

20 JUL 2020

David & Dr Z G Erskine  


Your Ref LPD2021 NN

**Objection to Proposal for Development at Site OP3, Inchmarlo**  
**(Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan 2021, Notification of Publication of the Proposed Local Development Plan 2020)**




14<sup>th</sup> July 2020


Whilst aware that planning permission was granted back in 2015, the most recent proposals are not the same, and in no way should they be allowed to be 'noddled through'.


Kirkwood homes want 100 houses - the original application was for 70 houses in East Mains (although this was subsequently increased to 85).

The original stipulation was that not a single house could be occupied until the hotel was built and operational –  without this clause the developers would wriggle out of their commitments.

Kirkwood Homes want a 'relaxation' of this stipulation. In fact, they will not even be building the hotel ! They want to get in and get out avoiding any further responsibility.

I would like to remind everybody that the original application was a controversial proposal, not least because it would be on land outwith the Local Plan; and the very main reason for the housing development was  to altruistically generate funds to build this fabulous, global destination, McCulloch Unique Hotel (MUH) - the Royal Whisky Lodge, which was going to turn the area in to a holiday paradise. (  is the entrepreneur behind the original Malmaison chain, and the Dakota Hotels).

I would urge you to read the mission statement from  the spokesman and enabler for the original proposals, where he waxes lyrical as to the benefits of the development, very firmly fixed to MUH. They were to create a 'world destination of repute'. The 3 Banchory councillors voted against the application, but councillors from far outside the area voted it through.

Kirkwood homes want the original stipulations 'relaxed', and also to build more than the original allocation of houses. Can this work both ways ? Can the original objectors call for the housing allocation to be reduced ? And if not, why not ? As it is, the council and planners have seen fit to reclassify the 42 Inchmarlo holiday 'lets' as mainstream housing, increasing significantly the housing allocation in the immediate area. Additionally, Forty houses have planning approval on the old Glen 'a Dee site (of course, as is their want, the developers then  wanting 100 houses to cover their costs.....!). Plus the 10 houses in Auldeer Wood (loosely linked to the Kirkwood development), plus what looks like 12

20 JUL 2020

additional 'Lodges' attached to the [REDACTED] hotel (which will also probably end up as mainstream housing). Add this all up, plus the East Mains development and we are looking at an influx of around 1000 on the opposite side of Banchory from all the amenities. How sensible and sustainable is that ?

There will be no walking to school from this area. Are Kirkwood homes going to pay for pupil transportation ? Or will that be down to the locals to support through their Council Tax ? The Kirkwood Homes Representative assured us that there was adequate schooling provision. That is not what we hear from our contacts.

Can the surgery cope with an additional 1000 patients ? Have you tried getting an appointment recently ?

Our understanding is that the main Banchory sewage plant cannot and will not be able to cope with additional housing over and above what was originally approved.

And the Kirkwood Homes representative admitted that the present sewage provision in East Mains has problems. Let's not allow East Mains to be turned into a problematic sewage issue. Rainwater drainage could also be an undeclared issue, with talk of large sumps next to Holly Leaf Cottage.

Are Kirkwood Homes going to pay for road improvement ? I don't want my council tax going towards unnecessary expenditure.

This ribbon, roadside development up Glassel Road is as ridiculous now as it was at the time of the approval. Going way back 30 years to when our house was built on a gap site, the stipulation of the then councillors was that there would be no further roadside development. Now a cart and horses has been driven between all that was agreed, and Local Plans have been totally disregarded. And now they seek 'relaxation' of previous agreements and want permission for ADDITIONAL housing. It's not on.

Not one single house in excess of that already approved should be allowed to be built, and there should be no relaxation of the stipulation that not one single house can be occupied before the Hotel is built and operational.

Remember, there never was an urgent need for this housing ( we seem to have somehow survived the last 5 years without it ) and the approval was totally linked to the promised 5 star plus hotel.

David & Zenab Erskine

Carolyn Irvine [REDACTED]

PS: The same numerous letters of original objection are still pertinent, and Aberdeenshire Council ([REDACTED] Head of Planning and Environmental Service) should refer to these and take them in to account without us resubmitting our original objections).

Also, see attached letter of 9<sup>th</sup> July 2020 in which we seek clarification of what seems to be our misunderstanding that the OP3 development that you refer to, had already been approved ??? Please explain.

20 JUL 2020

20 JUL 2020

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 09 July 2020 16:48  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** <ldp@aberdeenshire.gov.uk>  
**Attach:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Aberdeenshire Council letter Ref: LDP2021 NN - Proposal for development at Site OP3, Inchmarlo.  
Aberdeenshire proposed LDP includes proposals for development at site OP3

9th July 2020

Dear Councillors,

Please see the attached letter dated 02 March 2020.

You may recall that your response was that you could not comment until the Planning Application was made.

We, and our fellow objectors, are puzzled that what we thought was an approved housing plan has reverted to a Local Development Plan 'Proposal'.

Our main objection to the very original application (now referred to as 'OP3', 85 homes, tourism leisure and business – Hotel and Hotel Lodges on land at East Mains and Auldeer Wood) was that the development was on land not zoned for development in the Local Plan. Now it seems the Planning & Environment Service want the next local plan to include this development, thereby cleverly demolishing the main objection. It looks like a ruse the import of which has possibly escaped the attention of the locals in East Mains. It is very confusing – as far as we were aware OP3 was already approved but the latest developer wanted the number of allocated houses to be increased to 100, and the clause insisting on development of the Hotel to be removed. This, as far as we were concerned was the main issue. But now we are being asked to comment on a plan that is already approved, suggesting that we can influence development at OP3. Well, if the issue is, at this late stage, that it is not in the LDP, why was approval granted in the first place. And are they suggesting that this development can be stopped in its tracks because it contravenes the present LDP? I don't recall this site being identified for development in the previous Plan (2017), and incorporated in to this Plan. It can be very wearying keeping pace with all these machinations. On what grounds can we object to an approved Local Plan?

Yours sincerely

David and Zenab Erskine [REDACTED]

Carolyn Irvine [REDACTED]