

Objector
517a

Name Helen Murray
1 Monaltrie Way
Ballater
AB35 5PS

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector
513a

Name Ian Black
11 Lochnagar Way
Ballater

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector 515a	Name Allyson Meechan 2 Craigview Road Ballater AB35 5PD	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector
514a

Name Brian Gibson
3 Lochnagar Way
Ballater

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

HEARING

Objector
518a

Name Alan Henderson
11 Craigview Place
Ballater

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector 521a	Name Mrs A Redland 26 Albert Road Ballater AB35 5QL	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Mr and Mrs D Milne
519a 10 Pannanich Road
 Ballater
 AB35 5PA

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

HEARING

Objector
539a

Name Frances Gibson
3 Lochnagar Way
Ballater
Aberdeenshire
AB35 5PB

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 516a	Name Mr and Mrs Hepburn Monaltrie Lodge Ballater AB35 5QJ	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

HEARING

Objector	Name	Agent
391c	David Horsfall Homes for Scotland 5 New Mart Place Edinburgh EH14 1RW	

Company Homes for Scotland

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

We objection to the following policy wording: 'Where no public subsidy is available, the developer will be required to provide all of the affordable housing on site to a target of 30%.'

Land values in the Cairngorms National Park are low as a result of high costs associated with development, in particular labour costs. A 30% affordable housing requirement with no public subsidy would leave most sites with a negative site value.

Paragraph 39 of PAN 74 states that where sites do not fall within areas of strategic priority for development alternative means of provision should be considered. PAN 74 goes on to state that it is not appropriate to introduce policy which requires developers to construct new houses to be handed over free to a local authority or an RSL.

PAN 74 paragraph 10 states where development funding is not available, or will meet part of the requirement, affordable housing built without public subsidy will have a roll to play. Housing without public subsidy are appropriate where it can be clearly demonstrated that they will meet the needs of, and be affordable to, groups of householders identified through the housing needs assessment.

Changes that will resolve this objection –

The policy wording must be changed to state:

' where no public subsidy is available, the developer may be required to provide affordable housing without subsidy where it can be demonstrated that they will meet the needs of, and be affordable to, groups of householders identified through an up to date housing needs assessment. '

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

Part 3 - Homes for Scotland object the requirement for a 25% affordable housing contribution where public funding is less than a third of the total cost of the development. Land values in the Cairngorms National Park are low as a result of high costs associated with development, in particular labour costs. A 25% affordable housing requirement with little or no public subsidy would leave most sites with a negative site value.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third if available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
456g	Reidhaven Estate Seafield Estate Office Cullen Buckie Banffshire	Jill Paterson Halliday Fraser Munro 8 Victoria Street Aberdeen AB10 1XB

Company Reidhaven Estate

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

Reidhaven Estate support the principle of a policy on affordable housing and its background however consider this policy to be unworkable and onerous. The threshold of only two houses seems excessive, impacting on the viability of schemes and effectively discouraging against new development in Park, thus reducing the number of units overall coming forward. In operational terms it would be difficult to see how this policy might operate. RSLs may find it difficult to manage very small numbers of units in various locations and may not be able to build this number of homes. In addition Communities Scotland are unlikely to fund such development.

The 50% requirement is considered too high and is contrary to national guidance in PAN 74 without any sufficient justification. The Plan's own figures do not back up this requirement. On page 42 it states a housing need of 132 units per annum yet this is not taken into account in table 3. Had it been the housing requirement would have been significantly higher. It is also useful to note that housing need assessment is a very contentious issue (Aberdeen City Local Plan Inquiry recently reported, reducing affordable housing requirements from 25% to 10% based on major errors and over-estimates in the housing needs assessment). There is no reason to assume that the National Park should not adhere to national planning policy that suggests 25%.

The requirement for single open market houses to make a contribution towards affordable housing is also considered to be unduly onerous and will likely discourage development. It should include an exception (e.g. for housing in remote areas) for where there is no household in need in the immediate area. Paragraph 5.59 refers to 'equivalent unit' however this is not defined in the plan. It is important for this to be defined in order to provide greater clarity for developers.

Modifications: The policy should be reworded to provide a more flexible approach to affordable housing.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained. We note that the requirement for affordable housing contributions has been reduced in this revised policy. We do however still consider this revised policy to be unworkable and onerous, impacting on the viability of schemes.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and

25% where less than one third if available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included.
response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector	Name	Agent
391a	David Horsfall Homes for Scotland 5 New Mart Place Edinburgh EH14 1RW	

Company Homes for Scotland

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

The grounds of objection -

Homes for Scotland object to Policy 24: Affordable Housing, in respect of:

- The Threshold for affordable housing contributions required on developments of two or more units
- The requirement for an affordable housing contribution of 50% where public subsidy is available
- The requirement for an affordable housing contribution of 30% where no public subsidy is available
- The range of tenures required
- General

Grounds of objection – We object to the following policy wording:

‘Proposals for housing developments of two or more units will be required to incorporate a proportion of the total number of units as affordable housing.’

Pan 74 – Affordable Housing states that a local authority should seek to achieve on site provision for developments of 20 units or more. Homes for Scotland accept that this provision may be lower in rural areas where the general scale of development is smaller. However by setting the threshold for schemes of two units or more this will threaten the viability of many developments. Changes that will resolve this objection – the threshold for Affordable Housing contributions should be set at 20 units. There may however be provision within this policy for the threshold of 10 units in identified rural areas. In these instances this requirement must be justified by an up to date housing needs assessment and account must be taken of financial obligations relating to the development.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Confirm that PAN74 allows for different thresholds in rural areas. Include clarification in 5.50 that this could be in the form of a commuted sum or off site provision in the case of small sites.

Response to 1st modifications

Part 1 - Homes for Scotland object to the requirement for affordable housing units on housing development of three or more units. PAN 74: Affordable Housing states that a Local Authority should seek to achieve on site provision for developments of 20 units or more. This may be lower in rural areas where the general scale of development is smaller. Setting the threshold at three units will threaten the viability of many developments.

The threshold for Affordable Housing contributions should be set at 20 units. There may however be provision within the policy to allow for some thresholds of 10 units in identified rural areas. These thresholds must be justified by an up to date Housing Needs Assessment and account must be taken of financial obligations relating to these developments.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The unit size of 20 referred to is suggested for urban areas, and this is not considered appropriate within the National Park. A lower threshold for on site provision

is suggested in PAN 74 and the figure of 3 is considered appropriate as in any development this would secure one house on each site. No modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
400g(f)	Dr A M Jones Badenoch and Strathspey Fiodhag Nethybridge PH25 3DJ	

Company Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

Policy 24 - Object to statement para 3 “developer will be required to provide all of the affordable housing on a site to a target of 30 per cent”. Objection due to the lack of clarity as to how much affordable housing the developer will in practise be required to provide. Wording should specify a minimum percentage of affordable housing that is not negotiable.

5.48 - Object to statement that “the numbers of households considered to be in housing need... were greater then [sic presumably than] the numbers of houses being built through programmed delivery of affordable housing” on grounds of the quality of the data used and that this data is not summarised in a rigorous manner in the Deposit Plan

It is unsatisfactory and unacceptable that the data, assumptions and predictions on which the housing “needs” are assessed are not presented to the public. It is not reasonable to expect the public to work through lengthy and specialised analyses and reports to assess for themselves individually whether the conclusions used to inform the DLP are justified.

The CNPA should as a matter of urgency make a summary of all this information publicly available to enable the public to make an informed judgement.

Object to statement “...for those in need in the park” on grounds of lack of clarity. This is a non-specific, woolly statement. Who are defined as “those”? And the meaning of “in” the Park needs careful definition. It is our understanding that according to present housing policy preference is not given to people living in the Park for affordable housing in the Park.

Policy 24 and 5.50 - Object to the single house contribution on grounds that it is not stated how this money will be used and who it will benefit, indirectly or directly. For example, this financial contribution could indirectly promote developments of open market housing through developments commonly consisting of only a proportion of affordable housing, and this proportion is the principle justification for the entire development.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Confirm that the housing needs surveys identify who is 'in need' and CNPA continue to work closely with the 4LAs housing departments to monitor need. Also

Response to 1st modifications

5.43 Object. The reference to ensuring increased rate of housing supply for those in the Park is misleading due to affordable housing allocation rules.

5.47 - Support the retention of affordable units in perpetuity. Support control through removal of permitted development rights.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The issue of local waiting lists is key to the success of the housing policies in the local plan and CNPA continue to work with the local housing authorities to try and influence this. Local people or people with a local connection can however get additional points on waiting lists and we aim to build on this. The issue raised regarding para 5.2 is not accepted as all developments will take place with the 4 aims of the National Park and the reasons for its original designation in mind.

Regarding land allocations, the CNPA conducted a study to assess the need for housing within the Park and has allocated land accordingly. However it is not considered to have allocated excessive amounts of land which are more than the established need would suggest. The allocations do therefore comply with the requirements of SPP17.

Regarding para 5.23 the paragraph is intended to highlight the reasons for the growth in demand for affordable housing, as throughout the consultation for the local plan, this was seen as a key issue and important to help retain local people within their communities. The development proposed will be carried out in accordance with the 4 aims of the Park and it is considered an important part of the local plan by the CNPA Board. No modifications are therefore proposed in light of this objection.

The position regarding land allocation as set out in tables 2-4 has not changed. The background information has been made available, and this remains the basis for the approach. The paragraphs 5.22-5.40 aim to explain what is a complex issue and important part of the local plan and is intended to clarify the CNPA board thinking behind the approach taken. This thinking has not changed, and therefore no modifications are proposed to this section.

A definition of 'housing market area' will be added to the glossary.

response to 2nd modifications

Object

Policy 21. Object to reduction of affordable housing proportion from 40%, to between 25% and 40%.

Welcome the changes to the 3rd para.

