

# AGENDA ITEM 9

## APPENDIX 4

2013/0073/MSC

2013/0074/MSC

CONSULTATION  
RESPONSES  
AUG 2015

## **2013/0073/MSC and 2013/0074/MSC** **Dalfaber housing development, Aviemore**

### **Ecology Response to appeal case 2015**

**20th August 2015**

An ecology consultation response provided by Hayley Wiswell dated 12/08/2014 listed the following required surveys for the two applications:

- A bat survey of Dalfaber farm house – this was to include internal and external surveys of the building, following by 3 dusk/dawn surveys
- An otter survey
- A water vole survey
- A badger survey
- A survey for the devil's-bit scabious mining bee (*Andrena marginata*)

The applicant submitted new information in January 2015. This includes:

- A bat transect survey – a bat activity survey of the site, using transects to detect bat activity across the site
- A camera trap survey to detect the presence of badgers
- No survey information has been submitted for otters, water vole or *Andrena marginata*

### **2013/0073/MSC (north site)**

#### **Bats**

A detailed bat survey of Dalfaber farm house was specifically requested; bats have been recorded roosting in this building but the previous survey (conducted in 2007) is now out of date by 8 years and is no longer valid. The building still has good potential to support bat roosts and further survey work is required to determine the presence of bats and what impact there would be on bats through renovation of the farm house. Because bats are a European Protected Species, legislation requires that the impacts on these species is assessed prior to determination, and cannot be conditioned.

The “bat transect survey” was not specifically requested, as it was felt that the habitats within the site were not of high value for bats and that design of the application was unlikely to have a significant impact on the foraging and commuting behaviour of bats. The survey is useful however and highlights that there are small numbers of common bat species using the site and foraging habitat is available, but the site is not an important foraging area and the proposal would have a negligible impact on the local bat population.

Although it is unclear in the Bat Transect Survey Report, the survey did include a stationary recording point at the farmhouse and bat activity was recorded in this area (Peter Cosgrove, pers.

comm.). However it was not able to make a definite assessment of numbers of bats entering/exiting the building and from which points. No internal inspections were conducted.

Although the survey follows best practice guidance as an activity survey, it is missing key elements to count as a roost assessment of Dalfaber Farm (detailed internal and external inspections, focused emergence and re-entry surveys at dusk and dawn). This survey does not provide key information on the status of the farm house as a bat roosting site and as such detailed surveys of this building are still required.

If bats are still present within the farmhouse a Species Protection Plan will be required detailing mitigation to avoid disturbing bats, measures to incorporate roost spaces into the farmhouse or compensation roosts if the roost within the farmhouse cannot be retained.

### **Otter**

Otter were originally included in a series of surveys conducted by Marchfield Ecology in 2005; no otter signs were noted at that time but because this survey is now 10 years old, it is considered obsolete. The “walkover” survey carried out in 2013 focused on bats and badgers and does not mention searching for signs of otter. Because there are watercourses crossing the site and the site lies within 200m of the River Spey, which is known to support otter, a new otter survey is required. Like bats, otter are a European Protected Species and as such survey information is required prior to determination.

### **Badgers**

There are a number of burrows within the site that had potential to be used by badger, but the “walkover” could not confirm this and an additional survey was requested and specified the use of camera traps. A camera trap study was conducted in late summer/autumn 2014 and this is welcomed. The traps were deployed over 12 nights during a time of the year when badgers are particularly active. No badger activity was seen, only rabbits, roe deer and locals walking their dogs. This survey, combined with previous survey efforts indicates that it is unlikely that the burrows within the site are used by badgers and as such the proposal is not likely to impact on this species.

### **Devil's-bit scabious mining bee (*Andrena marginata*)**

In 2009 a local naturalist recorded *Andrena marginata* on the application site, though the exact location was not disclosed. This species is a Cairngorms Natural Action Plan species and is therefore has conservation priority within the Park. The bee depends upon bare ground to nest in and devil's-bit scabious as a food source. Both are present on the site – there is a large expanse of bare ground by way of an overflow car park and devil's-bit scabious is plentiful in grassy glades. There is also bare ground adjacent to the golf course parking area. The walkover survey in 2013 found that suitable habitat existed for this species, but a detailed search for the bee was not conducted (there is no mention of a detailed search for nest sites or using sweep nests etc. in the report). As such a detailed survey for this species is still required in order to establish if it is still present and if so what level of mitigation is needed.

