I wish to object to this application, which in manifestly inappropriate for a National Park, for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is incompatible with the four statutory objectives of the National Park some of which is set out in the Overarching policies that form part of the Local Development Plan under “Overarching Principles” and “Development Requirements”. For example: in relation to conservation the proposed development will have an adverse impact on landscape and “important views” (being situated on loch shore), on wildlife, through developing existing green areas and the local historic and cultural heritage (no regard is given to the historical buildings at the pier area); it will detract from the recreational experience – no-one wishes to walk through a chalet park which is not “easy to move around”; it promotes unsustainable development (e.g on a flood plain, through low wages and increasing parking); there is very little in the application which is about sustainable use of resources so impossible to tell if this requirement might be met.
2. The proposal is contrary to the LLTNPA’s own local development plan which contained no proposals for development in Drumkinnon Woods (indeed rejected Scottish Enterprise’s suggestion the woods be included) or on the shoreline on the west side of Drumkinnon lagoon. In addition ALL the land at Woodbank House was earmarked for Visitor Experience NOT housing. My detailed reasoning about this is set out <http://parkswatchscotland.co.uk/2018/09/11/flamingo-land-the-lltnpa-local-development-plan-and-the-planning-bill/>
3. The proposal is incompatible with a large number of the Park’s polices set out in the LDP including: Visitor Experience Policy 2 Delivering a World class Visitor Experience; “a bespoke and high quality product” – e.g indoor water resorts are not the sort of world class development that is appropriate for a National Park; Housing 2 – no mention affordable housing at Woodbank; Natural Environment polices 4 – presence of red squirrels; 6 – habitats and green corridors; 8-9 on protecting woodland – eg Drumkinnon Woods and woodland by shore; 11- Protecting the Water Environment eg flood plains; 13 – Flood Risk; Historic Environment Policies 1 – not demonstrated other development is minimum required; 3 and 6 – failure to incorporate pier head buildings in sympathetic way; Transport 2 – Parking and cars given greatest priority on site; Open Space 2 – no regard given to impact on current open space; Community facility 1 – none proposed; Retail – no explanation given about how retail might fit this policy.
4. Development contributions – none appear proposed and Planning Application explicitly rejects contribution which might have met this as proposed in Balloch Charrette e.g .bridge over River Leven.