

Cairngorms National Park
Consultative draft Local Plan

CONSULTATION REPORT

July 2007



The Cairngorms National Park Local Plan Consultation Report

The Cairngorms National Park Authority approved the Deposit Local Plan on 15th June, for placing on 'deposit' for formal representations from 9th July 2007. This report accompanies the Local Plan Written Statement, and details the results of the public consultation on the Consultative Draft Local Plan 2005 carried out between November 2005 and February 2006

Cairngorms National Park Authority,
Head of Planning and Development Management – Don McKee
June 2007

CONTENTS

Part A

1.	Background to Public Consultation	2
2.	Summary of Respondees	4
3.	Key findings	6

Part B

Summary of representations and CNPA responses	10
Workshop Results	127
Comments received on Strategic Environmental Assessment	149
Summary of additional specific comments on SEA report	153

PART A

1. Background to Public Consultation

- 1.1 The Cairngorms National Park was designated in 2003 by Scottish Parliament and in accordance with the requirements of the National Park (Scotland) Act 2003 the Cairngorms National Park Authority has adopted the Cairngorms National Park Plan on 15 March 2007. It provides the context for development planning and management in the National Park with general guidance and specific direction for the Local Plan.

Statutory Requirements

- 1.2 The Local Plan will provide the Park Authority with the tools to ensure delivery of the Park Plan objectives. In developing it, and in line with the requirements of the Planning (Scotland) etc Act 2007 and the Town and Country Planning (Structure Plan and Local Plans) (Scotland) Regulations 1983 the Park Authority, as Planning Authority has undertaken a number of steps to ensure that its requirements under the Regulations have been met.
- That regard has been paid to any information and any other considerations which appear to them to be relevant
 - That any proposals conform generally to the Structure Plan as it stands for the time being, whether or not it has been approved by the Scottish Ministers
 - That adequate publicity is given in their area to any matters arising from a survey of the area and to proposal which are proposed to be included in the plan
 - That persons with an interest in the plan and who are likely to wish to make a representation are informed of their right to do so
 - Adequate opportunity is given to such persons who wish to make a representation, and
 - Any representations which are received within the prescribed period are given consideration.
- 1.3 In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Structure and Local Plans) (Scotland) Regulations 1983 the prescribed period for the submission of representations shall be no less than 4 weeks. The formal period for making representations ran from November 2005 and 28th February 2006, although comments and views were received up to May 2006 have been included in this report.
- 1.4 The Cairngorms National Park Authority published its intention to prepare a Local Plan in September 2004 in local press covering the National Park area during the weeks ending 17/9/04, 24/9/04 and 30/9/04.

Identification of issues

- 1.5 Initial work to identify issues relevant to the Local Plan commenced in 2003, and steps were taken to increase public awareness and receive comments on planning issues within the Park area. Two 'Community Liaison Co-ordinators were appointed in May 2004 whose job was to set up communication networks across the Park's 23 Community Council areas. They also enlisted facilitators to help organise consultation in each area. All the Community Councils were also given various options for the extent to which they wished to organise and run the consultation in their own area.
- 1.6 In September 2004 the CNPA delivered a questionnaire and community profile to every household in the Park. Over 1400 questionnaires were returned (over 14% of those delivered) but that proportion actually rises when the numbers are considered again 20% of the Park's houses at that time being second homes or holiday accommodation. The results were collated and analysed and were used to form the basis of the Consultative Draft Local Plan. The purpose of this report is to set out the procedures the Cairngorms National Park Authority undertook during consultation on the Consultative Draft Local Plan 2005.

Consultative Draft Local Plan

- 1.7 The Cairngorms National Park Consultative Draft Local Plan was published in October 2005. Consultation on this document was held from September to November 2005 and every community area in the Park had at least one Local Plan consultation meeting to discuss its content. The meetings included open meetings, small discussion groups and meetings with specific interest groups and facilitators were used to ensure a tailor made approach was taken for each community. In total 924 people attended the meetings.
- 1.8 In addition to these meetings copies of the Consultative Draft Plan were made available in local libraries and relevant Local Authority offices. Seminars and briefing sessions were held with Board members, key agencies and stakeholders and the 4 Local Authorities.