## **2013/0074/MS (south site)**

### **Otter**

Otter were originally included in a series of surveys conducted by Marchfield Ecology in 2005; no otter signs were noted at that time but because this survey is now 10 years old, it is considered obsolete. The “walkover” survey carried out in 2013 focused on bats and badgers and does not mention searching for signs of otter. Because there are watercourses crossing the site and the site lies within 200m of the River Spey, which is known to support otter, a new otter survey is required. Like bats, otter are a European Protected Species and as such survey information is required prior to determination.

### **Water vole**

To my knowledge, there has never been a water vole survey at the site, despite the presence of watercourses within the site. The “walkover” survey carried out in 2013 focused on bats and badgers and does not mention searching for signs of water vole. Water vole burrows are protected under the Natural Environment (Scotland) Act 2004 – it is an offence to destroy a burrow or disturb a water vole while using its burrow. A survey is needed to confirm the presence or absence of this species on the site in order to avoid an offence and to ensure appropriate mitigation is in place, if required.

### **Devil's-bit scabious mining bee (*Andrena marginata*)**

In 2009 a local naturalist recorded *Andrena marginata* on the application site, though the exact location was not disclosed. This species is a Cairngorms Natural Action Plan species and is therefore has conservation priority within the Park. The bee depends upon bare ground to nest in and devil's-bit scabious as a food source. Both are present on the site – there is a large expanse of bare ground by way of an overflow car park and devil's-bit scabious is plentiful in grassy glades. There is also bare ground adjacent to the golf course parking area. The walkover survey in 2013 found that suitable habitat existed for this species, but a detailed search for the bee was not conducted (there is no mention of a detailed search using sweep nets etc. in the report). As such a detailed survey for this species is still required in order to establish if it is still present and if so what level of mitigation is needed.

**Summary table of response in relation to conditions**

2013/0074/MS (south site)					
Condition	Badgers	Bats	Otter	<i>Andrena marginata</i>	
1	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>		Locations and specification of paths and roadways, tree planting etc. could have implications for otter habitat – without confirmation of otter presence on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	Locations and specification of paths and roadways, tree planting etc. could have implications for bee habitat – without confirmation of bee's location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	
2	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>		Location of planting could have implications for otter habitat – without confirmation of otter presence on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	Location of planting could have implications for bee habitat – without confirmation of bee's location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	
8	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>		Location of public access could have implications for otter habitat – without confirmation of otter presence on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	Location of public access could have implications for bee habitat – without confirmation of bee's location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	
9	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>		Without a survey for otter presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of maintenance of site cannot be known. <b>Not met.</b>	Management and maintenance of landscaped areas, roads, footpaths etc. could have implications for bee habitat – without confirmation of bee's location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. Although wildflower areas are mentioned, no specific mitigation for this species is provided. <b>Not met.</b>	
13		Design statements for individual plots must include provisions for bat boxes/bricks as site enhancement – this is mentioned in the Design Statement but numbers and			

		type is not discussed. Numbers should reflect findings of bat survey of farmhouse. <b>Not met.</b>					
14	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>	Design statements for individual plots must include provisions for bat boxes/bricks as site enhancement – this is mentioned in the Design Statement but numbers and type is not discussed. Numbers should reflect findings of bat survey of farmhouse. <b>Not met.</b>	Without a survey for otter presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of Design Statement of site cannot be known. <b>Not met.</b>	Without confirmation of bee's location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided within the Design Statement. Although wildflower areas are mentioned, no specific mitigation for this species is provided. <b>Not met.</b>			
17	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>	Construction Method Statement will need to refer to species survey and a Species Protection Plan as to how the farmhouse will be renovated whilst avoiding harm to any bats that might be roosting. <b>Not met.</b>	Without a survey for otter presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of Design Statement of site cannot be known, and therefore what mitigation/avoidance measures would be needed as part of CMS. <b>Not met.</b>	The CMS may need to include measures to avoid damage to sensitive grassland habitat/nesting habitat for mining bees – survey information needed to inform this. <b>Not met.</b>			
23		Detailed arrangements for the restoration of Dalfaber farmhouse cannot be made until the impact on roosting bats is fully assessed – this cannot be done without a bat survey of the farm house. <b>Not met.</b>					
<b>2013/0073/MSC (north site)</b>							
<b>Condition</b>	<b>Badgers</b>	<b>Bats</b>	<b>Otter</b>	<b>Water vole</b>	<b>Andrena marginata</b>		
1	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required.		Locations and specification of paths and roadways, tree planting etc. could have implications for otter habitat – without confirmation of	Locations and specification of paths and roadways, tree planting etc. could have implications for water vole habitat – without	Locations and specification of paths and roadways, tree planting etc. could have implications for bee habitat – without confirmation of bee's		

