

**Application for full planning permission for
the partial change of use of a cottage from
holiday accommodation to also allow
occupation by essential worker.**

Site: PKC, Spittal of Glenshee, Leanoch Cottage

Prepared by: John Wright (BSc Hons) MRICS

Prepared for: Dalmunzie Estate Ltd

Date: 18 March 2024

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	3
2.0	SUMMARY	3
3.0	NPF4.....	3
4.0	LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (LDP)	3
5.0	PLANNING HISTORY.....	5
6.0	CONSTRAINTS	6
7.0	CONCLUSION.....	6

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Wright Planning & Development Ltd (WPDL) are instructed by Dalmunzie Estate Ltd to prepare a planning supporting statement for submission with an application for full planning permission for the partial change of use of existing holiday accommodation to allow occupation by an essential worker (underkeeper for the Estate) and to provide flexibility in the future should the Under Keeper position no longer be required.

The property is located in Perth & Kinross Council Area, but also within and on the edge of the Cairngorms National Park planning area. It is situated on the western edge of Spittal of Glenshee within Perth and Kinross. It is at the southeastern edge of Dalmunzie Estate and is referred to as Gamekeepers Cottage. It is accessed via a private track leading from Old Military Road off the A93.

The site measures 530sqm and is an existing cottage (measuring approx 80sqm) which has recently been changed from residential to holiday accommodation (under 22/00269/FLL now implemented) and is next to the head keepers house (currently under construction).

2.0 SUMMARY

The house consented for the Head Keeper and his family is being built at present, having been implemented in October 2023. The business now also requires an Under Keeper, who has been recruited and employed, but requires housed and this would most logically be achieved near the head keeper, kennels, storage and machinery, if possible.

Whilst Leonach Cottage was considered too small and too costly to extend/alter to accommodate the Head Keeper and his family, it could (subject to this change) accommodate the Under Keeper (who has no family) whilst continuing to accommodate holiday makers should the Under Keeper no longer be required. Whilst the bedroom would be accommodated at first floor level, a bedroom could be accommodated on the ground floor, if required in the future.

We believe that this proposal has significant benefit to the Estate and Park generally and should be favourably considered.

3.0 NPF4

The National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) is the Scottish Government's long-term spatial strategy with a comprehensive set of national planning policies. This strategy sets out how to improve people's lives by making sustainable, liveable and productive spaces.

NPF4 was adopted on 13 February 2023. NPF4 has an increased status over previous NPFs and comprises part of the statutory development plan.

As the property lies in the Remote Rural area (Scottish Government 6 fold urban rural classification) Policy 17: Rural Homes (c) is considered most relevant to this proposal, and it expresses support for new homes where the proposal supports and sustains existing fragile communities; supports identified local housing outcomes; and is suitable in terms of location, access, and environmental impact.

We believe this proposal meets these requirements and complies with Policy 17.

4.0 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (LDP)

Within the National Park boundary applications are submitted to the relevant Local Authority who apply the Cairngorms National Park Policies in determining planning applications within the Park boundary unless the application is called in for determination by the Park Authority.

4.1 Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan (26 March 2021)

The CNP LDP describes Glenshee as a small, dispersed community and notes that development here should be of a small scale, organic nature designed to meet local need. We have provided our commentary on the policy base inset in italics below.

This proposal is small scale, organic in nature and designed to meet a local need on an existing long established rural business that already contributes significantly to the aims of the settlement and park generally.

The settlement objectives are stated as being to support development that enhances the visitor experience and compliments the role of Glenshee as a focus for visitors and supports a thriving community. The only developer contributions noted to be collected are stated as being towards affordable housing (25%) which in this case would be a commuted sum.

As the commuted sum has been paid in relation to the parent consent, and this proposal is for essential worker housing, and visitor accommodation, rather than unrestricted Class 9 (this is controlled by the description of development and would require a change of use if it were to be occupied as Class 9) and taking in to account the small accommodation limiting the occupancy we would not expect a contribution to be required in this instance.

Policy 1 states that all new housing should meet the requirements for the settlement (noted above) and reinforce and enhance the character of the settlement.

This proposal would meet the stated requirements for the settlement and make no change to the dispersed character of the settlement.

Within the countryside (1.3), proposals which are necessary for, or improve, the operational and economic viability of an active business which has a locational requirement directly linked to the countryside; or it is on a brownfield site will be supported.