Maintain objection

5.43 Object.

The reference to ensuring increased rate of housing supply for those in the Park is misleading due to affordable housing allocation rules.

Maintain support

5.47

Support the retention of affordable units in perpetuity.

Support control through removal of permitted development rights.

confirm that contributions will be made to the 4 LAs and a protocol will be established to ensure appropriate spending of the funds generated.

HEARING

Objector **Name** Jamie Williamson **Agent**
439s Alvie and Dalraddy Estate
 Alvie Estate Office
 Kinncraig, Kingussie
 PH21 INE

Company Alvie and Dalraddy Estate

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

There will be situations where there is not sufficient local demand for affordable houses.

Any house built that is occupied by an existing resident helps relieve the problem of local demand exceeding the available supply. A house occupied as a second home or by an incomer employed elsewhere does not relieve this problem. Tax on single house developments (5.59) is not the solution as it does not address the problem.

The most affordable houses are those built for rent. Traditionally Estates and the largest employers provided accommodation for their staff, either in the form of tied accommodation or on short assured tenancies. Some employers also provide housing for retired staff. In Scotland's rural areas 53% of rented accommodation is provided by the private sector, almost entirely without government assistance (As reported by Andrew Bradford in a seminar organised by CNPA – source possibly 2002 Scottish House Condition Survey). If encouraged with incentives rather than disincentives, the private sector would increase the units of rented accommodation provided to meet the current shortfall. In many cases private sector businesses both own land suitable for housing and already provide rented accommodation, they are therefore likely to be able to both build and rent accommodation more cost effectively at less cost to the government than a government financed Housing Association. Providing houses for rent can be a valuable means of diversification for many rural land holdings.

If the Cairngorms National Park Authority and/or the National government were to encourage rather than discourage the private sector to build and provide houses for rent the Park would not need to attract large a large amount of additional public funding to build the number of houses required. (5.35).

Since 1946 the increase in employment by government plus social housing for those least able to pay market rents has been provided by local authority housing. The current increase in demand over supply of affordable homes in our rural areas nationally is largely the result of the decline in the building of homes by the Local Authorities (Council houses) compounded by the selling off of Local Authority homes, See figure 23. It is important that the affect of government policies in expanding government employment whilst at the same time reducing the number of local authority homes for rent is not compounded by discouraging the private sector to provide accommodation for their own staff and/or filling the vacuum in rented accommodation created by the government's withdrawal from the supply of rented homes.

Households should not require to be registered and approved by a Local Authority or Housing association housing list to be eligible to be a tenant of a private sector landlord. (page 48).

What the National Park requires is a range of accommodation that will meet the needs of businesses including accommodation for visitors and those willing to invest in our rural economy. A recent study concluded that "social housing" only really delivered on affordability (Nick Fletcher, July 2007, CIH in Scotland Position Paper 'The future of the social housing sector in Scotland in delivering successful, mixed communities 'page 3). If local businesses were encouraged to provide accommodation to meet the needs of their staff, or failing that to link with other businesses that could provide this accommodation for rent, a significant proportion of the demand for affordable" housing would be satisfied.

The insistence of social rented housing being provided by Registered Social Landlords (5.49) is an unnecessary restriction further discouraging the private sector to fill the vacuum created by government in rented accommodation. What is required is encouragement to the private sector by freeing up the market to rent not further restrictions, regulations and taxes.

Developers add the loss they make on providing affordable houses below the cost of supply to the price of houses sold on the open market. This proposed policy will create a gap in the price range of houses between those sold on the open market and those built as 'affordable' homes.

The perceived lack of affordable accommodation is a problem we face now, not in 20 or even 50 years time. Insisting on houses being built to be rented in perpetuity (5.49) is another disincentive for the private sector to build to rent. If this disincentive is compounded by insisting on a "below market" rent in perpetuity, it is unlikely that the private sector will provide the "affordable" accommodation to fill the vacuum created by the decline in Local Authority accommodation to rent. Building houses to rent should be encouraged not discouraged. If the investor in the home to be built cannot perceive a reasonable return on their investment, homes will be built as cheaply as possible. If the "below market" rent does not cover the investors costs and provide a net return, further homes for rent will not be built.

If adjacent local authorities require 25% of a development to be 'affordable' houses and the Cairngorms National Park Authority 50%, this may persuade developers to develop just outside the Park. Houses may not be built where they are most required.

It should be remembered that transfer of ownership normally occurs approximately every 20 to 30 years. As rented accommodation does not enjoy business relief, rented accommodation on transfer is liable for Inheritance Tax at up to 40% of the value of the asset. If transferred in life the Capital Gains Tax could be as much as 40% of the asset value. In addition the impact of VAT, Stamp Duty and Rates must also be taken into account when assessing the return to the investor in rented accommodation.

We recommend that the Cairngorms National Park Authority carefully assesses the likely net return to the private sector investor of building houses to rent and ensures that any package provides a reasonable net return net of tax to the investor. We also recommend that the Park Authority compares the true cost to the government of encouraging the private sector to build and manage houses to rent in our rural areas with the cost of housing associations carrying out this task. When the full extent of income from rates and taxes are taken into account over the longer term we believe that the government would still be better off financially even if they subsidised the building of private sector houses for rent with a 100% grant.

We suggest that "affordable housing" should be considered as houses subject to a section 75 agreement over a period of between 20 and 50 years that restricts occupancy to rented accommodation for residents, dependents of residents, households with full time employment in the area or households investing in the economy of the area. We are concerned that restricting rents rather than restricting demand may result in less houses being built to rent. The Park Authority should not be determining the level of private sector rents unless they have contributed financially to the building or management of the property.

We suggest that as an alternative to a section 75 Agreement the Park Authority should consider a loan to the developer secured on the property being developed.

The loan would have to be repaid with interest plus a penalty if the property is taken off rent and/or sold on the open market within say 20 years. We are concerned
CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

that if the property is tied into renting in perpetuity (5.49) it will lower the value of the investment when sold or transferred. To make the investment worthwhile
The need for affordable homes remains a key aim of the local and national park plans and is retained in a revised form in policy 21, supported by the work of the
either the initial grant aid or the rent charged will have to be higher. 3Dragons study.

Response to 1st modifications

Where houses are built for sale to residents of households that will be economically active within the area, houses can be made more affordable by a shared equity
Developments of three or more dwellings (will) may be required to incorporate a proportion of the total number of units as affordable housing.
scheme whereby the household is able to buy out the developer over a period of time. Where public funding is (available) accepted by the developer to help fund
affordable housing, the overall affordable contribution of the development may be
required up to 40% , (with any shortfall ...by the developer.)

Modifications proposed - Where less than one third of the total cost of the development is available through public funding, the developer (will) may be required
to provide (all of the

Proposals for housing developments of two or more units (delete will) may be required to incorporate a proportion of the total number of units as affordable
affordable housing on a site to a target of 25%.) up to 25% of the houses as affordable on a site.

housing. This housing (delete will) may include tied or rented accommodation, social rented housing provided through Communities Scotland grants as well as low

Proposals for one and two open market dwellings (will) may also be required to make a contribution towards affordable housing. This (will) could be a cash payment
cost home ownership and/or rent options provided through public subsidy or by the developer. towards the meeting of housing need in the local area.

Where public subsidy is (delete available) used to help fund affordable housing, the overall affordable contribution of the development will be (delete expected to be)
Proposals for off site contribution Of the community.

assessed according to local demand for subsidised accommodation. (delete 50%, with any shortfall between the public subsidised element and 50% target made up by
developers) This policy is too prescriptive and inflexible. It could end up as a disincentive to build more houses in some areas of the National Park. It will be perceived
as a local

Where no public subsidy is available, the developer (delete will) may be required to provide (delete all of the affordable housing on a site to a target of 30%) a tax
on house building in the National Park. If the effect of this Local Authority intervention is to curtail further house building the net effect may be no more
proportion of the accommodation as rented accommodation. This proportion to be assessed according to estimated local demand. affordable homes being built while at
the same time curtailing further economic development.

Proposals for single open market houses (delete will) may also be required to make a contribution towards affordable housing in the Cairngorms National Park area.

Those willing to carry out economic development should not be used by the government or National Park Authority as a "cash cow" to be milked. Traditionally rural
(delete This will be a cash payment towards the development of affordable housing in the local area) enterprises built homes to house their staff and/or dependents.

They should not then be asked to help fund the responsibilities of government in addition to
contributing to the economic development of the area and providing homes for residents who would otherwise have to be housed by the Local Authority or left
homeless.

Contributions to affordable homes should only be considered where the developer is building houses for sale.

There will be situations where additional affordable housing is not required in the local area.

There is concern over what is regarded as "affordable homes". We have tried to improve existing homes to rent under the Rural Empty Properties Grant scheme but
have had to turn down the grant offered as what was offered would have resulted in the Estate running at a net deficit. We have enquired about the Rural Homes
for Rent Pilot Scheme but found the conditions so onerous as to risk making the proposed investment a net liability to our organisation. If we then build to rent

without grant aid with a rent set to cover the reasonable management, maintenance and borrowing costs will this then be regarded as “affordable”? If not and we have to pay developer’s contributions and/or a further contribution to the National Park’s affordable housing scheme, it will make the rents for houses we build for local residents even less affordable. If these proposed additional Local Authority developers’ taxes are applied to our proposals to meet our local housing requirements, the disincentive may be sufficient to persuade us not to build any more houses. There is a danger that these proposed disincentives to building homes for rent will reduce the number of privately rented homes in the area and be counter productive to increasing the accessibility of rented and owned housing to meet the needs of the community.

If some of the houses developed are priced artificially low in order to meet the criteria of affordable housing, the increased cost of development as a result of this tax will be added to those that don’t meet the “affordable” criteria. This will result in new houses being even more expensive with the exception of those that meet the “affordable” criteria. Residents that don’t qualify for “affordable housing” will end up being unable to find homes within the Park. If this tax is added to homes built to rent, rented accommodation will become even more expensive for those that don’t qualify for “affordable” rented homes. Two tiers of accommodation will develop accommodation that is unaffordable to all but a very small proportion of the resident population and “affordable” accommodation at the bottom end of the scale restricted to only those that meet the government’s criteria for “affordable” housing. There is some evidence that this is already happening. This attempt at social engineering will distort the market and not achieve the stated objectives.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The wording of the policy is intended to give clarity to developers of the expectations regarding affordable housing. The proposed wording of the representation would undermine this clarity and no modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 409c	Name William Stuart Paterson 3 Lynstock Park Nethy Bridge PH25 3EL	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

I am disappointed that the plan makes no reference to the Cairngorms National Park holding a data base or register as was discussed at the consultation meetings, of those wishing to purchase property within the park area. This information would identify the type of property and the purpose for which it would be used ie permanent residence, holiday home, 2nd home, letting house, tourist accommodation etc.

This register could be used to indicate the price bracket that would be affordable. It would also profile those wishing to reside within the area. Wither they be young families requiring schools, nurseries etc, retired people with future needs of social services, care homes etc.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The CNPA will continue to work with its partners and housing providers to ensure the most accurate and up to date information is available on housing need in support of the delivery of the affordable housing policies in the local plan. Confirm we work closely with the 4 LAs regarding need but do not have the capacity to hold a database for all housing demand in the Park, including the private sector, holiday and tourist markets etc. However we will continue to work closely with local communities to ensure that the local need is identified.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained. Some concerns appear to have been addressed.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The issue of a housing database remains something which CNPA work with the housing authorities on to ensure the most accurate and up to date information. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 425o
Name Rona Main
Scottish Enterprise Grampian
27 Albyn Place
Aberdeen
AB10 IDB
Agent Steve Crawford
Halliday Fraser Munro
8 Victoria Street
Aberdeen
AB10 IXB

Company Scottish Enterprise Grampian

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

We are concerned that this policy is unworkable and onerous and may discourage development in the Park. We believe this may place onerous obligations on the funding of such development. RSLs may not be able to build this many affordable houses and developers that may not accept such requirements. There may be an oversight in that the Plan's own figures do not back up the requirement in this Policy. On page 42 it states a housing need of 132 units per annum yet this does not appear to be taken into account in table 3. Had it been the housing requirement would have been significantly higher. It is also useful to note that housing need assessment is a very contentious issue (Aberdeen City Local Plan Inquiry recently reported, reducing affordable housing requirements from 25% to 10% based on major errors and over-estimates in the housing needs assessment). There is no reason to assume that the National Park should not adhere to national planning policy that suggests 25%.

Key worker housing is a priority for SE Grampian who are therefore willing to discuss potentially more effective means of achieving affordable and key worker housing.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

We welcome the modifications to Affordable Housing under Policy 21 however we believe the need for mixed tenure and key worker housing should be strengthened in the document, particularly due to the high dependency on Tourism Industry for affordable housing. There appears to be no mention of Seasonal Housing for the Tourism sector. This is a concept we would strongly support and would be happy to work with the CNP to discuss this type of worker accommodation further, with the prospect of including this concept within the Local Plan.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

Policy 21 relates to the provision of affordable housing for all sectors of the population rather than particular sectors employed in particular jobs. It is hoped that this policy will secure high quality accommodation for all those in need and no further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector **Name** John Forbes-Leith Esq
4181 Dunachton Estate

Agent Debbie Mackay
Smiths Gore
12 Bernard Street
Edinburgh
EH6 6PY

Company Dunachton Estate

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

While my client welcomes actions to promote affordable housing, it is considered that this policy is hugely onerous and likely to be counter productive to the provision of affordable housing across the Park area. My client objects to the following aspects of the policy;

- The threshold of two or more units - This is against national advice in PAN 74 which states that Local Authorities should seek to achieve on site provision for development of 20 units or more (paragraph 37). Using a threshold of 2 units or more is likely to threaten the viability of many developments.

- The 30% and 50% requirements - The 30% and 50% requirements are against national advice in Planning Advice Note 74 Affordable Housing which sets a benchmark of 25% affordable housing on appropriate sites. The PAN states in paragraph 35 that;

“The Local Authority may also seek a higher percentage on a specific site but this will only be appropriate in exceptional circumstances, for example linked to a substantial release of Greenfield land or on a site owned by the local authority or other public agency which is being released for development”

No such exceptional circumstances have been identified in this situation.

There is a concern that the additional costs created by these 30% and 50% requirements will deter developers and therefore be counter-productive to the achievement of affordable housing in this location. There is also a concern that in order to achieve the required returns on housing sites, developers may have to increase the price of open market properties to enable them to provide the affordable housing. This will create an even greater gap between those able to afford open market housing in the Park area and those who can only enter the housing market through affordable housing.

It is also noted that adjacent local authorities are requiring 25% contributions towards affordable housing. This may attract developers away from the Park.

- The prescriptive nature of the baseline assumption in paragraph 5.52 - PAN 74 identifies the 5 categories of affordable housing and states that it is up to the local housing strategy to provide evidence of the balance between the different categories.

Modifications to resolve this objection.

- The number of units should reflect national advice and be set at 20 units.
- The percentage of affordable housing should reflect national advice and be set at 25%.
- Paragraphs 5.52 and 5.53 should be replaced with a section which gives examples of the categories of affordable housing that may be acceptable. It should also require that a housing needs assessment must be undertaken jointly between the four local authorities.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The need for affordable homes remains a key aim of the local and national park plans and is retained in a revised form in policy 21, supported by the work of the 3Dragons study. The % requirements have been amended accordingly. Confirm the rest of the para referred to allows for smaller sites to have a different threshold in rural areas.

Response to 1st modifications

The Policy has improved marginally but is still onerous. The original objection is sustained and a new objection to the First Modifications is set out below. My client objected to Policy 24 Contributions to Affordable Housing in the Finalised Plan. This policy has now changed to Policy 21 whose key elements are;

- 1.The thresholds which trigger the need for on-site provision of affordable housing has been changed to 3 units or more and the percentage requirements have been altered to 40% where public subsidy is provided and 25% where less than one third of public subsidy is provided.
- 2.One or two open market dwellings will still trigger an affordable housing contribution and paragraph 5.50 sets out the broad terms of a formula to be used to work out the level of such contributions.
- 3.The policy now allows for of-site provision to be considered where community needs assessments of similar indicate that this is a better way of meeting housing need.
- 4.The supporting text in paragraph 5.43 states that a recent study “Planning for Affordable Housing in the Cairngorms National Park” identified a need for 121 affordable dwellings per annum. Policy 21 is designed to support this provision.
- 5.The policy goes on in paragraph 5.44 to state that the CNPA will work with housing providers to see as high a proportion of affordable as possible between 40% and 100%.
- 6.Paragraph 5.47 seeks to “retain the units in perpetuity”.

My client is supportive of the provision of affordable housing in the Park and sees it as a vital part of sustaining the local community and economy. However the policy as it stands is unlikely to create the step-change in affordable housing provision which is desirable. My client therefore objects to the following aspects of this proposal;

The threshold of 25% is very challenging in these marginal market areas and 40% is unrealistic. Together with the requirement for every house unit to provide an affordable housing contribution, will jeopardise the economics of many schemes, especially given current market conditions, to the point where schemes will not be able to go ahead and neither market nor affordable housing will be achieved. The “Planning for Affordable Housing in the Cairngorms National Park” Study of March 2008 indeed states in the Executive Summary page v, Paragraph 5 that while a policy of seeking 25% affordable housing quota would appear the most realistic if delivered without housing grant although grant would need to be available if market circumstances change. But at 40% and 50%, grant would “appear to be needed for most circumstances and financial viability must be questionable”.

Pan 74: Affordable Housing recommends that on site provision should be sought for developments of 20 units or more with some discretion for these to be lower in rural areas, however setting the threshold at three units with every unit having to make contributions will threaten the viability of many developments.

The basis on which the Park Authority is going ahead with this policy is therefore highly questionable when the recent study casts doubt over the viability of such schemes.

The desire to “retain the units as affordable in perpetuity” while laudable, does not allow scope for the use of innovative additions to the affordable housing market of the Rural Homes for Rent scheme which retains the new properties on a rented basis for a minimum of 30 years. This scheme has the potential to contribute

significantly to increasing the stock of rural affordable homes and should be treated as a mainstream way in which to achieve affordable housing in rural areas.

Proposed amendment -

The percentages of affordable housing should be reduced to no more than the Government benchmark of 25% across the board with scope for alterations should economic conditions worsen and further jeopardise the delivery of housing.

The house limit which triggers on-site contribution should be increased to something much closer to the PAN 74 recommended threshold of 20 units or more.

The requirement for every house unit to contribute to an affordable housing pot should be removed.

The requirement to retain the units as affordable in perpetuity should be adjusted to allow for innovative schemes such as Rural Homes for Rent or equivalent schemes.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The retention of affordable provision in perpetuity aims to ensure that the current situation once resolved does not come about again, and the provision does meet the needs of future home buyers. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector **Name** Rothiemurchus Estate
446b Estate Office
 Aviemore
 Inverness-shire
 PH22 IQH

Agent Howard Brindley Consulting
26 Holm Park
Inverness
IV2 4XT

Company Rothiemurchus Estate

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

The Estate welcomes the inclusion of the proposed new community at An Camas Mor in the Deposit Local Plan. The process began with a proposal by Aviemore and vicinity Community Council during the 1988 Local Plan consultation. It has included the 1994 Public Local Inquiry into the Draft Badenoch and Strathspey Local Plan, inclusion in the adopted Local Plan in 1997 and the Highland Structure Plan in 2001. Since the adoption of these two documents the Estate has been working towards the realisation of the new community. The Cambusmore Action Group led by the Estate and Highland Council explored options and set out objectives and guiding principles for the new community. A Vision and an Indicative Land Use Plan for this proposed new community has been prepared by the Estate's team following considerable consultation with key stakeholders in the public agencies and the local Aviemore and area community. The proposal is for An Camas Mor to be a balanced community with a full range of home types and occupation, including a proportion of the homes in the affordable category.

The Indicative Land use Plan demonstrates the capacity of the site to accommodate 1500 units and accompanying tables illustrate how this can provide a substantial element of affordable housing at An Camas Mor to meet the social and economic needs of the Aviemore area. Consequently the proposed community design allows for high density smaller house units as part of the balanced provision. It is expected that 80% of the houses will be between one and three bedrooms, and that a proportion of these will be for rent by social landlords or available for low cost ownership.

Policy 24 states that the overall affordable contribution of development will be expected to be 50% where public subsidy is available. This implies that 50% of the one to three bedroom housing units proposed in the An Camas Mor Indicative Land Use Plan will be in the affordable category. This would make it more difficult to accommodate residents from the middle income groups who make up the largest constituent of a thriving economy. In our view, as currently drafted, this would not be compatible with the overall vision of a balanced community. In addition there is currently a need to achieve a housing ladder so that as the needs and circumstances of families change they can move out of subsidised housing. This also allows for a move to a larger house or to downsize. The proposed policy reduces the range of housing and therefore options and choice. It could also reverse recent progress in Aviemore which is building a more balanced and cohesive community and moving away from the previous clear division between large privately built houses and ex local authority stock.

Provision of a blanket 50% affordable housing is a considerable additional burden on the developer and risks diminishing the ability to invest in the higher design and environmental expectations that are contained in the Vision for An Camas Mor and which are appropriate to a new community in the National park. Therefore Policy 24 is too prescriptive as a policy to be applied to An Camas Mor as a whole. PAN 74, which is the basis for national policy on affordable housing, states (para 34) that the benchmark figure is that each site should contribute 25% to the total number of affordable units, and (para 35) that a higher percentage may be sought on a specific site, but only in exceptional circumstances. We accept that at times there may be an exceptional circumstance within a phase in which a site may be appropriate for an innovative form of affordable housing. Such a decision is best left to agreements between developers, householders and the Authority. It is inappropriate as a blanket policy for a whole community.

Modifications:

Policy 24 should be re-worded to indicate that the national policy benchmark for affordable housing should be applied generally to major new housing developments.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

Affordable housing – the previous objection requested that the policy of 50% affordable be reworded to apply the national benchmark of 25% generally to new housing developments with the possibility of negotiating higher levels in various phases at An Camas Mor. The policy has been modified to require, where public funding is available, the overall affordable contribution of the development to be 40% with the developer making up any shortfall between the public subsidised element and this target. Where insufficient public subsidy exists the developer will be expected to provide 25% affordable units. We understand from Appendix 2 that affordable homes are to be to people on 'modest incomes' on the basis of being on an area housing list and subject to the current income tests and allocation rules.

To realise views expressed by the local community and detailed in the local plan the estate is proposing, over 20 years, to enable development of a balanced community at An Camas Mor. The vision includes homes and space for community facilities and employment representing a normal range of ages, household types and average or above average incomes levels. It believes that the proportion, types and allocation of affordable housing for people in housing need on modest incomes should support that purpose. It also understands that there is a need to meet the needs of people who are on incomes that are above the level to qualify them for affordable homes but find it near impossible to buy in the existing market. It believes that solutions appropriate for a new community can be found for both sectors together.

Recently indicators are that a fundamental readjustment is taking place across the banking, house building, mortgage and house buying markets and that assumptions developed over recent years may have to be reviewed.

Against this background the Estate is still of the view that modified policy 21's requirement for affordable housing is insufficiently flexible for planning a successful new community. Consequently the Estate maintains its objection to this policy as it is currently worded.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 409b	Name William Stuart Paterson 3 Lynstock Park Nethy Bridge PH25 3EL	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

I believe the wording 'windfall site' being used by park planners is misleading. A developer will give a small area for 'affordable housing' and then submit plans to build houses that are unaffordable to the local community on an adjacent area thereby holding local officials over a barrel.

The wording 'affordable housing' is misleading, and does not allow for the residents of Highland villages to enter the housing market. A 2 bedroom flat selling for £115,000 is unaffordable to a couple working in the local economy who earn the minimum wage with seasonal work.

The park should be looking to let a body similar to Highland Council to build and regulate the use of such properties.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The term 'windfall' is a commonly used planning term, and is not intended to be misleading or confusing. The terms windfall and affordable will be further defined in supporting text to clarify the position and ensure the expectations of the policy are clear to developers. Also confirm how the allocations would work in conjunction with highland councils housing dept.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained. Some concerns appear to have been addressed.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

Windfall sites have been included in the glossary. By their very nature they cannot be identified on any proposals map. No further modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Davall Developments Ltd
461c Myrtlefield House
 Grampian Road
 Aviemore

Agent Gary Johnston Building Consultants Ltd
Willow House
Stoneyfield Business Park
Inverness
IV2 7PA

Company Davall Developments Ltd

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

Policy 24 - Contributions to Affordable Housing with specific reference to Kingussie

Grounds of your objection - Object to the blanket 50% affordable housing requirement from sites of 2 or more houses. Provision of affordable housing relies upon cross-subsidies from the profits from private development. However, in current circumstances where infrastructure and other planning gain costs are now significantly higher this reduces the availability of such cross-subsidies. The potential of many small sites such as in Kingussie can also be limited through topography or woodland safeguards. In such circumstances the provision of 50% affordable housing will not be viable.

We accept that in special circumstances the requirement can be varied in line with SPP3 and PAN 74 but this should not be a blanket requirement across the whole National Park area where a more realistic proportion will help with the delivery of infrastructure improvements for example. A blanket 50% affordable housing requirement from sites of 2 or more houses deter developers from building houses. This will also suppress land values and so discourage land owners from making land available for development. The result will be an even more acute shortage of all tenures of housing not just that required to meet affordable needs. This situation will not be conducive to attracting business investment and the creation of jobs in the National Park area placing it at a disadvantage when seeking to compete for the share of jobs with the A96 Corridor for example, where the requirement is 25%. Henceforth this will not support the sustainable development objectives of the National Park.

Modifications to resolve this objection

A reduction in the proportion of affordable housing to 25 to 30% in line with the quotas set out in the Deposit Draft Local Plan where subsidy is not guaranteed. In the larger settlements of the National Park, such as Kingussie, the threshold for provision should remain at 10 or more dwellings which will allow more significant and viable affordable housing developments to be achieved. In smaller communities the threshold should be 4 or more dwellings. Such changes would be consistent with the Highland Council's recently agreed policy.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection – Policy 21 Contributions to Affordable Housing with specific reference to Kingussie.

Grounds – object to the requirement for 25% (without subsidy) and 40% (with subsidy) contributions from affordable housing to developments of 3 or more houses. We accept that in special circumstances the requirement can be varied in line with SPP3 and PAN74. the latter clearly sets the benchmark figure at 25% of the total number of units in any housing development proposal. The reason given for this is ‘to create a climate of certainty and confidence in the requirement for affordable housing’. Para 35 makes it clear that a local planning authority may seek a higher percentage on a specific site, ‘but this will only be appropriate in exceptional circumstances for example linked to a substantial release of Greenfield land or on a site owned by the local authority or other public agency which is being released for development.’

There would be extreme difficulty in implementing a policy requiring a minimum 25% affordable housing without subsidy particularly in the volume housing market. In the past the 25% level itself was achievable – often with some difficulty – in a buoyant housing market. This accounted for inflationary rises in the costs of building as well as any necessary cross-subsidy required to install major site infrastructure which is front loaded. In such circumstances the provision of the minimum 25% affordable housing would not have been viable without public subsidy.

In the current financial climate we are clearly seeing the housing market returning to more normal conditions resulting in reduced sales and slower building rates. The 25% level itself may be in some jeopardy in poorer market conditions. There are other issues of benchmark costs, increasing planning gain contributions and economies of scale which significantly reduce developer cross-subsidies. We are also aware of lower capital spending by public housing agencies which may not allow timeous development of affordable housing on a site. As such, the viability of the overall development of an area of land is also in doubt and with higher interest rates on development related borrowings it is more than likely that developers will be deterred from building houses in the National Park, let alone land owners making their land available for development.

We consider that increasing the requirement to 40% without justification of the exceptional local circumstances will lead to considerable uncertainty in both land purchase and development costs and will be a negative influence on bringing forward viable housing sites to supply the private and affordable market alike. Such constraints will increase the housing shortage and further exacerbate a situation that is not conducive to attracting business investment and the creation of jobs in the National Park area.

We anticipate that the response/objection from Homes for Scotland will elaborate on these matters.

Proposed changes – a reduction in the proportion of affordable housing to a minimum of 25% in line with the Highland Council's guidance. This would still allow for negotiation of a higher rate in exceptional local circumstances (as identified in a community needs assessment or similar) and where public subsidy is available. In the larger settlements of the National Park such as Kingussie, the threshold for provision should be 10 or more dwellings which will allow more significant and viable affordable housing developments to be achieved with subsidy. In smaller communities the threshold should be 4 or more dwellings. This would be in line with the policy of the Highland Council as housing authority.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included.

response to 2nd modifications

Our clients confirm that they wish their objections to be maintained on this particular issue.

HEARING

Objector 504a	Name Mr Ian Duncan 12 Sir Patrick Geddes Way Ballater AB35 5PG	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector 037j	Name DW and IM Duncan Pineacre West Terrace Kingussie PH21 IHA	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

Since the identified requirement from the local population is for rented accommodation or low costs shared ownership properties, the percentage of these in any proposed development should be increased to 80%.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to your letter of 5th November regarding modifications to the Local Plan.

I have no further comments to make on these modifications but I would reiterate that I still have serious concerns regarding the extent of the zoning for new housing development across the area and I believe that this is at odds with the first aim of the National Park.

I am happy for my written submissions to be considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
391d	David Horsfall Homes for Scotland 5 New Mart Place Edinburgh EH14 1RW	

Company Homes for Scotland

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

We object to the following wording in paragraph 5.52: 'The baseline assumption will be that between 15% and 25% of a development will be social rented housing, 15%-20% will be forms of low cost home ownership housing and the remaining 5% will be affordable rented accommodation or serviced plots'. Paragraph 11 of PAN 74 Affordable Housing, identified the 5 categories of affordable housing and paragraph 12 goes on to state that it is down to the local housing strategy to provide evidence of the relative balance between the needs of the different categories. The tenure split specified at paragraph 5.51 would not be justified until a robust housing needs analysis is undertaken jointly and simultaneously with the four local authorities. The findings of the housing needs analysis should be incorporated within a local housing strategy and this will set out any shortfall in provision for particular types of household.

Changes that will resolve this objection –

Replace paragraph 5.51 with a section that gives examples of the affordable housing that may be considered acceptable under the terms of Paragraph 11 of PAN 74.

It should be clearly stated that a housing needs assessment must be undertaken jointly and simultaneously with the four local authorities. In the mean time the affordable housing tenure on each site should be established through discussions between the local authority and the developer having consideration to available funding and constraints in each instance.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

See previous objection.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Anna Hauley & Gavin Hedges **Agent**
503a 10 Sir Patrick Geddes Way
 Ballater
 AB335

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector
520a

Name Mr A Myddleton
24 Albert Road
Ballater
AB35 5QL

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector 502a	Name Aileen Mutch 8 Sir Patrick Geddes Way Ballater AB35 5PG	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
501a	Peter Gray 3 Sir Patrick Geddes Way Ballater	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Dominic Fairlie **Agent**
452f Scotia Homes Ltd
 23 Bridge Street
 Ellon
 AB41 9AA

Company Scotia Homes Ltd

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

Clause 5.49 – Page 46

The draft plan states that affordable housing should be maintained as such “in perpetuity”. This gives the impression that the houses will remain affordable forever. Whilst this may be a desire, it would be better to quote a duration (say 15 years) that the property needs to remain affordable. It is easy to see that in the current property market property needs to be affordable; however this may not remain the case over a very long time. It is hard to see why property owned by a housing association will be affordable for ever as, say in 20 years time when the property needs further upgrading or modifications, it may be better to sell the whole site to another for re-development rather than insist on refurbishment. It also makes no sense for property that is sold as low cost to remain low cost forever. All this does is ensure that once an individual has bought their low cost unit, they are only then able to buy another low cost unit. It is much better to give this person a step up into the open market.

Modifications: Line 4 of para 5.49 – delete “in perpetuity” and insert “for a period of 15 years or more”

Delete the last sentence of sub-paragraph IV “if the owner wishes to sell the property, the subsidy and a proportion.....purchase the home”. Insert in its place “the amount if the discount be quoted in the title deeds for the property as a burden which amount will reduce annually such that it is zero after a period of 15 years from the date if the purchase he or she will pay to the council the amount of such a figure then outstanding and the council will use the funds to help another individual purchase another affordable house”.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Confirm that the intention is that the house remains affordable for ever, and if there is a need to change from that view, owners could apply to have the restrictive parts of any planning permission etc removed.

Response to 1st modifications

One of my original representations related to the protection of affordable housing in perpetuity, and I note that this is reinforced again in the modification to section 5.47. Whilst it may be a desire and goal, it is just not practical. Over a long period of time I do not believe that any house can remain affordable in perpetuity.

Housing Association houses and council houses are likely, over a very long period of time, to depreciate or become expensive to operate and manage and the preference may be to sell the site and move on to another. The same is true with other affordable houses. To force perpetuity onto the provision of affordable housing is just not terribly realistic.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The issue of retaining affordable housing in perpetuity is considered important by CNPA and this position has not changed. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector
500a

Name Jill Adams
30 Hawthorn Place
Ballater
AB35 5PH

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector 453j
Name Glenmore Properties Ltd
Viewfield Farm
Craigellachie
Aberlour
AB38 9QT

Agent Steve Crawford
Halliday Fraser Munro
8 Victoria Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1XB

Company Glenmore Properties Ltd

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

We believe that this policy is unworkable and onerous. It will discourage development in the Park. Communities Scotland will not be able to fund such development, RSLs will not be able to build this many affordable houses and developers will not accept such onerous requirements. The Plan's own figures do not back up this requirement. On page 42 it states a housing 'need' of 132 units per annum yet this is not taken into account in table 3. Had it been the housing requirement would have been significantly higher. It is also useful to note that housing need assessment is a very contentious issue (Aberdeen City Local Plan Inquiry recently reported, reducing affordable housing requirements from 25% to 10% based on major errors and over-estimates in the housing needs assessment). There is no reason to assume that the National Park should not adhere to national planning policy that suggests 25% as a notional figure.

Allocating land specifically for affordable and key worker housing should be considered a viable alternative to meet any shortfall.

Modifications:

Alter policy wording to be less onerous and consider allocating land specifically for affordable housing.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

We believe that this policy is unworkable and onerous. It will discourage development in the Park. Communities Scotland will not be able to fund such development, RSLs will not be able to build this many affordable houses and developers will not accept such onerous requirements. Although the threshold has been increased to three units, and the percentage contributions decreased, the policy requirements remain too onerous and impractical.

Allocating land specifically for affordable and key worker housing should be considered a viable alternative to meet any shortfall.

The justification for the policy at 5.50 states that 'The contribution (from one and two open market dwellings) would be waived where the developer can demonstrate that the occupant of the house would qualify to access a form of affordable housing within the Park by reason of their housing need or income.' This creates difficulties in terms of a planning application (particularly outline applications) where the developer might sell the site or property on to a marketing agent, and the end occupant is unknown. The occupant may well qualify for affordable housing, but this is unknown at the planning application stage. The requirement for one or two open market dwellings to contribute should therefore be removed.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included. A supplementary note will be prepared to

explain exactly the figures involved in making contributions towards affordable housing. Where the development is for affordable housing, such as the example referred to, no further contribution would be required.

response to 2nd modifications

In respect of our previous correspondence we would wish to maintain our objections as previously detailed to Policy 21

HEARING

Objector 499a	Name E J Procter Clashanruich Glen Gairn Ballater Ab35 5UR	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Dominic Fairlie **Agent**
452d Scotia Homes Ltd
 23 Bridge Street
 Ellon
 AB41 9AA

Company Scotia Homes Ltd

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

It is appreciated that the Cairngorm National Park Authority consider that affordable housing is an issue and a strict policy needs to be in place in order to provide housing for people that live and work within the park, particularly the young people who otherwise leave to find opportunities elsewhere. However, the allocation rates of 50% and 30% are too high.

We agree that all developments over a certain size need to be given every encouragement to provide affordable housing on site as part of the development.

However, the provision of affordable housing on site is not cheap and too high a requirement may well detract from the development as a whole. In our experience affordable housing is best (in terms of the design of a mixed development) at a level of up to 25% within the site. We have no experience at all of affordable levels of up to 50% and have doubts that it will have the desired effect.

Modifications:

Policy 24 para 1 line 4 – delete “will” and insert “may”

Policy 24 para 2 lines 4 & 5 – delete “50%” and insert “30%”

Policy 24 para 3 line 3 – delete “30%” and insert “25%”

Adjust other words to suit (clauses 5.53 and 5.54 in particular)

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

Thank you for your letter dated 22 May 2008 outlining your comments relating to my representations. I agree that you have addressed many of the points I raised. However, I feel that the policies relating to affordable housing may still lead to problems.

The requirement for up to 40% to be provided (albeit with a potential public subsidy) may be just too much in some cases (economically and socially) and may well result in conflict between other objectives in the plan. The plan appears to be asking that developers fund (without subsidy) 25% affordable housing, and even this, is likely to be extremely costly, and more than we have had to provide to date. In addition I note that there is a further policy (Policy 19) relating to the requirement to achieve an extra 15% reduction in carbon emissions beyond 2007 building standards. It will be extremely difficult to achieve all of this as well as meet other design requirements in the plan as each of them will cost considerable amounts of money. There needs to be an amount of flexibility in the wording to allow for circumstances where the commercial case just does not add up.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the

implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included. The approach to carbon emissions is also in line with government guidance on the topic.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector 498a	Name H and BD Wight 8 Pannanich Road Ballater AB35 5PA	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

HEARING

Objector **Name** Mrs Fiona Powell **Agent**
089 I Meadow Gardens
 Hopeman
 Elgin
 IV30 5PN

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

In my opinion this proposal is likely to:

1. place too high a financial burden on the developer
2. force the developer to pass costs on to the purchaser so further increasing the cost of housing
3. stifle the construction industry within the confines of the Cairngorm National Park leading potentially to job losses

Paragraph 5.50: For many individuals a self-build or single development single house is their 'affordable option'. Why should these individuals be required to make a financial contribution towards the cost of other affordable housing? I would suggest that the vast majority of self-builders need every penny of the funds they can raise to fund their own builds. To ask them to make an additional payment towards affordable housing may cause their own plans to become unaffordable to them.

Paragraph 5.59: Nowhere in Paragraph 5.59 does it clearly or definitively indicate how much that the level of financial contribution from single house developments is likely to be. It would have been helpful if a table had been provided to indicate examples based on the differentials between the benchmark cost of a Communities Scotland home and the price of an equivalent unit on the open market. If people are being asked for their opinions, then they should be provided with the clearly defined facts on which they can properly base an opinion.

I can see no justification for introducing the practice of contributions from single house developments to the Angus, Highland and Moray areas of the CNP just because this model is currently employed in the Aberdeenshire Council part of the Park.

Paragraph 5.67: Once again, in order to assist the public, it would have been helpful to have had a definition or explanation of what a Section 75 Agreement is. I have grave reservations here on the basis that linking houses built to rural businesses and its workers could have a serious impact on the value of such properties and could present difficulties for raising mortgages, loans, etc.

What change(s) you are seeking in future modifications to the Local Plan which could resolve your objection:

1. Remove or reduce the requirements on developers to contribute to affordable housing.
2. Remove the requirement for the single development builder to make a financial contribution towards affordable housing.
3. Remove the suggestion of using Section 75 agreements to link single house developments to rural businesses.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Confirm that the contribution would be agreed in protocol with the LAs and board. Seek further detail from Aberdeenshire on the actual figures. Also confirm legal agreements currently exists, and are the only constructive method of ensuring the house remains with the business and is not built and just sold on.

Response to 1st modifications

My apologies for not having responded to you earlier. Thank you for allowing me this opportunity.

I do still have difficulty with the proposal to require builders of "one and two open market dwellings" to make a cash payment towards the meeting of housing need. I take the term "open market dwelling" to include private houses built as a main or single places of residence. Please correct me if I am wrong. If my interpretation is correct, I fear that to ask individuals to have to make a cash payment at a time when all their financial resources are likely to be directed into building their own home is likely to place those individuals under financial strain and could even render their own builds unaffordable.

Furthermore, the document fails to explain how such "cash payments" would be calculated or to give any sort of indication what size of financial contribution is likely to be required of the individual.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

A supplementary note will be prepared to explain exactly the figures involved in making contributions towards affordable housing. Where the development is for affordable housing, such as the example referred to, no further contribution would be required. No further modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector
497a

Name P Brough
Alt Lee, 33 Dee Street
Ballater

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

HEARING

Objector 522a	Name Mr and Mrs Taylor Viewfield 34 Albert Toad Ballater	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** The Crown Estate
4191

Agent Debbie Mackay
Smiths Gore
12 Bernard Street
Edinburgh
EH6 6PY

Company The Crown Estate

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

While my client welcomes actions to promote affordable housing, it is considered that this policy is hugely onerous and likely to be counter productive to the provision of affordable housing across the Park area.

My client objects to the following aspects of the policy;

- The threshold of two or more units - This is against national advice in PAN 74 which states that Local Authorities should seek to achieve on site provision for development of 20 units or more (paragraph 37). Using a threshold of 2 units or more is likely to threaten the viability of many developments.

- The 30% and 50% requirements - The 30% and 50% requirements are against national advice in Planning Advice Note 74 Affordable Housing which sets a benchmark of 25% affordable housing on appropriate sites. The PAN states in paragraph 35 that;

“The Local Authority may also seek a higher percentage on a specific site but this will only be appropriate in exceptional circumstances, for example linked to a substantial release of Greenfield land or on a site owned by the local authority or other public agency which is being released for development”

No such exceptional circumstances have been identified in this situation.

There is a concern that the additional costs created by these 30% and 50% requirements will deter developers and therefore be counter-productive to the achievement of affordable housing in this location. There is also a concern that in order to achieve the required returns on housing sites, developers may have to increase the price of open market properties to enable them to provide the affordable housing. This will create an even greater gap between those able to afford open market housing in the Park area and those who can only enter the housing market through affordable housing.

It is also noted that adjacent local authorities are requiring 25% contributions towards affordable housing. This may attract developers away from the Park.

- The prescriptive nature of the baseline assumption in paragraph 5.52 - PAN 74 identifies the 5 categories of affordable housing and states that it is up to the local housing strategy to provide evidence of the balance between the different categories.

Modifications to resolve this objection -

- The number of units should reflect national advice and be set at 20 units.
- The percentage of affordable housing should reflect national advice and be set at 25%.
- Paragraphs 5.52 and 5.53 should be replaced with a section which gives examples of the categories of affordable housing that may be acceptable. It should also require that a housing needs assessment must be undertaken jointly between the four local authorities.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The need for affordable homes remains a key aim of the local and national park plans and is retained in a revised form in policy 21, supported by the work of the 3Dragons study. The % requirements have been amended accordingly.

Response to 1st modifications

The Policy has improved marginally but is still onerous. The original objection is sustained and a new objection to the First Modifications is set out below. My client objected to Policy 24 Contributions to Affordable Housing in the Finalised Plan. This policy has now changed to Policy 21 whose key elements are;

1. The thresholds which trigger the need for on-site provision of affordable housing has been changed to 3 units or more and the percentage requirements have been altered to 40% where public subsidy is provided and 25% where less than one third of public subsidy is provided.
2. One or two open market dwellings will still trigger an affordable housing contribution and paragraph 5.50 sets out the broad terms of a formula to be used to work out the level of such contributions.
3. The policy now allows for of-site provision to be considered where community needs assessments of similar indicate that this is a better way of meeting housing need.
4. The supporting text in paragraph 5.43 states that a recent study “Planning for Affordable Housing in the Cairngorms National Park” identified a need for 121 affordable dwellings per annum. Policy 21 is designed to support this provision.
5. The policy goes on in paragraph 5.44 to state that the CNPA will work with housing providers to see as high a proportion of affordable as possible between 40% and 100%.
6. Paragraph 5.47 seeks to “retain the units in perpetuity”.

My client is supportive of the provision of affordable housing in the Park and sees it as a vital part of sustaining the local community and economy. However the policy as it stands is unlikely to create the step-change in affordable housing provision which is desirable. My client therefore objects to the following aspects of this proposal;

The threshold of 25% is very challenging in these marginal market areas and 40% is unrealistic. Together with the requirement for every house unit to provide an affordable housing contribution, will jeopardise the economics of many schemes, especially given current market conditions, to the point where schemes will not be able to go ahead and neither market nor affordable housing will be achieved. The “Planning for Affordable Housing in the Cairngorms National Park” Study of March 2008 indeed states in the Executive Summary page v, Paragraph 5 that while a policy of seeking 25% affordable housing quota would appear the most realistic if delivered without housing grant although grant would need to be available if market circumstances change. But at 40% and 50%, grant would “appear to be needed for most circumstances and financial viability must be questionable”.

Pan 74: Affordable Housing recommends that on site provision should be sought for developments of 20 units or more with some discretion for these to be lower in rural areas, however setting the threshold at three units with every unit having to make contributions will threaten the viability of many developments.

The basis on which the Park Authority is going ahead with this policy is therefore highly questionable when the recent study casts doubt over the viability of such schemes.

The desire to “retain the units as affordable in perpetuity” while laudable, does not allow scope for the use of innovative additions to the affordable housing market of the Rural Homes for Rent scheme which retains the new properties on a rented basis for a minimum of 30 years. This scheme has the potential to contribute significantly to increasing the stock of rural affordable homes and should be treated as a mainstream way in which to achieve affordable housing in rural areas.

Proposed amendment -

The percentages of affordable housing should be reduced to no more than the Government benchmark of 25% across the board with scope for alterations should economic conditions worsen and further jeopardise the delivery of housing.

The house limit which triggers on-site contribution should be increased to something much closer to the PAN 74 recommended threshold of 20 units or more.

The requirement for every house unit to contribute to an affordable housing pot should be removed.

The requirement to retain the units as affordable in perpetuity should be adjusted to allow for innovative schemes such as Rural Homes for Rent or equivalent schemes.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included. The retention of affordable provision in perpetuity aims to ensure that the current situation once resolved does not come about again, and the provision does meet the needs of future home buyers.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector 391b
Name David Horsfall
Homes for Scotland
5 New Mart Place
Edinburgh
EH14 1RW
Agent

Company Homes for Scotland

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

We object to the following policy wording: 'Where public subsidy is available to help fund affordable housing the overall affordable contribution of the development will be expected to be 50%, with any shortfall between the public subsidy element and the 50% target made up by the developer.'

We object to the 50% affordable housing requirement on the basis that it will result in landowners refusing to sell their land as a result of unreasonably low site values. PAN 74 paragraph 34 states that a percentage figure should create a climate of certainty and suggests a benchmark figure of 25% of the total number of units.

A high affordable housing requirements will reduce the ability of the private sector to subsidise affordable housing sites. The requirements for 50% affordable housing would result in less spare funding available for common infrastructure costs and build costs. High affordable housing will affect land value and land acquisition will become more difficult.

Furthermore, the affordable housing requirement must be realistic and the subsidised affordable housing should be fully justified with evidence of available public sector funding.

Changes that will resolve this objection –

The policy wording should delete reference to a 50% affordable housing requirement and replace with a 25% requirement to accord with the benchmark set out in PAN 74 paragraph 34.

The percentage requirement must be revised until an up to date housing needs assessment is produced with accurate information from all of the four Local Authorities

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The findings of the work undertaken by the 3Dragons will influence the affordable housing policy and ensure appropriate statistical support for the approach.

Response to 1st modifications

Part 2 - Homes for Scotland object to the requirement for a 40% affordable housing contribution with any shortfall between the public subsidy element and the 40% target made up by the developer. We object to the 40% affordable housing requirement on the basis that it will result in landowners refusing to sell their land as a result of unreasonably low site values. PAN 74 paragraph 34 states that the percentage requirement should create a climate of certainty and suggests a benchmark figure of 25% of the total number of units.

Unreasonably high affordable housing requirements will reduce the ability of the private sector to subsidise affordable housing sites. The requirement for 40% affordable housing is likely to result in less spare funding available for common infrastructure costs and build costs. High affordable housing requirements will also affect land values and land acquisition will become more difficult.

The affordable housing requirement must be realistic and the subsidised affordable housing should be fully justified with evidence of available public sector funding.

The policy wording should delete reference to a 40% affordable housing requirement and replace with a 25% requirement to accord with the benchmark set out in PAN 74 paragraph 34.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Jane Reynard **Agent**
526a East Bank
 50 Albert Road
 Ballater
 AB35 5QU

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector 525a	Name The Occupier Mar Cottage Cambus o May Ballater AB35 5SD	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector 528a	Name Mrs E MacNamee Far Hills, Monaltrie Avenue Ballater AB35 5RY	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

HEARING

Objector	Name James and Evelyn Sunley	Agent
056o	12 Lochnagar Way	
	Ballater	
	AB35 5PB	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

5.57 We are certain that the response the Park received during the Park Plan public consultation exercises; highlighted that the eligibility criteria for affordable housing and social rented housing, to be taken from Local Authority and housing associations housing waiting lists, do not meet the needs of the local people who require affordable housing and have caused considerable anger in the community previously. Means of overcoming the housing allocation policy must be found to help those local people and for incoming essential workers in the National Park in need of affordable housing but whose circumstances do not give them sufficient points to be allocated a house from the national waiting lists.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The role of waiting lists is important in identifying those in need. As CNPA is not the housing authority we must work with the local authorities on the use of waiting lists, and there are clear legal guidelines on this. CNPA will therefore continue to work closely with the LAs to try and secure the most appropriate end for local people in greatest need.

Response to 1st modifications

The modified Park Plan does not address any of the objections that we made, we therefore continue our objections and ask you to think again.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The CNPA continue to work with the local housing authorities to influence allocations policies. This is work done in tandem with the local plan. No further amendment is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Thank you for your letter dated 5th Nov. 2008 with regard to the arrangements for the Local Plan inquiry and the further modifications to the Local Plan. I refer you to the changes indicated in appendix page 8 of your letter and point out that "page 68 , Ballater ..."is in fact page 72, page 68 refers to Kingussie. I further point out that the change to 16.2ha from the original 10.99ha, is a change due to the inclusion by CNPA of areas E2, and E3 areas which did not form part of development land on the Aberdeenshire CC Local Plan. This change should be properly delineated as a change from the ACC Local Plan.

With regard to my intentions with regard to the Reporters enquiry, it is decide on this matter but will probably follow the informal route.

HEARING

Objector
496a

Name Katrina Wimbush
32 Craigview Place
Ballater
AB35 5PJ

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** James Clark **Agent**
511a Pineviews, 6 Pannanich Road
Ballater

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
507a	Mane Fraser 20 Sir Patrick Geddes Way Ballater AB35 5PG	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector
509a

Name A Esson
12 Craigview Place
Ballater

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** The Proprietors of Mar Centre
394j

Agent Steve Crawford
Halliday Fraser Munro
8 Victoria Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1XB

Company The Proprietors of Mar Centre

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

We note that the requirement for affordable housing contributions has been reduced in this revised policy. How this will work in reality is debatable, especially given the current economic climate and we therefore object to this policy until further clarification is presented at the seminar on 27 August, which HFM will be attending.

Changes Required to Resolve the Objection

Not known as yet.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure affordable units in a way which creates a level playing field for all developers, and reflect the various funding streams which may be available. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation. The policy is therefore to be modified to seek between 25-40% where public funding is available, and 25% where less than one third is available. Support for developments which are completely affordable will also be included.

response to 2nd modifications

This policy has been altered following the completion of a couple of recent reports for the CNPA and the Scottish Government. Even having attended the recent seminar on the issue in Tomintoul the policy implications are still complex. It is difficult to work out how such a policy will be implemented. In that respect we maintain our client's objection to this policy unless we are able to consider it in more depth.

HEARING

Objector
529a

Name E Black
1 Deebank Court, Deebank Road
Ballater

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Lesley McL...	Agent
506a		18 Sir Patrick Geddes Way	
		Ballater	
		AB35 5PG	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Fred Vincent	Agent
512a		40 Old Station Road	
		Ballater	
		AB35 5RG	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
440	Hamish Jack Rhuarden Croft Rhonan PH24 3BY	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

The recent and well attended discussion group chaired by Professor Shucksmith and Fergus Ewing MSP raised many points of interest and offered suggestions of value as to how we can all contribute to the further success of our National Park development.

I attended, on behalf of my group, the Spey Valley Crofters Association, and have subsequently furthered our interest with other group representatives.

I was able to take the moment to show our speakers my own small croft and the contribution I believe it could make in this endeavour.

My Croft:

This is of nine acres holding a spread of Birch and Pine plus a great deal of heather and gorse. The croft is geographically on the southern limit of Nethybridge sited beyond the group of dwellings known as Cotterton Beg, Monduie, Squirrel Cottage, Tall Pines and set back on the lane/track that leads to An Tealack and on to the Ranch House, the track leads off from the B970.

I am minded to make the croft, or part, as permitted under your master plan for the area, available for development of affordable housing units responding to the cultural needs noted in National Park publication plan 2007.

My thoughts go beyond the building of these dwellings but to create a model of what can be a style for the future of other similar sites within our Park — the opportunities within the 3800 km area are obviously there.

I offer a brief outline of the possible development and trust you will be encouraged to grant me an interview — at a time and place of your choosing, when such a project can be further discussed.

The influence I bring to bear is as the result of such historical creations as that by Architect Clough Williams—Ellis circa 1920, at the now world famous visitor attraction of: Port Merrion, N..Wales and created on previous scrubland.

Other examples have impressed me as for instance:

The Frys Factory, Sommerdale near Bath; The Bournville Village by Cadbury, Birmingham; The Taylor Mills at Bradford, and the Mill at Coatbridge, all inspired housing creations in landscaped settings.

It is my conviction, with all the feeling one develops from the four hundred year history of my family, farming, foresting and crofting in the Spey Valley, that the opportunity is there for us to grasp that will both serve a desperate need for the first time home hungry buyers who search for a rung on a ladder that all too often, is not there, and to serve the ever growing tourist interests fast becoming our first Industry.

In order to get such a project off the ground I propose making any dwelling plots available at a price of circa £30,000.00 this level will counter the impossible for the young workers house prices that over the decade have plused with never matching inflation on the wage market.

The dwellings too while being sound, attractive and desirable will use the latest materials viz insulation and materials and would call on co-operation from University Building faculty as did the notable Milton Keynes 'green' housing developments by the 'corporation' as constructor and University of London as designers. The result

being homes that cost no more than £50 per year in heating costs and use recycled waste in various beneficial ways. This clever development is now in its 25th year and is an outstanding example of material use and technology with heat exchange units and the like. There have been many subsequent benefits and material developments.

I hope Sir, that you feel we have the nub of an idea worthy of pursuing regarding planning needs and that you can find a slot in your diary to meet with me.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The plan allocates sufficient land for housing development, and there is no need therefore to include additional land such as that suggested.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The CNPA position regarding affordable housing has not changed, and opportunities remain in place for affordable housing outside settlement boundaries. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
505a	Robert Moir 14 Sir Patrick Geddes Way Ballater AB35 5PG	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector
494a

Name Susan Donald
24 Craigview Place
Ballater

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Mr J Cooper & Ms M Majzlikova **Agent**
523a 7 Richmond Place
 Ballater
 AB35 5GS

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector
495a

Name Mary Murchie
28 Craigview Place
Ballater

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector
491a

Name Mr and Mrs McKechive
Cambus O May Hotel

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Ballater (RD) Ltd
076b 7 Bridge Street
 Ballater
 AB35 5QP

Agent Bryan Wright
Pronybeg
Ballater
AB35 5XB

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

**CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications
response to 2nd modifications**

Second, we refer to page 40, paragraph 5.28. The late addition of the identity of two important sources of information on such a critical matter as housing demand, at this late stage in the consultation process, is not acceptable and we wish to register an objection, on the grounds that it leaves too little time for concerned parties in the Community to examine these information sources in order to assure themselves of the integrity of the decisions made by the CNPA with respect to housing matters. We therefore request that, now these information sources have been revealed, the second modifications be given a further period of consultation.

Third, we refer to page 43, policy 21, 2nd paragraph. In principle, we endorse the new statement that “Development solely for affordable housing will be favourably considered”, if this is accompanied by withdrawal of site H1 for housing allocation. If site H1 is retained for housing allocation, then we object to the new statement, on the grounds that it implies the building of public sector housing which would be additional to the housing at site H1. With respect to the concept of “Development solely for affordable housing” we would urge the CNPA to apply more creative energy than has been evident so far to this approach to addressing the real housing issue that confronts Ballater which is access to affordable housing for local people. We strongly suspect that the concept of “Development solely for affordable housing” could offer a more cost effective route (in terms of the net unit cost of affordable homes) to satisfying the needs of Ballater people for affordable housing than that achievable under the current CNPA strategy, which involves paying large public subsidies to a developer to damage the environment of Ballater by building houses which the Community does not need or want. Further, we believe that, if the concept of “Development solely for affordable housing” were combined with the removal of Ballater area H1 from the housing land allocation, and efforts were made vigorously to pursue opportunities for intelligent “brown field” and infill developments, then the recommendation by the Prince’s Foundation of 28 September 2007, that “social housing should not be clustered in groups of more than about 5 units to avoid creation of social divides” could be achieved more naturally than would be possible with mass development in area H1. It would also give the added benefit of resolving much of the public opposition regarding the housing proposals for Ballater, provided area H1 and the land beyond it is dedicated to amenity/recreational use in perpetuity.

Fourth, we refer to page 43, policy 21, 2nd paragraph. We object to the change of wording from:

“Where public funding is available to help fund affordable housing, the overall affordable contribution of the development will be expected to be 40%, with any shortfall between the public subsidised element and 40% target to be made up by the developer”

to:

“Where public funding is available to help provide affordable housing, between 25% and 40% of all units will be expected to be affordable”.

This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in the terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers.

Further, it jeopardises the realisation of the reasonable aspirations of local people for access to affordable housing. The reason given for this change (current market conditions) does not appear to justify the CNPA's increasingly lavish generosity towards the developer with tax payers' money. This is especially worrying, as there appears to be only one developer in contention for the associated work. The combination of non-competitive arrangements for developer selection, together with sudden and significant changes in the financial incentives for the sole developer, must surely be a cause for public concern for proper appropriation of public funds. It may also raise concerns in relation to compliance with EU legislation. We request that this change be reversed, or that a comprehensive statement of the sums involved be included in an amendment to the second modifications, to be re-issued for a further period of consultation, thereby enabling the public to assure itself of the financial integrity and equitability of the proposals.

Fifth, we refer to page 46, paragraph 5.58, 2nd sentence. We object to the reference made to the findings of the report "Planning for Affordable Housing in the Cairngorms National Park" by Communities Scotland, March 2008, as the reference for the declared approach, which is to take a benchmark of 75% two and three bed units in the absence of firm information on specific housing needs. This is not appropriate, because a) it is not supported by the statements made in the referenced report and) recent inquiries to Aberdeenshire Council showed that, at 1st October 2008, of all applicants for housing in Ballater (as a location of first choice) 67% requested Ballater one bedroom units and 22% sought two bed units. AB35 5PJ

We offer this finding as new evidence. It appears that the adoption of 75% two and three bed units is clearly inappropriate. Notwithstanding the fact that the adoption of the figure of 75% was part of the Local Plan prior to the second modifications now under consultation, we request that the CNPA take appropriate steps to reconcile these inconsistencies in a manner which appropriately reflects the significance of the potential for errors in the associated cost figures. We note also, with some concern, that paragraph 5.57 makes reference to the increase in the number of households being dominated by one and two person households,

INQUIRY

Objector	Name	Agent
538a	Capt J Schuneman Cut-a-way Cottage Cambus o May Ballater AB35 5SD	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

I wish to register my objections to the CNP local plan in its entirety concerning the proposal to build houses on the green field site to the east of Ballater, destroying and denying to future generations, one of the few remaining jewels left in the Highlands of Scotland.

However, and more specifically I wish you to acknowledge and register my objections to amendments 1 and 2, policy 30 (complete) and policy 21 (2nd and 3rd para) concerning the provision of sites for gypsies/travellers and travelling show people. And also respectively the reduction from 40% to 25% or less of affordable homes by any future developer depending on available public funding.

It would appear that whilst attempting to 'bend over backwards' and attract developers at any cost, you would also like the public to pay for this gross folly. As office holders and bearers of the future of our Park, you should be asking 'what can they do for you, and not what can you do for them'!

On this matter and as an entity the CNPA not only show a distinct lack of awareness of three of your stated and mandated aims:

1. to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area
2. to promote sustainable use of natural resources of the area
3. to promote understanding and enjoyment (including enjoyment in the form of recreation) of the special qualities of the area by the public.

But also a poor understanding of the rudiments of business! Will it actually enhance the environs of Ballater? Quite plainly no! will it pour money into the developers pockets? Yes! What then is your legacy to future generations.

What is quite plain to everyone is that this is a 'top down' easy solution rather than 'bottom up' endeavour i.e. the landowners and the developer have laid it all out before the CNPA saving your months if not years of honest work, office holders must now ask themselves at what point will you acknowledge manipulation.

Although a set quota of affordable homes are most definitely required for the Cairngorms national park, these do not need to be built on 'green field' sites there being many brown sites available with existing infrastructure already in place and crying out for development, which would truly enhance and benefit our environment.

Yes we want our local people to live in affordable homes and stay in the area but the answer is not to destroy a truly unique highland village in the process we do not wish it and nor would they want it in their name.

HEARING

Objector	Name	Victor Jordan	Agent
537d		2 Oakleigh Albert Road Ballater AB35 5QL	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

Page 43 policy 21 2nd para the proposed wording is ambiguous. I suggest "The developer will be required to provide 25% of the units on a site as affordable housing".

Page 44 para 5.44 3rd sentence I object to the removal of the sentiment of the third sentence. I suggest that following the precedent set by the new second paragraph of policy 21, the third sentence should read "in doing so schemes which promote 40% of units as affordable housing for which local people will be preferred will be favourably considered".

Page 44 para 5.46 I object to the removal of the phrase in question which is consistent as it stands with policy 21 as modified by the 2nd modifications

INQUIRY

Objector	Name	Agent
536	Mr and Mrs S Barns 12 Monaltrie Close Ballater AB35 5PT	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

We would like to submit our objection to the planned building of 250 houses to the northeast of Monaltrie Park Ballater as detailed in the CNPA Local Plan 2nd amendment.

Our objections are as follows:

1. regarding the amendment to page 40 para 5.28 – why was the identity of the publications omitted from the Deposit CNP Local Plan initial issue? we wish to strongly object to the withholding of the source of important documents that the housing policy has been based on.

This action has misled us into not submitting objections within the timescale permitting objections. As there could obviously be other residents similar to us, we submit that the consultation period should be recommenced to allow for new objections to be submitted.

Reason: these documents clearly contain information that demonstrates there is no requirement for an additional 250 houses to be built in the village of Ballater.

2. page 43 policy 21 2nd para – we are appalled by this dramatic change and we cannot understand why. Affordable housing for local people is the one item that Ballater needs and craves. We considered the 40% to be barely acceptable considering the makeup of the Ballater village and the greater requirement. But previously we envisaged that the 40% mark was guaranteed as the developer would fund these houses out of their own finances, because we suspect that it is most unlikely that there will be any public funding available.

But the change to “Where public funding is available to help provide affordable housing between 25% and 40% of all units will be expected to be affordable” is completely unacceptable as it puts no onus on the developer to supply affordable housing at all.

In summary we are shocked and horrified by the impact these changes will have on supplying what Ballater requires. It is our belief that they are so enormous to insist that the Cairngorms National park Local Plan be withdrawn. It should then be reviewed also taking into consideration the dramatic effect that the world wide recession is having and reissued as the formal deposit Cairngorms National Park Local Plan and recommence the start of the formal statutory process at that point.

HEARING

Objector
535a

Name Gordon Chaplin
6 Morven Way
Ballater
AB35 5SF

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the late change and reduction in the number of affordable houses contained in the local plan and would ask why this has occurred at such a late date. I came to live in Ballater in the summer of 2006 and was therefore unaware of the rise in planned housing. I has acquired a copy of the finalised Aberdeenshire Local Plan together with your October 2005 CNP Local Plan and noticed at the time the area H1 for planned future development, was similar in both documents. I was unaware of any further actions on the plan, until I was invited to attend a meeting at the end of September about 250 new houses in Ballater.

In a subsequent meeting which was attended by National Park representatives much emphasis was placed by them on the legal requirement for public notification of your actions. I have no doubt that you have observed the letter of the law but would question whether much energy was expended in also observing the spirit of the law.

WRITTEN

Objector
492a

Name Mr and Mrs Hempseed
Hazeldene, 26 Queens Road
Ballater
AB35 5NJ

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
532	W J Romilly Allandale, Morven Way Ballater AB35 5SF	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

My concern as regards the above is with particular reference to Ballater. Where the argument presented by the Planning Department is that the planned housing development of some 95 houses is necessary in order that low cost housing might be provided within the scheme.

However I note that there is now a change. Page 43 Policy 21 whereby the percentage of affordable housing required by the developer to provide has now been reduced from around 40% to as low as 25%.

Equally the thought of an increase to the number of private houses what will result to almost 70 within the development, being for occupation for the retired or holiday homes is not exactly a dynamic vision for Ballater in the future.

So it is to this changed and reduced figure of 25% that I wish to register my formal objection.

HEARING

Objector	Name	Agent
527a	Mrs W Sim Culardoch Sheag, 47a Braemar Ballater AB35 5RQ	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
531a	Graham Adams Heathcourt, Morven Way Ballater AB35 5SF	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons.

I. the changes are significant and wide ranging. You have stated in correspondence on the changes that the 'changes focus mainly on points of clarification and error' this is clearly not the case. For instance the changes to Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. At a recent meeting with the deputy convenor (Mr Eric Baird) to discuss the second amendments he consistently stated that the affordable housing would be 40% but that there would be no guarantee of any figure. The CNPA representative also said that the CNPA had no funding available and that allowing developers to build profitable houses was the only way to create affordable housing. This conflicts with the information in the Local Plan FAQs.

HEARING

Objector 490a	Name Mr and Mrs MacAllister The Birches Invercauld Road Ballater AB35 5RP	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector 524a	Name The Occupier Roaring Stag Linn of Dee Road, Corriemulzie Road Braemar AB35 5YB	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector 530a	Name The Occupier Rinelen, Glen Gairn Ballater	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector
510a

Name Linda Johnston
4 Craigview Road
Ballater

Agent

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I wish to object to the modifications affecting Ballater for several reasons:

1. Policy 21 significantly reduces the possible quantity of affordable housing from 40% to 25%. This change appears to represent a significant relaxation in terms offered to the developer, and an unacceptable increase in the burden on UK tax payers. Further it puts at risk the reasonable aspirations of local people to access affordable housing.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
533	Mr and Mrs Burrows 15 Pannanich Road Ballater AB35 5PA	

Company

Policy/site Policy 21

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

I would like to express my objections to the changes within the Second Modifications as they seem at odds with the stated aim of the need for affordable homes within the National Park. I take as my reason the removal of targeted percentages within this modification in 5.44 and 5.46. Within the original submission between 99 and 132 affordable homes were flagged per annum in 5.31, thus taken over the time of the plan takes this to between 1990 and 1320 units. Taking your calculations in table 4 of 3365 units means that to achieve your stated goal that between 29 and 39% of build will have to be affordable, therefore the removal of percentages devalues the objective and I feel needs re-enforcing not watering down to benefit a developer.

Secondly your changes to Policy 21 are at odds whereby your paragraph starting "Development solely for affordable housing will be favourably considered" concludes "where public funding is available to help provide affordable housing, between 25% and 40% of all units will be expected to be affordable." This is contradiction as it is either a development solely for affordable housing or it is a mixed development, your changes have created a hybrid that means nothing and needs rewriting to read "development solely for affordable housing will be favourably considered".

HEARING