	<b>Condition met.</b>		otter presence on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	confirmation of water vole presence on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>
2	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>		Location of planting could have implications for otter habitat – without confirmation of otter presence on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met</b>	Location of planting could have implications for water vole habitat – without confirmation of water vole presence the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	Location of planting could have implications for bee habitat – without confirmation of bee's location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>
8	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>		Location of public access could have implications for otter habitat – without confirmation of otter presence on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	Location of public access could have implications for water vole habitat – without confirmation of water vole presence on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>	Location of public access could have implications for bee habitat – without confirmation of bee's location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>
9	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>		Without a survey for otter presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of maintenance of site cannot be known. <b>Not met.</b>	Without a survey for water vole presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of maintenance of site cannot be known. <b>Not met.</b>	Management and maintenance of landscaped areas, roads, footpaths etc. could have implications for bee habitat – without confirmation of bee's location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided. <b>Not met.</b>
12		Design statements for individual plots must include provisions for bat boxes/bricks as site enhancement – this is mentioned in the Design Statement but numbers and type is not discussed.			Although wildflower areas are mentioned, no specific mitigation for this species is provided. <b>Not met.</b>

13	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>	Numbers should reflect findings of bat survey of farmhouse. <b>Not met.</b> Design statements for individual plots must include provisions for bat boxes/bricks as site enhancement – this is mentioned in the Design Statement but numbers and type is not discussed. Numbers should reflect findings of bat survey of farmhouse. <b>Not met.</b>	Without a survey for otter presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of Design Statement of site cannot be known. <b>Not met.</b>	Without a survey for water vole presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of Design Statement of site cannot be known. <b>Not met.</b>	Without confirmation of bee's location on the site, avoidance/mitigation cannot be provided within the Design Statement. Although wildflower areas are mentioned, no specific mitigation for this species is provided. <b>Not met.</b>
16	Surveys reveal that badgers are not currently using the site – mitigation for this species not required. <b>Condition met.</b>	Without a survey for otter presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of Design Statement of site cannot be known, and therefore what mitigation/avoidance measures would be needed as part of CMS. <b>Not met.</b>	Without a survey for water vole presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of Design Statement of site cannot be known, and therefore what mitigation/avoidance measures would be needed as part of CMS. <b>Not met.</b>	Without a survey for water vole presence on site, the level of mitigation needed, if any, as part of Design Statement of site cannot be known, and therefore what mitigation/avoidance measures would be needed as part of CMS. <b>Not met.</b>	The CMS may need to include measures to avoid damage to sensitive grassland habitat/nesting habitat for mining bees – survey information needed to inform this. <b>Not met.</b>





## **Dalfaber North (2013/0073/MSC and 2013/0074/MSC): Landscape Response to the Submission of Revised Documentation in respect of Matters Specified in Conditions (Text in black shows advice at 9/04/2014, Text in red advice at 26/08/2015)**

Housing land at Dalfaber North is identified in the 2010 Local Plan. The H2 and H3 allocations were permitted on appeal. In the reporters Appeal decision for this site there is recognition of the sensitivity of the eastern edge of the site and the need for effective allocation of land for trees on the periphery.

My comments are based on the Design Guide dated January 2014, the Proposed Landscape Strategy drawing 216 6 rev D (oct 2013) and individual Plot Plans. Drawing A5383/L(-) 45 dated 1/3/13 shows a different plot layout.

The proposal site extends to 11.2 ha lying east and north of Aviemore and west of the river Spey within the Reidhaven Estate. It is within the Cairngorm Mountain NSA and the Cairngorms National Park.

It is likely that the site will be developed by a variety of developers/single house developers.

The conditions applying to Planning Permission in Principle following the Appeal, and which are relevant to landscape matters are as follows.

### **Condition 1 Plans and Particulars etc**

#### **1.1 The siting, design and external appearance of all buildings and other strictures including fencing.**

##### **1.1.1 Layout and siting**

In my assessment I have taken the plot location (but not the house placement on the plot) as being fixed.

