

LOCAL PLAN WORKING GROUP
APPROVED MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON
Thursday 13th January 2005 at 3.00pm.
in the Cairngorm Hotel, Aviemore.

PRESENT:

Basil Dunlop	CNPA Board
Jane Hope	CNPA (CE)
Fiona Munro	" (Housing Officer)
Anna Barton	" (Community Liaison Co-ordinator)
Hamish Trench	" (Park Plan Officer)
Norman Brockie	" (Local Plan/Policy Officer)
Maggie Bochel	Highland Council
David Bale	SNH
Miff Tuck	SRPBA
Kate Adamson	Association of Cairngorms Community Councils

AGENDA:

1. N.Brockie welcomed those present and offered introductions.

APOLOGIES:

2. Apologies were offered for: Gillian Buchanan, Aberdeenshire Council; Martin Wanless, Moray Council; Nicola Abrahms, SEPA; Duncan Bryden, Douglas Glass, Bruce Luffman & Sue Walker, CNPA Board; Jean Henretty, Local Plan Community Liaison Co-ordinator; Gavin Miles, CNPA Planning Officer.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:

3. Were approved.

MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES:

4. Relative to issue 4 (re. the Scottish Executive [SE] and the legal position for the CNPA Local Plan/Park Plan timetable); N.Brockie issued a copy of a letter received from the SE dated 6th Dec 2004, which noted that the Local Plan could proceed to deposit draft, developing in tandem with the Park Plan.

COMMUNITY LIAISON CO-ORDINATORS' REPORTS.

5. N.Brockie issued a 'record of consultation' which detailed all the meetings, and the attendances, which added up to a very healthy 1600+ figure. This represents some 10% of the Parks population which is an excellent result for the first phase of consultation, and a great base to build on for the successive rounds.

6. Anna Barton gave a report on the first phase of consultation, noting that she was currently tidying-up reports and planning the next round of feedback to community council meetings. On the whole the exercise had been a success, but of course there were many things to develop and improve on. Anna did have a particular concern (which was shared by Jean), that across the park there had been a low level of participation by community councils/councillors, although this was not the case in all communities. This issue had been raised at the ACCC meeting on 12th Jan 2005.
7. B.Dunlop noted that from his experience of attending meetings, the process had worked very well and the team should be thanked for the extensive consultation that had been taken to every community; we should also not be disheartened by criticism and negative comments, an exercise of this size can never please everyone.
8. K.Adamson and Anna both raised the issue of demographic attendance spread, and the general lack of younger groups. This was certainly one of the problem areas to be tackled for the next phases of consultation. M.Bochel noted that regardless of how varied and innovative your consultation techniques were, there were many groups/individuals/sectors of the community that would simply not engage. The task for us all was to give everyone the opportunity to engage, if they wished. In Wester Ross they had used the practice of 'neighbour notification' for all zoned sites/areas, but this is likely to skew the consultation response.
9. Norman and Anna summarised Jean's progress, noting that the Angus Glens had been the only problem area as it had been difficult to establish contacts; Glen Isla had come on-board and organised their meeting, but Glens Esk, Clova and Prosen had generated little response. The meetings that were held in these Glens, however, had produced facilitators so the next phases should be better represented and attended.
10. M.Tuck queried how land owners would be consulted, and noted that they should be considered as part of the 'business community'; the SRPBA is already on the LP consultee list (represented by Kate Gordon-Rogers), Miff suggested that F.Munro contact the SRPBA's Sarah-Jane Laing (SRPBA Housing Strategy Officer) to discuss housing issues, in relation to estates; Fiona noted that she had met her earlier that week. Hamish also suggested that the RICS be added to the consultee list, as they represented land managers.
11. D.Bale queried whether involvement in the consultation process was actually having a positive benefit on community councils, Kate replied that this could be the case where they were already more active.
12. J.Hope noted that the extensive community network, which was currently being established for Local Plan purposes, was a valuable resource which should be maintained and developed for much wider Park/community liaison; this was an issue which would need to be developed for CNPA Board consideration.
13. J..Hope also queried whether the feed-back sessions would adequately explain the rationale behind which suggestions could be implemented by the Local Plan, and those which would not; Anna noted that this would be explained at the next

phase of consultation meetings, Norman noted that if a contentious issue was evident in the Plan's preparation, then a community meeting could be held in the next few months to find solutions/consensus prior to the next consultation.