Consultation Report

- 1.9 This consultation report summaries the comments and opinions expressed during this consultation phase, and also include comments on the Environmental Report of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Local Plan which was formally available for consultation between 20th December 2005 and 28th February 2006.
- 1.10 The report organises comments into five different interest groups representing: public bodies, general organisations; estates, landowners, land managers and developers; community groups; and individuals. Those who responded in writing are included in the

following table. They are intended to reflect possible similarities or differences in views expressed. Following each general comment and policy the CNPA response is included to indicate the action that has been taken in light of the comments received, and to clarify how the comments made on the consultative draft plan have influenced the deposit plan and its policies. Where comments made have resulted in a major change to the deposit plan and its format, one comment is included which explains the actions taken.

- 1.11 Also included are summaries of the community consultation events held on the Consultative Draft Local Plan that were held between September 2005 and November 2005.
- 1.12 The results of the comments made have informed the revision of the document and the development of the Deposit Local Plan, and this report will accompany this document when placed on formal deposit.

2. Summary of Respondees

- 2.1 The consultation process was very successful and resulted in a great deal of debate on a number of key issues. In total 204 written responses were received to the consultation on the Consultative Draft Local Plan. Each of the comments received was considered together with the cumulative views expressed on individual policies and topics, and alterations to the Consultative Draft plan were made and submitted to the Planning Committee on 4th May 2007, and the revised Deposit Local Plan was endorsed by the Cairngorms National Park Authority Board on 15th June. Responses were received from the following:

Consultation response groupings	
<p>PUBLIC BODIES Aberdeenshire Council – Infrastructure Services Committee Commercial Development Manager Angus Council Moray Council</p>	<p>Moray Council – Roads Service Perth & Kinross Council The Highland Council SEPA SNH Historic Scotland</p>
<p>GENERAL ORGANISATIONS Albyn Housing Society Architecture & Design Scotland The British Hydro Power Association The Cairngorms Campaign The Cairngorms Chamber of Commerce The Cairngorm Club Cairn Housing Association The Civic Committee of the Moray Society Communities Scotland Crofters Commission HIE Moray Highland Fire Brigade Homes for Scotland Inverness Architectural Association on Behalf of RIAS Inverness, Nairn, Badenoch & Strathspey Enterprise</p>	<p>Mountain Bothies Association Mountaineering Council of Scotland National Trust for Scotland Network Rail North East Mountain Trust The Ramblers Association RCAHMS Royal Deeside and The Mearns Tourist Forum RSPB SCNP Scottish Enterprise Grampian Scottish Water - Kevin O'Hare Scottish Wild Land Group SportScotland SRPBA Strathspey Railway Company Ltd Visit Scotland</p>

John Muir Trust	
<p>ESTATES, LAND OWNERS, LAND MANAGERS & DEVELOPERS</p> <p>Alvie & Dalraddy Estates Alain F Angelil (Cluny Castle Estate) ASBC Marketing Ltd Balnafettach Estates Ltd Ben Alder Estate Brodies LLP Solicitors Bruce & Partners (})Scotia Homes Crannach Management Group Danny Fullerton – Landmark Forest Theme Park Dunecht Estates Forestry Commission Scotland - Inverness Forestry Commission Scotland – Dingwall GL Hearn Property Consultants (The Co-operative Group Property Division) Glenmore Properties Gordon Land Ltd Grantown Caravan Park Hiddleston & Feist Indigo Planning Ltd Invercauld Estate Jacobs Babbie (J Smith) MBM Planning & Development MBM Planning & Development (Inverburn Homes Ltd)</p>	<p>Mono Consultants Ltd Montagu Evans (Amec Projects Investments Ltd) Montagu Evans (Aviemore Highland Resort) Muir Homes Muir Smith Evans (Aviemore & Highland Developments) Reidhaven Estate Robertson & Company Rothiemurchus Estate RPS Group Edinburgh (Laurel Grant LLP) RWE Npower Savills (Muckrach Estate) Savills (Pitmain & Dochfour Estates) Smiths Gore (Crown Estate of Glenlivet) Smiths Gore (J C Forbes-Leith - Dunachton Estate) Strutt & Parker (Mr A Macpherson-Fletcher, Balavil Estate) Strutt & Parker (Mr M Bruce, Glen Tanar) Strutt & Parker (The MacLaren-Webster Partnership) Tweeddale (Forest Holidays Ltd) Woodland Trust Scotland</p>