The layout of plots in the northern bit of the development (2013/0073) retains and utilises the wooded character of the site. There is some limited tree removal.

The layout of plots 03 to 32 in the southern part of the site (2013/0074) are very tightly spaced with relatively little opportunity for the effective allocation of land for tree planting and the development of connectivity within the design.

The layout of plots west and immediately north of Dalfaber farm house (plots 38 to 45 and 68 to 71) are similarly tightly spaced.

**Drawings P14, P15 and P16 show a planting layout that will improve the landscape amenity and in time provide an extent of tree cover that will relate to the character of the northern**

part of the site. The revised documentation is sufficient in respect of the landscape layout subject to points made below.

### **1.1.2 Design and External Appearance**

The Design Guide gives broad parameters for design and external appearance of houses linked to different character areas of the site, though where these character areas apply needs to be more clearly identified. At the edges of the site where the design intent is towards rural clusters rather than a suburban character it would be helpful for the Design Guide to be more specific about the height/mass of individual buildings and the juxtaposition of the individual houses to create attractive groupings.

There is no further detail on these points in the revised documentation. As previously, I would recommend that the Design Guide to be more specific about the height/mass of individual buildings and the juxtaposition of the individual houses to create attractive groupings at the edges of the site.

### **1.1.3 Boundary treatment/Fencing**

Experience from elsewhere in the Park highlights the need to be very specific about boundary treatments as it is an issue that could have an adverse effect countering desirable design measures. For example, where houses are close together the demand for privacy is often high and a ubiquitous 'high fencing' detail applied say in the dense housing in the south east would be disastrous from a landscape perspective. Differing approaches may need to adopt across the application sites, with the need for a consistent uniform approach in some areas and perhaps diversity in others. The guidance given in the Design Statement is still too general in this respect.

Drawing 216-P7 provides details for boundary treatment along Spey Avenue and adjacent to the golf course. Details for internal fencing are still required to meet the condition which refers to 'all' fencing.

The mixed hedge planting proposed along boundaries is shown as *betula pendula*, *carpinus betulus*, *corylus avellana*, *crateagus monogyna*, *ilex aquifolium*, *prunus spinosa* and *rosa canina*. The hedging mix on drawings P15 and P16 is shown as *acer campestre*, *betula pendula*, *corylus avellana*, *crateagus monogyna* and *ilex aquifolium*. Both of these mixes contain a variety of species with different forms and different growth rates. The outcome, even with pruning, would be more similar to woodland edge scrub rather than a controlled hedge. As the hedges form the perimeter to gardens I would strongly recommend that a beech/holly hedge mix is used. This mix can be hard-pruned to produce a defined boundary that does not sprawl into adjacent spaces, does not puncture balls (*prunus spinosa*, *rosa canina* and *crateagus monogyna*) or produce hazardous long tendrils of growth (*rosa canina*). Pruned once a year this type of hedge will provide good thicket for nesting birds whereas the species proposed for woodland and woodland edge planting will provide a variety food sources and habitat for wildlife. The hedges proposed for this scheme are key to both visual and habitat connectivity. I recommend that the species for garden boundary

hedging on drawings P15 and P16 are changed to Beech/holly (50:50), and that the Design Guide (Annex I) and the Landscape management and Maintenance statement are altered to clarify the responsibility for both planting and long term maintenance of the hedges shown on drawings P15 and P16.

## **1.2 The location and specification of all vehicular roadways and paths**

The entire 2013/0074 site has no footpath access along its eastern edge limiting the recreational opportunities for the public, their opportunities to experience the stunning views to the hills, and to access the river Spey and the golf course. This was raised by Jack McGowan following a meeting with the developer on 26/7/13 but no change has been made to the drawings.

Footpath access along the eastern boundary is not included but opportunities to experience views out to the east and south from the internal paths and pavements are shown on drawing 216-P11 as are new proposed paths on drawing 216-P10. This analysis is welcomed but if there is to be no eastern periphery path then these views need to be kept open in perpetuity for amenity value. The layout of planting on drawings P15 and P16 should be adjusted so as to retain the views identified on drawing P11 in perpetuity.

