

PAPER 3

APPENDIX I

REPRESENTATIONS

From: [REDACTED]
To: Planning
Subject: 13/03416/S42
Date: 09 October 2013 12:51:02
Attachments: [REDACTED]

13/03416/S42

I wish to object to the change in FFL, if this results in the final ridge heights being higher than what the original planning permission allowed.

This was one of the very few specific conditions that the reporter stipulated. My garden boundary is already being surrounded with an excess amount of properties. The CNPA tried to limit this in its refusal of the original application. My garden is to be bounded by the gardens of 6 properties and be within earshot of 9 or 10.

Raising the level brings noise levels closer to me.

If the ridge heights, especially on Nos 7-9 increase, I'll have more of a direct view into these houses.

I also note that the houses are now defined as 2 storey, whereas before they were 1.5 storey.

Has the house design changed?

There are no side elevation or cross section plans published with this application.

Assessing these proposed changes, I can only have one conclusion that it will have a major impact on my tenants, my business and ourselves.

My tenants are adversely impacted with the siting of Nos 7-9 as they currently stand and I fear my business will suffer.

It appears that the hydrobrake system proposed in the Halcrow drawings that controlled the flow of surface water into the burn is no longer being utilised, and IS THIS the reason that the road level is being raised rather than the previous calculations being incorrect?

I attach a copy of Halcrow's proposal.

One of the previous planning concerns was of allowing surface water to freely flow into the burn without any form of attenuation or control, giving rise to potential flooding down stream.

Why is this no longer a concern?

I am also concerned that the orbital path and the lower part of the woods to the south of the site will now flood more often. This has been an exceptionally dry year and the pond is at the lowest I have seen. I doubt the culvert under the orbital path will cope. One of the comments from CNPA at one of the planning meetings was that the houses should not appear excessively high where they border the orbital path.

If these changes are brought on by technical error, then these should have been identified at the time and dealt with by the people involved. It makes a mockery of the planning system, if permission can be obtained using false data, which fundamentally gives a developer carte blanche to do what he likes once he has that permission.

Very detailed and specific plans were obtained for this site and basically it should be built to the specifications that were passed by the reporter. At this stage in events, no modifications should be getting made to ridge heights, road levels or drainage systems to the detriment of people and

environs.

Yours sincerely
Douglas Graham
Anne Stewart
Millside House
Aviemore
PH22 1QD

