# **AGENDA ITEM 6**

**APPENDIX 2B** 

2020/0013/DET

REPRESENTATIONS OBJECTION

# **Comments for Planning Application 2020/0013/DET**

## **Application Summary**

Application Number: 2020/0013/DET

Address: Land 65M South Of 22 Kerrow Drive Kingussie

Proposal: Erection of 22 apartments, formation of access road, SUDS, landscaping

Case Officer: Stephanie Wade

### **Customer Details**

Name: Mr David Fallows

Address: Woodlea Main Street Newtonmore

### **Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

**Comment Reasons:** 

Comment: Holding objection pending clarifications.

Surface water drainage. I am concerned that the trial pits in appendix B logs appear to have been tested on 7th August 2008 - in the drier part of the year and twelve years ago. How can we be assured these are still relevant and accurate, especially with very tight and limited SUDS arrangements?

Disabled parking bays. It is obvious that disabled bays should be sited adjacent to the access paths to ground floor apartments. Neither of the bays shown do this, one being adjacent to a first floor access and the other being completely disconnected. Can extra thought be given to this? Parking inconsistencies. There are inconsistencies between the visualisations shown in the statement and the site layout plans. The plans show no parking bays in front of block A but the visualisation clearly indicates vehicles parked in front of the building. It is difficult to understand why residents in block A or block F should be denied convenient parking when all others have that facility. I appreciate that a road narrowing is indicated (on the swept path analysis only) in front of block A, which would block off parking access, but suggest this narrowing should be 'round the corner' on the northern side. I also do not understand why the parking bays for block F should be so very much detached. In general, however, I am supportive of the general layout, design and finishes proposed though disappointed that no indication is given of the likely finished target cost of these houses beyond the note that this will not exceed a somewhat extraordinary £200,000