**1.3 A detailed landscaping plan, including extensive peripheral tree planting and proposals to protect and maintain the scenic integrity of the site and provide wildlife corridors. And also at condition II**, *“the details of landscaping shall include sufficient depth and density of trees on the eastern edges of the site, effectively to soften the visual impact of houses nearest to the boundary of the site with the Dalrader golf course, including during seasons when the trees are bare of leaves.*

The reason for condition II is clearly stated as *“to avoid creating an impression of hard-edged, angular urban sprawl within the National Park, at a location highly visible from the adjacent golf course and from hills and mountains beyond it...”*

These proposals give the opportunity to form a permanent and robust wooded edge to this side of Aviemore, complementing and enhancing the existing woodland character and protecting the scenic integrity of the NSA. The Landscape Strategy Plan gives an idea of arrangements and proposals for the development but it is not properly 'keyed', is not consistent with the Plot Plans and is insufficiently detailed to be a 'detailed landscaping plan' that delivers all aspects of the conditions (I and II).

A Detailed Landscaping Plan is required taking account of the following;

- The Character Areas referred to in the Design Guide should be clearly marked on the Landscaping Plan. **Not done, could be variously interpreted from the Design Guide.**
- The detailed landscape plan should clearly identify the planting to be undertaken by the site developer and that which would be undertaken by each individual plot developer. **Drawing 216-P13 identifies the extent of individual feus and in conjunction with The Design Guide (Jan 2014) gives guidance for individual plot**

developers. Drawings 216-P14, P15 and P16 provide the planting details but this is not reflected in the plot by plot detailed drawings (Annex I of Design Guide). The individual plot drawings require to be clarified to be consistent with drawings P14, P15 and P16.

- The 5m width of planting on the eastern edge in the south will give a narrow belt of thicket and individual trees. If managed sensitively and consistently this will contribute to a softening of the edge and screening of the development over time. However, in my view this could not be described as ‘extensive peripheral planting ...’ as referred to in the condition. NB the proposed planting in this area is shown on the Landscape Strategy Plan as being woodland planting plus individual deciduous and coniferous between the perimeter fence and a continuous hedge , but on the plot plans only the individual proposed trees are shown. The ‘detailed landscape plan ‘should in this case reflect the Landscape Strategy. **Proposed planting on drawings 216-P14, P15 and P16 sufficient to address these concerns.**
- Further north (plots 46 to 50) plots extend right to the eastern perimeter which is marked by a hedge and in-curtilage tree planting in each plot. The extent of this tree planting differs between the Plot Plans where mandatory tree planting is shown to be more extensive than on the Landscape Strategy Drawing. The ‘detailed landscape plan ‘should in this case reflect the Plot plans. **Proposed planting on drawings 216-P14, P15 and P16 sufficient to address these concerns.**
- There are no continuous corridors of proposed and /or existing planting connecting the eastern edge of the site to the retained woodland in the centre and north of the site. What is proposed will only contribute towards effective visual and habitat connectivity if it managed and maintained appropriately. The detailed landscaping plan should contain this information. **I am content that drawings 216-P14, P15 and P16 along with the Landscape management and Maintenance statement now provide the detail to ensure that in the long term this connectivity will be provided.**
- Page 22 of the Design Guide states that ‘A post and wire (plus hedge planting) approach is being utilised for the overall site boundary. This is shown on the plot plans but is not keyed, and is only partially shown on the Landscape Strategy Plan. This proposed hedging will contribute substantially to the landscape amenity and habitat connectivity across the site and it should be properly specified in the ‘detailed landscape plan’ along with a maintenance schedule. The species currently shown in the hedge planting mix on the Landscape Strategy Plan are inappropriate to this situation and the likely management regime. **Given the clarification on woodland and woodland edge planting provided in drawings P14, P15 and P16 it is my view that hedging around the ‘overall site boundary’ as referred to on page 22 of the Design Guide is not necessary to provide the extensive peripheral tree planting, protect and maintain the scenic integrity of the site and soften the visual impact as required by the Reporter. This reference could be removed from the Design guide.**

#### **I.4 Surface drainage in accordance with SUDs**

Insufficient information to determine the effects on/ contribution to the overall landscape plan. Need further detail on how the swales are to be planted/vegetated. **Not provided**

## **Condition 2**

*The landscape plan shall be coordinated with that for the adjacent area covered by 07/144/CP (2012/0074/MS).*

In so far as it goes the landscape plan is co-ordinated, but see all other comments.