The Dalmunzie Estate has an operational requirement for an Under Keeper on the Estate, to assist the Head Keeper, and be centrally located to their work (close to equipment and vehicles), particularly during adverse weather (snow, wind, rain etc.) due to the impact that can have in this area on the ability to travel around the locality and property generally.

This proposal would therefore improve the operational viability (responding directly to the locational need of the under keeper) of a long established and active business in the area and a significant contributor to the aims of the area.

All other alterations to the building have previously been approved and the permission implemented.

The aims of Policy 1 are to maintain high quality sustainable places in a way that makes best use of resources and is compatible with the unique natural heritage and landscape qualities of the park. Proposals for staff accommodation associated with a specific business will be supported where it meets the policies of the plan.

We believe that the current proposal before you presents an ability to meet a local need in an area already containing development whilst making the best out of the situation by securing the required accommodation, whilst maintaining flexibility when the under keeper is no longer required to revert to holiday use.

Policy 2 at 2.4 states that proposals which support or extend the economy, or which enhance the range and quality of economic opportunities or facilities, will be considered favourably where they; have no adverse environmental or amenity impacts on the site or neighbouring areas; are compatible/complementary with existing business activity in the area; and support the vitality and viability of the local economy.

Should this proposal be granted, there would be no loss to the housing stock, a local housing need would be met, and an additional, sufficiently different offering to the tourism market delivered with its associated positive spin off benefits to the locality. If refused, the Under Keeper would need to be housed elsewhere in the locality reducing the overall stock of housing in the locality.

As with previous applications on this site, there will be no impact on residential amenity or neighbouring areas.

Policy 3 relates to Design & Placemaking and requires that all developments meet the six qualities of successful places (distinctive; safe and pleasant; welcoming; adaptable; resource efficient; and easy to move around and beyond).

Whilst this applies to all proposals, as there is no physical change to the currently approved proposal (which has been implemented) we do not consider Policy 3 to apply here (or at least that it has previously been considered and deemed to comply).

5.0 PLANNING HISTORY

The property has been subject to 3 planning applications previously, as follows:

- 17/02176/FLL – Alterations and extension to dwellinghouses. Refused (not called in by CNP).

This proposal had been subject to pre-application consultation (Ref: 17/00782/PREAPP) which highlighted the increase in ridge line would result in the extension dominating (and being alien to) the existing house to its detriment.

The reason for refusal was that the proposal was contrary to Policy 1.7 due to the scale and unbalanced design not being in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing property.

The Councils preference here was for an extension to be subsidiary to the original building and should set the ridgeline below the existing to create a distinct separation.

There were no objections or landscape, amenity, roads or access, drainage or flooding issues raised in considering this proposal. There were no developer contributions sought. The economic impact of this proposal was considered to be minimal and limited to the construction phase.

- 18/00606/FLL – Alterations and extension to dwellinghouses. Approved (not called in by CNP).

This proposal had been subject to pre-application consultation (Ref:18/00161/PREAPP) and attempted to address the previous reason for refusal through reducing the ridge line but lagrley leaving the proposal as previously. No issues raised by consultees, and no objections.

This proposal was considered to be compliant with CNP Policy and an appropriate addition to the cottage. This proposal lapses on 29th May 2021.

- 22/00269/FLL - Change of use of dwellinghouse to holiday accommodation and erection of a dwellinghouse. This was approved and has been implemented, and it is this permission that we seek to amend to allow for occupation by essential workers as well as holiday makers.

6.0 CONSTRAINTS

We can confirm that the property is not identified on the SEPA Flood Map as being at risk of flooding from surface water, rivers or the sea in an extreme event.

We can confirm that the HES mapping confirms that the property is identified as both a Canmore (Inscribed lintel Stone C17th) and a Historic Environment Record (as a “find spot”). The lintel stone is noted as being “reused” and possibly relocated from the Lairds House at Dalmunzie. The areas surrounding the property are considered to contain remnants of former farming activities including a kiln, building and rig and furrow features.

The Nature Scot Mapping confirms that there are no protected designations on the property, and none in sufficient proximity to influence development of the property.

The Land Capability for Agriculture Mapping confirms that the land is not prime quality agricultural land being Grade 5.1.

The Ancient Woodland Inventory shows that the property is not identified as being Ancient or Semi Natural of Plantation Origin Woodland.

7.0 CONCLUSION

We believe that this proposal is the most sustainable solution to the issue and has considerable merit, significantly contributing to the achievement of the aims and economy of the area and should receive your support.