COMMUNITY GROUPS

Aviemore Community Council
 Ballater Community Council
 Ballater Royal Deeside Ltd
 Boat of Garten & Vicinity Community Council
 Braemar Community Council
 Braemar Royal Highland Gathering Ltd
 Carrbridge Curling Club
 Dalfaber Action Group
 Glenisla Group - J B Muir
 Glenlivet & Inveravon Community Association

Kincraig & Vicinity Community Council
 Kingussie & Vicinity Community Council
 Laggan Community Association
 Nethy Bridge Community Council
 Nethy Bridge Tourist Association
 Newtonmore Community Council
 Newtonmore Granttown on Spey Initiative
 Community Woodland & Development Trust
 Rothiemurchus & Glenmore Community Association

INDIVIDUALS

R James	John Partridge	GH Johnston on behalf of A J Baillie
Nick Aitken	Marjorie Harper	Fergus Ewing MSP
Miff Tuck	Frank Bardgett	Alan & Janet Goodall
Gill Nisbet	S Masson	K Shaw
Keith Mathieson	J Davison	Stewart G Fulton on behalf of Lorna Fraser
Anne Simpson	Jenny Smith	Montgomery
Jayne Langran	Ann Williamson	J G Grant & Son
S & A Dick	Adam Gordon	N I Thomson
J & C Steinle	Ian Kirk	Donald Black
A Bremner	Roy Turnbull	Mr & Mrs Brown
Andy Rockall	J C D	Mrs Duncan
Hilary Mutch	Montgomery	K Roy King
Michael Franklin	Maureen	Patricia Rimell
Jean & John Holley	Macmillan MSP	Angus MacPherson
Jane Angus	Johnny Pott	Anne & Robert Watt
A M Millership	T Levinthal	Jean Slimon
Samantha Faircliff	Richard Miller	Mr & Mrs Bell
P Bates	J Walker	Janet Davidson
M Domoney	Richard Spencer	Amanda Fraser
K Adamson	John MacDonald	Residents of Dellmhor
D O'Reilly	Mr Bloomfield	Jennifer Bate
Mr Gatenby	Jan Semple	Tom Welsh
Jane & Ian Whitaker	D & M McCreath	Anne Heath
E & D Lambie	W S & B A	Malcolm MacIntyre
Sue Jardine	Paterson	Michael McAree
Ian Fraser	S Culliford	D Burke
Beryl MacRae	Jennifer & David	David Shearer
Gregor Mackenzie	Carrott	David Chandler
Peter Mackay	P & J Smith	Raymond Treadwell
Ian Grant	P & L Crane	Mr & Mrs Milne
Nat & Michael Hone	J M Gaukroger	Robinson Associates – On behalf of Dan
Ian Moffett	Olwen Billington	Tindall
David Hogg	Alan Billington	A W Laing – On behalf of 7 Clients
Mrs J Lamb	A D Wallace	
Adam Watson	A C Bell	

3. Key findings

- 3.1 The following section provides a brief summary of the key issues which have been highlighted through the consultation process and the approach CNPA is taking towards these issues in the development of the Deposit Local Plan. The summary given endeavours to draw together what have often been diverse views, and draw some common ground, taking the breadth of comments into account.

General comments

- 3.2 In general the responses received have been largely positive and supportive, and it has been useful to consider the comments made regarding how the plan can be improved as it goes through the various stages of consultation and amendment. In particular the comments made regarding clarifying the text within the policies, and how they fit with other statutory documents which are relevant to the planning process has been taken on board. It is hoped that in future revisions there will be a clear relation evident between the Park Plan, the aims of the Park and the Local Plan, and in revising the text accordingly; the implementation of the plan will be simplified.