## **Condition 4**

*The Detailed landscaping plan shall be accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement and a full Tree Protection Plan. All in accordance with BS 5837 2005 (now 2012).*

The Design Guide makes reference to tree survey and to tree protection and management in relation to the design of individual sites by purchasers. However, a full tree protection plan (and by implication a full tree survey) and arboricultural method statement have not been submitted. This information is necessary at both a strategic site level (to inform the strategic landscape plan) and for individual plot development.

Further information may be on the Tree management Plan (drwg No. 216.P2) which was referred to in an earlier Landscape Management and Maintenance Statement, but this was not part of the most recent submission.

The most recent version of any British standard should always apply.

**Drawings 216-P08, P09 and P12 along with the Arboricultural method Statement provide sufficient information and address my concerns.**

## **Condition 9**

*A management and maintenance statement covering play areas hard and soft landscaped areas footpaths, cycle links not intended for adoption by THC. This to include details of how the woodland and open space will be retained and managed in perpetuity allowing for public access and pathways through the site etc*

Reference is made in the Design Guide to a 'continued maintenance regime' for areas of common landscaping. The details of this should be clarified.

The objectives for maintenance and long term management objectives were identified in a previously submitted Landscape Management and Maintenance Statement (DEP Feb 2013). A detailed Maintenance Plan will now be key to ensure the delivery of these landscape and wildlife objectives over the long term. This should include a description of the approach and details of all maintenance operations, including protection, weed control, replacement, thinning etc **Not provided**

The Design Guide should outline the landscape maintenance likely to be required of individual householders, with a reference to the Maintenance Plan for detail. **Not provided**

A detailed Maintenance Plan is key to ensure the delivery of these landscape and wildlife objectives over the long term. This should include a description of the approach and details of all maintenance operations beyond the initial 3 year post-construction period. This could be a development of the already submitted Landscape Management and Maintenance Statement.

## **Conclusion**

Significant progress has been made in a number of the matters previously raised in respect of the delivery of the conditions. Drawings P08, P09, P11, P12, P13, P14, P15 and P16 are particularly helpful.

Although I do not think that any new conditions are required in respect of landscape matters, further information is still required to;

- clarify inconsistencies between drawings and reports as this could lead to misinterpretation/disputes further down the line
- provide the detail necessary to fully meet the conditions
- provide sufficient guidance to prospective plot-developers
- deliver a development that is of high quality and reflects the sensitivities and special qualities of the place.

## Dalfaber Consultation – Access Team Comment on meeting existing planning conditions

Planning reference – 2013/0074/MSC and 2013/0073/MSC

Note- the following is based on our response dated the 8<sup>th</sup> of May 2014

<b>Condition</b>	<b>Previous advice</b>	<b>Does revised documentation address concerns</b>	<b>Positive recommendations</b>	<b>Potential new condition</b>
Condition 8 of the Appeal notice PPA-001-2001 stipulates that there should be a detailed plan of public access showing any diversions of paths temporary or permanent for the purposes of development	Condition 8 of the Appeal notice PPA-001-2001- Access will clearly be impeded during the construction of the road layout previously but there no indication how current use will be affected and how this will be managed. The application is still deficient in this regard as there is no detail in the construction method statement on how existing public access on the site will be managed during construction.	Both the Outline Construction Method Statement (dated 6 June 2015) or the Design Guide P2 (dated 30 Jul 2015) address this matter in insufficient detail.	LBS32 as it runs parallel to the golf course will effectively be subsumed as part of the road network. Post construction this does not present any issues. During construction we would like to see some form of diversion in place so that the public access from either the golf club car park, Spey Avenue or the link between Callart Road and Corrou Road can walk around the woodland unimpeded by construction.	To work with the Access Authority to identify a temporary diversion through the existing woodland for LBS32 for the duration of the construction phase and provide threshold signs at each entry point to the site warning the public about the diversion.
Condition 9 of the Appeal notice PPA-001-2001 stipulates that the plan should show how paths for both pedestrians and	Condition 9 of the Appeal notice PPA-001-2001 – Previously the plan was deficient in this regard as it had not taken into	Yes		



