

AGENDA ITEM 7

APPENDIX 3

2020/0111/DET

**REPRESENTATIONS
OBJECTIONS**

BSCG
info

From: BSCG info
Sent: 25 May 2020 23:38:41 +0100
To: Planning
Subject: 2020-0111 BSCG comments

Badenoch & Strathspey Conservation Group

Fiodhag, Nethybridge, Inverness-shire PH25 3DJ

Tel [REDACTED]

Scottish Charity No. SC003846

Email [REDACTED]

Website bscg.org.uk/

25 May 2020

Dear Stephanie Wade

2020/0111/DET | Phase 1 - 40 unit housing development | Land 160M South Of Baldow Cottage
Alvie Estate Kincaig

BSCG objects to the above proposal. We request the opportunity to address the planning committee when the application is determined.

The scale of development is excessive and out of proportion with the size of Kincaig. The style of the house layout is unsympathetic and out of character with Kincaig. The proportion of affordable housing is inadequate. On top of this we emphasise the significant problems there are with so-called affordable housing being far from genuinely affordable. We are also concerned at the climate change implications of this development. The facilities at Kincaig mean that reliance on private vehicles associated with this proposal is inevitable. Further, we do not see any evidence of high quality energy efficiency in the design of the houses.

The proposal site is a productive field that contributes very positively to the landscape, supports a valuable wetland hollow, supports the knoll area, and can support waders at different times of year and brown hare which is an SBL species.

The treatment of the knoll area is thoroughly inadequate to protect this important natural heritage and landscape feature. Housing adjoins the knoll. This is far too close to it and would have inevitable negative impacts from householders putting garden waste, lawn clippings etc over the fence onto the knoll area, and the likely spread of non-native invasive garden species. We are extremely concerned for the longer term sustainability of the knoll area with so many people and their pets living so close to it and the proposals to promote paths and a viewpoint on it.

The proposed landscaping and subsequent restoration of parts of the knoll area are completely unacceptable. Such intrusive operations would severely damage the soils and mycological interest, that includes *Hygrocybe punicea*.

If the CNPA are minded to approve this application, then a extensive area around the knoll area should be protected so that this biodiverse natural woodland and grassland can naturally expand to cover a substantially larger area than it does today.

There has been substantial loss of high quality habitats around Kincaig in recent years, with over-development and loss of important woodland at The Knoll and loss of valuable, long established fields to the dualling of the A9 and associated compounds. These fields contributed to habitat for waders and grassland fungi (including *Hygrocybe punicea*), flowers and invertebrates.

Such unsympathetic overdevelopment with significant negative impacts should have no place in the National Park.

Yours sincerely
Gus Jones
Convener

Comments for Planning Application 2020/0111/DET

Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0111/DET

Address: Land 160M South Of Baldow Cottage Alvie Estate Kincaig

Proposal: Phase 1 - 40 unit housing development

Case Officer: Stephanie Wade

Customer Details

Name: Dr Leith Penny

Address: The Old Manse Kincaig

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Firstly, the landscaped planting strip which separates the adjacent Macbean Road development from the B9152 has been a success. It is a pity that such a treatment is not included for the NW boundary in this proposal. It is clear that the developer's ambitions for the site involve a significantly larger number of units than the 40 envisaged in the 2010 CNPA site brief. Because of this, there is insufficient room for a protective planting barrier of 15m depth, which the site brief suggested as a minimum. Instead, the depth of the proposed barrier planting is repeatedly reduced to a very few metres by the incursions of the private gardens, in a saw-tooth plan form. This will not deliver the same protective benefits to the new homes that the Macbean Road boundary planting confers, nor will it much soften the impact of the development viewed from beyond the site. If the scheme was revised to deliver a housing density in line with the site brief, a more satisfactory boundary treatment (as well as a more generous internal layout, especially in terms of usable garden space) could easily be achieved. As it is, the intention to leave a large proportion of the site available for Phase 2 has required the placement of the internal road as close to the B9152 as possible, which in turn explains the skewed orientation of the houses between the two roads, and their very small gardens.

Secondly, the capacity of the sewage system and SUDS needs to be assessed in the context of the overall load on final completion of the development, not merely the first phase. Should the 40 Phase 1 units represent the maximum permissible load for these systems, then the constrained layout of Phase 1 will prove to have been unnecessary.

Finally, the 2010 site brief required the preparation of a landscape management and maintenance plan. I can find no reference to such a plan, nor the arrangements to implement it, among the application documents.

Comments for Planning Application 2020/0111/DET

Application Summary

Application Number: 2020/0111/DET

Address: Land 160M South Of Baldow Cottage Alvie Estate Kincaig

Proposal: Phase 1 - 40 unit housing development

Case Officer: Stephanie Wade

Customer Details

Name: Dr Dewi Owens

Address: 18 MacBean Road Kincaig Kingussie

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: We would like to comment on the planning application, and raise the following concerns:

1. The use of cementitious cladding is inappropriate in this rural setting, as is the choice of concrete tile roofing material. Locally sourced larch cladding allowed to naturally silver, and slate roofing, would be more appropriate, or the use of off-white render similar to existing developments in the vicinity. Cementitious cladding may have its place in an urban setting where there is no precedent for the use of natural materials, but not in a rural village in the National Park. Even in a more urbanised setting, we feel that the use of cementitious cladding in The Peaks, Caledonia Place, Aviemore, is a retrograde step/choice of material and does nothing to enhance the built environment of the CNP.

2. The site section and plan show that houses are positioned along the most elevated part of the land and several of the houses in this part of the development are fully two storeys high, which will cause loss of north-easterly outlook from the existing properties in the village. The site layout plan shows unacceptably high elevations. Neighbouring developments are more appropriately predominantly limited to one and a half storey houses.

https://wam.highland.gov.uk/wam/files/D93D7C18D1FE739C9F8B9776592BC623/pdf/20_01563_FUL-SITE_SECTION_PLAN-2081647.pdf

3. The land where the development is proposed is an important wildlife habitat for nesting Lapwings. Agricultural activity (? ploughing) was noticed in the field on the 7th May, potentially disrupting nesting activity. Building on this land does not conserve or enhance the natural heritage of the area (CNPA aim 1A).

4. Roads are prepared for a potential phase 2 - it is our understanding that the land has been earmarked for 40 houses in total. Why is a phase 2 being considered, especially with the drainage

challenges on the land?