General policies 1-5

- 3.3 There have been conflicting views between policies being overly restrictive, and overly permissive, and in considering these comments, the revised document has tried to take a pragmatic view which aims to facilitate development for the local communities living and working in the Park, whilst protecting the very character and nature which has led to the creation of the National Park in the first place.
- 3.4 In reviewing the use of general policies there have been many comments regarding their use, implementation, how the rest of the policies fit and how important some policies seem in comparison to others. As a direct result of this confusion, it has been decided to incorporate the aims of the general policies within the policies of the Plan as a whole, and retain only one overarching policy which is intended to make a clear and direct link between the aims of the Park and the implementation and use of the Local Plan. It is hoped that in further consultation this change will be welcomed and all policies within the Plan will be read together.

Natural heritage (policies 1-4 and proposal 1)

- 3.5 As expected due to the many natural heritage interests and designations found within the Park, there were a lot of responses on this section. Many of these referred to the confusion which exists between the wording of the policies and their relationship with other legislation and regulations.

- 3.6 The importance of striking an appropriate balance between promoting development opportunities and protecting the environment was a common concern. The role the National Park Authority can play in achieving this through carefully worded policies which are consistently implemented was highlighted as key to ensuring the success of the Plan. Potential conflicts between those working in the countryside and the natural heritage interests which exist will have to be addressed, and many comments highlighted the need for the Park to remain as a living community and not preserved as some sort of museum.
- 3.7 In the revisions to the policies in this section, the Deposit Local Plan has recognised the importance of natural heritage to the Park and its aims. The policies have been reworded to compliment rather than repeat the requirements of other regulations and legislation, ensuring that appropriate forms of development can be carried out in harmony with the natural heritage interests, enhancing it where possible.

Cultural heritage (policies 5-9)

- 3.8 The National Park Authority through its first aim has a duty to conserve and enhance both the natural and cultural heritage of the area, and as such the policies relating to cultural heritage, including built and other forms, are very important. Comments again referred to the repetition and confusion between the wording of policies and other legislation, and there were also a number of comments which highlighted the need to improve the efforts made to recognise the cultural heritage which exists in the Park so that policies can adequately protect it.
- 3.9 In revising the policies regarding cultural heritage the comments have been considered, and the lack of current understanding of the resource which exists has required policies to be expanded to ensure that appropriate levels of protection are offered to all forms of cultural heritage which may be important, and not just those features which are scheduled, listed or otherwise protected.

Water resources (policies 10-14)

- 3.10 A common theme throughout the comments was that of repetition and confusion with other regulations and legislation which exists to protect this valuable resource, and prevent flooding, contamination, and placing undue pressure on existing infrastructure. The need for flexibility was also highlighted in both supply and drainage. The need to refer to best practice was suggested, and this has been included in the revised policies regarding the sustainable use of resources in the Deposit Plan.

Minerals and peat (policies 15-17)

- 3.11 The majority of comments received referred to the need for a flexible approach to extraction of resources, since local reserves can prove important to meet local need. However this must clearly be done in a way that protects the natural heritage interests which may exist and the wording of the revised policy endeavours to ensure that appropriate measures are put in place to achieve this.

Contaminated land (policy 18), Waste Management (policy 19) and Telecommunications (Policy 25)

- 3.12 These policies attracted comments from those with a direct interest. The comments focused on working in accordance with the standards set by the regulatory bodies, and taking the most sustainable approach to dealing with all issues.

Energy (policies 20-21)

- 3.13 The issue of energy, both in terms of generation, and transmission was an important topic of debate when the Draft Local Plan was produced. The issue of transmission lines running through the Park generated a large number of comments, and these focused on the Bealey Denny line which is currently being considered at a Public Inquiry. Together with such large scale development, the impact of large wind energy schemes outwith the Park was raised and although policies within the CNPA Local Plan cannot control these, the CNPA will continue to comment on applications which affect the setting of the National Park.
- 3.14 In terms of energy production, the comments focused on sustainability and allowing individuals and communities to develop schemes which while being small in scale, would assist climate change issues and the economy of the Park in general. Key was the options for small scale hydro generation schemes. In revising the text of this policy, the Deposit Plan has recognised the important role that small scale and microgeneration schemes can play in slowing down climate change, and while the wording does not highlight one form of generation over another, it is hoped that the approach taken will allow small scale developments to occur where they do not adversely affect the aims of the Park.