<p>cyclists will link with opportunities off site.</p>	<p>account the existing core paths network, the required link to the Fisherman's Carpark, the link across the proposed golf club house site and the link to Corrou Road and Callart Road. The plan is still deficient in as it has not identified the link onto Corrou Road and it has not provided a link to LBS34 to the rear of plots 17 and 18. There appears to be an indication in the plan for a link to the Fisherman's Car park but I would like to see the bridge design to ascertain how accessible it will be</p>			
<p>Condition 9 of the Appeal notice PPA-001-2001 stipulates that there should be statement submitted with the application detailing the management and maintenance of the paths and cycle links.</p>	<p>Condition 9 of the Appeal notice PPA-001-2001 – The Design Guide refers to a “continued maintenance regime” further detail is needed clarify what this is.</p>	<p><i>Page 20 Annex 1 design Guidance for plots in document Design Guide P2 (dated 30 Jul 2015) refers to common areas of the site require to have a continued maintenance regime. It does not stipulate that such a regime will include the paths and cycle</i></p>	<p>The Design Guide could be easily amended to state <i>common areas including all paths and cycle links will have a continued maintenance regime. What we are seeking to ensure is that as part of any subsequent factoring regime the paths are</i></p>	<p>Include in the Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan a clear statement on how the paths in the woodland are to be managed.</p>

		<p>links.</p> <p>The Landscape Maintenance and Management document (dated 18 March 2013) states on page 11 <i>In order to improve access and environmental education the construction of access furniture and interpretation signs should be undertaken to keep the users of the wood how and why management.</i></p>	<p>adequately maintained so that the continue to function for both recreation and functional access i.e. safe routes to school.</p> <p>The Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan could easily be amended to state <i>all access routes to kept free of obstruction, core paths and key links on the site to be kept clear and any drainage issues to be dealt with promptly.</i></p>	

## Jane Shepherd

---

**From:** David Watson  
**Sent:** 12 August 2015 09:46  
**To:** Deirdre Straw; Jane Shepherd  
**Cc:** Sandra Middleton  
**Subject:** RE: Economic Consultation Request for Applications 2013/0073/MSC and 2013/0074/MSC - URGENT  
**Attachments:** 2013 0074 DET Dalfaber Farm.docx

Good morning both,

After looking at the new information provided it is my opinion that the previous submission by Economic Development (attached) is still relevant and there is nothing further to add at this point.

If there is anything specific that you would like commented on then please feel free to get back in touch.

Best regards,

David

David Watson  
Economic Development Manager  
Cairngorms National Park Authority  
14 The Square  
Grantown-on-Spey  
PH26 3HG

E Mail: [davidwatson@cairngorms.co.uk](mailto:davidwatson@cairngorms.co.uk)  
Direct Dial: 01479 870505  
Main Switchboard: 01479 873535  
[www.cairngorms.co.uk](http://www.cairngorms.co.uk)

Get the latest news - sign up for the [ebulletin](#) and read our [blogs](#)

 Before printing, think about the environment

---

**From:** Deirdre Straw  
**Sent:** 06 August 2015 16:56  
**To:** Sandra Middleton  
**Cc:** David Watson; Jane Shepherd  
**Subject:** Economic Consultation Request for Applications 2013/0073/MSC and 2013/0074/MSC - URGENT  
**Importance:** High

Sandra and David,

Please find attached an internal request for consultation on the above applications. These applications are subject to an Appeal. Please note this is an urgent request requiring a response by 25<sup>th</sup> August, 2015 to meet the Reporters deadline.

Details related to this application can be found online here <http:// Cairngorms.co.uk/park-authority/planning/new-planning-applications/>

To assist I have also attached a list of all the relevant plans and documents relating to these cases.

Please send your response to [planning@ Cairngorms.co.uk](mailto:planning@ Cairngorms.co.uk) with a copy to [janeshepherd@ Cairngorms.co.uk](mailto:janeshepherd@ Cairngorms.co.uk).

Please contact us if any further information is required.

Kind regards,

Jane Shepherd,  
Planning Manager.

Dee Straw  
Planning Systems Officer  
Cairngorms National Park Authority  
14 The Square  
Grantown-on-Spey  
PH26 3HG

Direct Number 01479 870517  
Switchboard 01479 873535



CNPA Application Ref. No.: 2013/0074/DET

**INTERNAL SPECIALIST RESPONSE**

Internal Specialist (Name & Job Title): David Watson, Economic Development Manager

*Interests affected by proposal (category e.g.- natural heritage, cultural heritage, access issues, economic development, housing)*

- Economic Development (ED) – this response relates specifically to the potential economic impact of the proposal and does not consider wider issues which other internal specialists will respond on. This advice should be taken in conjunction with advice provided by others.