14. K. Adamson noted that the communities were worried about the timing of the next phase of consultation - that there must be no slippage into late June, July and August, as people are either busy with visitors or on holiday. The last phase of the consultation was before Christmas, always a very busy time.

UPDATE ON CNP HOUSING ANALYSIS STUDY.

15. F. Munro gave a brief update on the Housing Analysis Study currently being undertaken by Heriot-Watt University across the Park, following previous research to highlight the information that was required/could be developed. Fiona had developed this study in partnership with the 4 local authorities and 3 Communities Scotland offices. The project was mainly using existing data, related to the LHS's; a draft report was due in February, the final by the end of March. Additional funding for the study has come from Communities Scotland (£10K) and £500 from the Area Housing Manager for Badenoch & Strathspey.
16. M. Bochel suggested that a consultation exercise could be run whereby a range of optional housing sites could be offered to each community. With reference to the housing study (and future housing need projections), Maggie noted that The Highland Council is about to run a revised set of population and household projections for each of its Areas to inform the housing requirement figures for the next three Council local plans. These would look at the implications of three different migration assumptions and it is important that there is consistency between them and any figures that the National Park Local Plan uses. Maggie also suggested that the CNPA speak to Christine MacLeod, THC Research Officer who is working on the projections.
17. B. Dunlop raised the issue of what other UK National Parks are doing with regard to affordable housing and 'residency status'; Fiona and Norman noted that a close watch was being kept on procedures and developments elsewhere.

ADDITIONAL EXTERNAL MEMBERS FOR GROUP/CONSULTATION LIST.

18. N. Abrahams had suggested that the relevant Fisheries Boards be added to the consultation list.

UPDATE ON WESTER ROSS LOCAL PLAN PROGRESS.

19. Maggie Bochel updated the Group on the Plan's progress towards the PLI (Public Local Inquiry), due to start 17th Jan 2005. The original 70 objections had been reduced to 3 issues, via discussion and arbitration, and no agency objections remained. The remaining issues to be 'heard' at the inquiry were: development sites at Loch Carron; a crofting-land dispute at Aultbea; and the settlement development boundaries in Applecross; (there are still a few resting on written submissions).
20. Maggie noted that although SNH did not 'formally object' to the lack of a wild land designation in the WRLP, they could do so elsewhere and therefore it may be an

issue for the CNP Local Plan. Maggie suggested that the CNPA speak to both SNH and Malcolm MacLeod from THC about what the issues were and how we resolved it. J.Hope queried whether they would do the same to the CNP LP. D.Bale noted that 'wild land' was more of a concept based on a set of principles rather than a label or designation. These principles were set out in SNH's policy document, and SNH would wish to see wild land become a consideration within the planning process with a back up policy in the Local Plan referring to it. The title was less important than the concept and SNH had, accordingly, accepted the term 'remote landscapes of value to recreation' in the Wester Ross plan. Jane also noted that the CNPA Natural Resources Group was currently developing a study and paper on the issue

ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

21. N.Brockie noted his regret that Bill Rowell had decided to resign from the Kincaig Community Council, and thereby ACCC rep to the Working Group and Local Plan facilitator. Bill had worked extremely hard and effectively in all these roles and would be sorely missed. NB to write a letter of thanks.
22. D.Bale requested that the next agenda include an item which addressed the remit of Working Group members, with regard to their input to the Local Plan's development.
23. K.Adamson queried the role of 'communities' on the group, and the issue of how their potential conflicts with other groups and stakeholders could be resolved; N.Brockie noted that the Working Group could be the ideal forum for such conflict resolution.
24. N.Brockie noted that this was Maggie Bochel's last meeting as Highland Council rep, as she was moving to a new post at Aberdeen City; thanks and good luck were offered to Maggie, whose updates on the Wester Ross local plan have helped to inspire the CNP plan. Maggie noted that her replacement was yet to be chosen, but that Colin MacKenzie would represent The Council on this group in the meantime.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING.

25. The next meeting was arranged for Thursday 24th February 2005, at 3pm in Ballater, venue to be confirmed.
26. The meeting closed at 5:00pm.