

# Kilmaronock Community Council

---

Chair: Gavin MacLellan

kilmaronockcc@btinternet.com

The Planning Officer  
Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park

15 August 2016

Dear Sir

Planning Application 2016/0126/DET

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above application.

The KCC held a public meeting in Kilmaronock Community Hall on 8 August in order to discuss the project. The project sponsor, Mrs Emily Morrison, gave a short presentation of the project and responded to questions.

A number of individuals, who have submitted comments to the NP attended the meeting and we gave each an opportunity to present their case also. Following this we held a question and answer session which was followed by a display of hands in support of or against the project. There was a strong majority against the project.

The KCC members then voted and the result was as follows:

For: nil  
Against:4 (1 by proxy)  
Abstained:1

The KCC can therefore report that it is opposed to the project as presented to the National Park and presented to us on 8 August. The reasoning and comments raised for your consideration are as follows:

1. Project Business case – there was no formal business plan presented but the business case offered was short term and there was concern that the future of the project could be more development or change of use.
2. The project area sits outside the NP designated development area. KCC were consulted only recently by the NP in the agreement of the designated development area so we do not consider this project consistent with development of the Plan itself and if it was approved we would consider the plan consultation and development process to be undermined.
3. National Park aims – KCC did not consider this a “small” project and were not aware that large projects were supported by the NP in the current plan.
4. Road access – the proposed road access (A811) has not been engineered in sufficient detail so we cannot comment on a reasonable solution, but we expect the limitation to be restrictive, the section of road has a record of accidents and an additional hazard will have an impact to safety which we cannot quantify.

5. Property positioning – a neighbor presented a mock-up visual of the new property and how it affected their amenity. The impact is considerable and we suggested relocation and separation of the properties would reduce impact. The neighbors in Laigh Raws will be adversely affected and had not been reasonably consulted or involved in the development of the project by the proposer or the NP.
6. Environmental Impact – the impact on wildlife, particularly birds, from light and noise and general disturbance will be significant. We do not consider the studies provided to be sufficient for the NP to exercise its responsibilities for protection of the Environment.
7. Environmental report from SEPA – the report was inadequate for the proposed project since it only concentrated on the flooding issue. The proposers had added that the population equivalent would be over 100 at certain times with 2 swimming pools, catering and transport movement. Specifically, there was no detail concerning pollution control, surface run off, final effluent discharge, nutrient impact to surface waters, hydrocarbon spillage, swimming pool discharge, impact on SSI ponds, impact on Endrick Fisheries, impact on water catchment for extraction under SEPA responsibility. Consultation with Loch Lomond Angling Association and the Riparian Owners Association was not provided. We point out that the site sits above an SSI and a full Environmental Impact assessment would seem necessary for a project of this scale and complexity.
8. Building design – the design and materials are not in keeping with local architecture and were more of a “New England” style.
9. Sustainability-the project will provide certain employment for part time low pay band employees but would be unlikely to offer salaried and pensionable sustainable employment.
10. Local benefit – access for locals to the facilities will be offered intermittently which does not offer a long term amenity.

## Summary

The KCC have reviewed the project in terms of balance of impact against benefit and taken consideration from the wider community. We consider the environmental to be most probably negatively affected and the evidence presented is insufficient to consider otherwise. On this basis we are of the opinion that conservation of the environment should take precedence, in accordance with the aims of the National Park.

Yours faithfully  
On behalf of KCC

Gavin MacLellan  
Chairman