*Potential impacts on interests, including evidence of impacts:*

- The potential impact of the proposal to the local economy

*Appraisal of impacts:* Lists and the significance of the impacts

Aviemore is, like many communities within the CNP, characterised by a rising population, low unemployment, a high number of second homes and higher than average house prices.

In 2010 HIE produced a Socio Economic Analysis looking at the area within a 30 min drive time from Aviemore (A30) which included information on population and house prices in the area.

**Population Trend, 2001-2010**

	2001 Population	2010 Population Estimate	% Change
A30	12,487	13,897	11.3
Highland	208,920	221,630	6.1
Scotland	5,064,200	5,222,100	3.1
UK	59,113,500	62,262,000	5.3

Sources: GRO mid-year Population Estimates, Census of Population

The above table shows that A30 population growth has been more than three times faster than in Scotland and more than twice as fast as in the UK as a whole. The working age population of the A30 area grew by 10.3% over the same nine year period.

**House Prices and Sales, 2010**

	A30	Highland	Scotland
Mean House Price	£211,787	£165,672	£163,429
Median House Price	£199,971	£146,500	£135,000
Number of House Sales	235	2,654	58,642

Source: Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics

The above table shows that house prices in the A30 area are high in comparison to the rest of Scotland, reflecting the high demand to live within the CNP and a high number of second homes in the area.

### Employment

In January 2011 HIE produced a profile for the Inner Moray Firth area, which includes Badenoch & Strathspey (B&S). The profile states that in December 2009, the unemployment rate in B&S was 2.2%, lower than for Scotland and Great Britain, at 4.1%, whilst the Highlands and Islands has a rate of unemployment of 2.9 %. Although the unemployment rate in B&S is nearly half of that in Scotland as a whole, there is a more pronounced seasonal pattern with the unemployment rate rising steeply over the winter months. This is a reflection of the recruitment by tourism related businesses during the summer months in the area.

The combination of an increasing population, increasing house prices, a relatively high proportion of second homes and a high dependency on seasonal tourism jobs creates a serious issue for the long-term economic sustainability of a community such as Aviemore as it can encourage population drift which usually leads to a more elderly and less economically active population.

The lack of affordable housing can also impact on the ability of local businesses to recruit people of working age to live in the area. This has been identified by local businesses as a significant barrier to attracting and retaining skilled staff and therefore a barrier to investment.

Concluding Advice: (This should consist of a brief summary of the key points that have been considered by the internal specialist in their area of expertise)

It should be noted that in any sizeable housing development within the boundaries of the CNP there will be 3 inherent benefits to the economy;

1. The proposal has potential to make a positive impact on the local construction industry in providing employment during the construction phase. In 2010 the Construction industry accounted for £25.6m of the CNP GVA (approx. 6%) and approximately 6% of employment in the area. This benefit tends to be short to mid-term.
2. Benefits to local employers through addressing the issue of shortage of appropriate affordable housing currently available in the area.
3. Benefits to local businesses through an increase in demand for goods and services due to an increase in the local population and therefore an increase in spend in the local economy.

It is also recognised that further economic activity could be encouraged by ensuring provision of housing that has built-in flexibility for home-working and the necessary infrastructure for high-speed broadband connections.

This is of particular relevance to this area as the A9 corridor is expected to benefit from access to super-fast fibre-optic technology through a £146m project, led by Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) and delivered by BT. This upgrade is due to be delivered by 2015.

*Advice: (Place an 'X' in box and elaborate where necessary)*

	Further information is required
	The development raises no issues in relation to <b>INSERT</b> e.g. landscape
	The development would have significant / major / minor impact on <b>INSERT</b> , but has the potential to be addressed by appropriate mitigation measures.
	In the event of planning permission being granted, conditions are required to address <b>INSERT</b>
	The development raises issues in relation to <b>INSERT</b> e.g. ecology, that are not capable of resolution.
<b>x</b>	The development has potential for a positive impact on the labour market and the local construction trade in the short/mid-term.

Further detail in support of advice: (please continue on additional page where necessary)

The provision of housing in the Aviemore area will impact on the local economy in several ways, most importantly through the increase in affordable housing which will help to address a recognised failure in the local labour market.

However, the environment is a key economic driver in the CNP and significant impacts on important habitats, or iconic species, may have a long term impact on visitor numbers and tourism in the Cairngorms.

Therefore although there will be positive impacts from the proposal in terms of economic development this will need to be carefully considered against all other factors.