion of the site as for future development to meet a longer term need should the Reporter consider this site to merit more detailed work to develop possible options for this alternative site.

Natural Heritage Issues

Scottish Natural Heritage (040) - The CNPA would not object to SNH's (040) suggestion to amend para 26.5 Amend to read: "In addition, development on land allocated in the Plan has potential to have significant effect, directly or indirectly, on a number of European designated sites, alone or in combination".

The CNPA would not object to SNH's (040) suggestion to amend para 26.6 to read "...to carry out Appropriate Assessment in order that they can be confident that your development will not have an adverse effect on the site integrity in view of the conservation objectives, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. If the planning authority is unable to reach this conclusion, your proposal will be judged not to be in accordance with this plan and planning permission will not be granted. Specifically your proposal must address..."

Settlement Boundary

Mary Laing (153) - The CNPA would not object to Mary Laing's (153) requests to change the development boundary to include the full residential gardens at 'Stondhu' and 'Transy'. As this reflects the situation on the ground and CNPA consider this best resolved using a non-notifiable modification. (SDxx map to show amendment

Explanatory Text

Nestrans (048) - The CNPA would not object to Nestrans (048) suggestion to include a reference to the opportunities to link development into the Deeside Way. The CNPA would suggest additional wording could be added to the end of para 26.17 (Proposed Plan SDXX page 120) saying "and takes advantage of opportunities to link into the Deeside Way strategic walking and cycling route". Text could also be added to the end of the fifth bullet point of para 26.3 saying "and its location on the Deeside Way".

Reporter's conclusions:

Reporter's recommendations:

