

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Ballater HI</b>		
<b>Objector(s):</b>	Mr & Mrs Houston	<b>Objection ref(s):</b>	096
	Mr & Mrs Sunley		056
	Mr B Wright		076
	Mr P Swan		462
	Mr H Wight		401
	Mr J Lovie		488

<b>Reporter</b>	Mr. Hugh Begg
<b>Procedure:</b>	Informal hearing

## Rebuttal

- 1.0 **(096), (056), (076), (462), (401), (488) General Statement:** These objectors have submitted a combined case. As well as specific reference to Ballater HI, the case also makes reference to housing land supply and affordable housing. Any rebuttals to these elements have been made under the relevant headings and/or policy. This rebuttal is specific to Ballater HI.
- 1.2 **(096), (056), (076), (462), (401), (488) Objection:** Para. 3.4.2 states that the immediate solution is small infill or other small sites for provision of affordable, mainly rented housing.
- 1.3 **CNPA Rebuttal:** The Local Plan does not preclude the use of infill sites for affordable housing if they are brought forward meet other policies in the Plan. The need for housing, including affordable, in Upper Deeside has been clearly set out in the Plan and in Topic Paper 3 (CD7.20) with reference to various studies that have been carried out and the CNPA is not aware of other effective sites available to provide the numbers required. The objection looks at Ballater as a self-contained housing market area: this does not accord with SPP3 and other Scottish Government Planning Policy. Ballater HI along with other sites in Braemar will contribute to meeting the housing requirement for Upper Deeside for the Plan period and beyond.
- 1.4 **(096), (056), (076), (462), (401), (488) Objection:** Para. 3.4.5 refers to mechanisms used elsewhere to provide housing for people with a local link and suggest that they be considered in Ballater.
- 1.5 **CNPA Rebuttal:** Topic Paper 3 (CD7.20) highlights that the CNPA policy on housing has evolved over the last few years and has taken account of these type of policies. The Plan does not preclude the use of such restrictions in appropriate circumstances, but they will not deliver the number of houses required or necessarily make them affordable. The CNPA continues to work with RSLs and Local Authorities to ensure that allocation policies reflect local circumstances as far as they are able.
- 1.6 **(096), (056), (076), (462), (401), (488) Objection:** Section 4 raises issues relating to flood risk. The objectors consider that there are unresolved flooding issues, that CNPA has not had proper regard for SPP7, and question the appropriateness of a prospective developer carrying out the Flood Risk Assessment.
- 1.7 **CNPA Rebuttal:** The CNPA has liaised with SEPA throughout the Local Plan process. On 16 April in a submission to the LPI SEPA revised its position and withdrew the objection to the allocation subject to a number of conditions. The CNPA is currently considering if this will have

any impact on the allocation and if necessary will update its position by the date of the hearing at the latest.

- 1.8 **(096), (056), (076), (462), (401), (488) Objection:** Section 5 considers that development on HI will have a detrimental impact on the tourism economy.
- 1.9 **CNPA Rebuttal:** The objection presupposes that development will be of a poor quality and will detract from the setting of the village. The text in the Plan makes it quite clear that there are high expectations with regard to design and the masterplan approach will ensure that proposals enhance the setting and the character of Ballater.
- 1.10 **(096), (056), (076), (462), (401), (488) Objection:** Section 6 makes reference to access and is concerned at the impact of roads on Monaltrie Avenue and environs. There is reference to Designing Streets and the Princes Foundation Work.
- 1.11 **CNPA Rebuttal:** The masterplan process and close involvement of the local authority highways department will ensure that issues to do with access are dealt with taking into account the types of issue raised in the objections. There has been no decision taken on access at this stage and no proposals have been tabled. The Princes Foundation work was preliminary and merely indicative.

## 2.0 Conclusion

- 2.1 The objections relate to the principle and scale of the allocation and the potential detailed impacts of its implementation on the character, economy and infrastructure of Ballater. It has been demonstrated that the principle is justified and the concerns over detail can be addressed via the masterplanning and design process.

## 3.0 CNPA Commendation to Reporter

- 3.1 It is commended to the Reporter that the objections to Ballater HI as listed above are rejected. No issues are raised that could lead the Cairngorms National Park Authority to consider the approach deficient.