Transport links (policies 22-24)

- 3.15 The importance of ensuring appropriate transport links in a rural community is vital to the sustainability of communities, and this was raised in the many comments received on this issue. The majority of comments received relating to the current transport network focused on the situation in Aviemore. Also there were a large number of comments which highlighted the need to improve pedestrian and cycle routes for both local people and visitors.

- 3.16 The issue of upland tracks seen as a key issue, and generated a large number of comments. The issues ranged from the need for flexibility to allow estate operations to be carried out, to the need for a cautious approach to protect the landscape. In the Deposit Plan it has been decided that the topic of tracks does not require a separate policy and their impact will be judged against the other policies of the plan including landscape and visual impact.

Farming and Crofting (policy 26)

- 3.17 The majority of comments focused on the need for policies to allow businesses to continue in a profitable manner without the worry of overly restrictive planning constraints. The need for farmers and crofters to react to new agricultural legislation and regulations was of paramount concern, and policies therefore needed to be worded in a way to allow this. However counter concerns related to the need to protect the environment from inappropriate forms of development, and policies therefore needed careful wording to ensure this.

Access, recreation and tourism (policy 27-30)

- 3.18 The importance of country sports and the work of the estates was raised as a major contributor to the overall tourism industry in the Park area and policies needed to reflect this. Also key is the link between access, tourism and economic growth, and policies needed to be suitably flexible to allow appropriate levels of development and where needed, diversification.
- 3.19 With reference to tourist accommodation, comments considered the policies unhelpful in promoting growth and development. The role of such developments in rural areas in supporting the economy should be more clearly established. Of particular concern was the impact of caravans on the landscape and on the economy. Conversely some comments considered the wording to be too permissive and would result in large amounts of development in the countryside.

Economic growth (policies 31-36)

- 3.20 Many comments were received on this topic, particularly on the need to ensure appropriate levels of growth in settlements to support the local communities. The wording of the policies as written was seen as too restrictive. The need for up to date guidance particularly in Aviemore was also seen as vital to the growth of the centre. Links with Scottish executive guidance should also be included in the policies to avoid confusion,

Housing (policies 37-43)

- 3.21 Housing was undoubtedly the biggest issue raised at the consultation phase, with the majority of comments focusing on the problems faced

by local people trying to get houses as an affordable price within the Park. The Local Plan should try and ensure that there is enough provision at an appropriate price for all those who need accommodation. The ongoing issue of holiday and second homes was also raised as adding to the problem. However in allocating land some comments did raise the need to ensure that provision did not conflict with the overall character of the Park.

- 3.22 Housing in the countryside to allow local people the opportunity to live in their own communities was a major concern, and policies should not therefore be overly restrictive on this issue. Undoubtedly due to the complexity of the issue, many views expressed were conflicting, but the underlying theme was in support of ensuring sufficient supply on appropriate site provided to local people at affordable prices.
- 3.23 As a result of the scale of interest in the housing topic, much further consultation has been undertaken specifically to examine the issue of need, and how best to provide houses for those in greatest need, and the revised policies have been developed following lengthy debate on how this can be achieved.

Settlements

- 3.24 Many comments were received looking at individual settlements, site allocations, and ensuring that the policies and proposals were suitably supportive of local community aspirations for growth and development. In the Deposit Local Plan this section has been greatly amended to introduce a further level of flexibility into the smaller settlements to allow future aspirations to be met.

Part B – Summary of Representations and CNPA Responses

General Comments on Local Plan & Policies

PUBLIC BODIES

- Must ensure cross-compliance of all policies
- Consideration of the need for appropriate assessments for developments which may affect a Natura site.
- Need to include a statement stating that potential cumulative effects will be considered.
- Should be consistent in whether the term “mitigation” or “compensatory” measures are to be used.
- Should include reference to disability.
- **Introduction** - Suggest a paragraph explaining how the reader might use the plan and linking General Policies and Topic Policies and linkages between issues.
- Concern that some policies may constrain economic/employment opportunities.
- Potential areas of conflict between the CNPA LP and NEST and the Aberdeenshire Local Plan by way of housing land supply, housing in the countryside and renewable energy.
- **para. 1.17** - It is not clear how a justified relationship could exist within the current legal context for structure and local plans.
- Note that most issues identified area concerned with National Park Policies rather than land use issues.
- Agree that planning doesn't stop at planning boundaries and there may be cross boundary issues in the future.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

Special Qualities and aims of the Park and the aims of the Local Plan

- A definition of the Parks special qualities should be appended as part of the plan.
- Consider that the Plan would benefit from additional policy which takes a positive stance in relation to development that would enhance the special qualities of the park e.g. that contributes to the promotion of enjoyment.
- The additional restrictive criteria contained in some policies are unsupportive towards the fourth aim of the Park
- Inconsistency between order of aims and vision points.
- **Paragraph 1.11** – Suggest the fourth listed aim of the development strategy be moved to become the first. This reflects the underlying legal basis for the park and also the structure of the general and topic policies.
- It is vital to ensure that all the aims for the national parks legislation are contained within the development strategy. Would prefer the development strategy in **paragraph 1.11** to reflect more closely the sequence of aims as laid out in the original legislation.
- **Paragraph 1.11** - The 5 bullet points partially reiterate the 4 statutory aims for NPs but the order, rewording, and additions weaken the conservation basis for the National Park and increase the development element.

- Four of the five points refer to the fourth aim of the Park; the undue weighting here is unacceptable.
- The third aim has been omitted entirely and must be included.
- These bullet points should more closely reflect the aims of the Park. The rewording is unjustified.
- Worryingly, the wording of the first bullet point which relates to the fourth aim of the Park is a significantly broader aim, both spatially and attitudinally than the fourth aim.
- This section must be significantly reworded; otherwise it runs the risk of having contrary aims to that of the park plan when it is written.
- Concern regarding the weighting of the first aim if a conflict of aims arise, feel that considerations must be given to land based business that continue to enhance the park's qualities and sustainability.
- Issue regarding aims/vision differentiation.
- **Page 121-4** – no mention of damaging land uses.
- Not clear whether the aims listed are intended as the development strategy referred to.
- Cannot understand how detailed plan can be developed from a vision that is still being developed.
- It is important that the aims of a development strategy must also have elements focused on serving the national and international communities; otherwise what was the point of declaring that area a National Park?
- The objectives stated fail to derive anything from the third aim of the Park.
- Feel that the stated Policy Objectives need changed to take account of imbalance described and lack of attention of the third aim of the park. Object to them in their present form.
- Suggest that the emphasis on the first aim of the park should be intertwined with the main objectives of the plan rather than separated as the overriding aim.
- Need for the first aim to be interwoven and not overriding.
- A more coherent and imaginative vision is needed.
- The aims of the park need to be more clearly stated

Housing

- The plan acknowledges its key role in housing provision in the park area.
- Concern regarding the absence of a clear implementation and delivery strategy which brings together the principal housing stakeholders. The danger of this absence is that the Plan becomes the focus of what cannot or should not happen, as distinct to enabling the achievement of the desired outputs.
- As well as zoning sites for general and affordable housing development, the plan must be part of the identification and provision of the investment required to realise the targets it sets.
- The plan must quantify both public and private investment needed to realise the housing targets and define how this is co-ordinated.
- Policies must address the availability and costs of the land zoned for affordable housing in particular.
- The design and character elements of housing developments must not be the sole primary focus - it is secondary to making the plan happen in the first instance.

- Worth considering the establishment of some form of working group on affordable housing to monitor the Plans performance with a view to addressing development constraints which may inhibit its desired achievements.
- Monitoring and Review: the plan should make it clear whether the “plan, monitor and manage” approach applies to all housing tenures.
- The monitoring of housing provision in the Park should not just be against the LP but also the housing needs of the Park itself. It would be useful to elaborate the role of communities in this process.
- LP seems to offer little additional capacity for housing in the Moray area.
- The lack of growth forecasts in household numbers and population change or economic activity is a serious weakness of the Plan.
- No data is available for housing provision.
- No Key forecasts
- Suggest using forecasts of a net +100 people per annum into the Badenoch and Strathspey area over the next decade as a basis for the Plan.
- The plan does not properly address the overall need for housing which must be used to make the case for the infrastructure investment to allow the need to be met at all levels of affordability.
- The Plan does not differentiate sufficiently between different types of affordable housing or make allowance for the requirements of the RSL.
- It is inappropriate for the Park to assume RSL provision when elements of the Parks policy may run counter to the RSL's obligations under the Housing Act 2001.
- Suggest, where immediate housing supply is a problem, reserving brownfield sites as they become available for affordable housing, only where a change of use is required.
- The plan should be sensitive enough to recognise that some key sites within communities may be best reserved exclusively for affordable housing.
- The LP makes little reference to the Highland Council's Local Housing Strategy.
- This strategy places Badenoch and Strathspey in a housing stress area, therefore the CNP LP should be more robust in its efforts to identify, together with the Council, more developable land for this purpose.
- **Para 1.3** refers to housing being a core policy area, however, the detailed policy options on housing appear very restrictive, effectively closing the park to incomers, which could be detrimental to its economic sustainability.
- **1.3 b)** – the term “local need” as currently used lacks definition and could lead to confusion if it is to be a significant criterion in assessing development proposals. Could also be discriminatory and excluding.
- Before the Draft LP was published the aim was to retain much of the required housing in the existing settlements. The consultation process seems to have reversed this thinking and there is now no clear strategy for the required expansion.
- Local people born and brought up in the area are generally supportive of expansion; those who are new to the area tend to oppose development. Therefore suggest that in the interests of sustainability, encouraging improvements to existing services and utilities and retaining

the economic vibrancy of existing settlements these are the most appropriate places for expansion.

- Lack of definite targets or forecasts for future population changes or number of houses to be built.
- The results of the Herriot-Watt study must be made available.
- It should be clearly stated that a limited amount of housing in appropriate circumstances can lead to the creation of innovative business opportunities
- Should be a positive attitude towards expansion.
- Would welcome projections of population/housing trends.

Natural and Cultural Heritage

- Natural and cultural heritage is listed as the fourth aim, in **paragraph 1.11** although it is the first aim of the Park. Suggest there should be a closer correlation between the aims included in this vision and the aims of the Park
- There is insufficient focus and attention on wild land, in terms of its qualities, its remoteness and its giving of experience to users of the locality
- Whilst the need for flexibility in many of the lower parts of the CNP area, there is a lack of definitive precision in stating what will be preserved from intrusion and development, in the core wilder and remoter areas.
- **Page 22** – second last paragraph; replace “montane” with “arctic-alpine”.
- The Local Plan should be going beyond the statutory requirements of legislation.
- The first sentence of **paragraph 1.35** shows neither evidence of this nor wider conservation ambition.
- Neither buffer zones nor habitat corridors are not mentioned nor are invasive species and their potential negative impacts.
- Opportunities to include encouragement of positive enhancement of habitats are omitted.
- Essential that the Plan keeps environmental consideration to the fore.
- The protection given to the environment should be distinctly greater than in a Local Authority Local Plan.
- Would be useful to define what is meant by the term cultural heritage

Recreation and Tourism

- Consider that sport and recreation contributes to the Parks special qualities and therefore should be protected by the policies in the plan.
- Consider that sport and recreation form a significant component of cultural heritage.
- Policy should be included recognising the sometimes unique locational requirements of some recreation related developments. The Local Plan should include dispensation for recreational proposals in such areas where it can be proven that development is needed in that location for the effective practise and provision of a recreational facility.
- Concern that the vision for the Park does not mention recreation.
- Would like to see a General Policy on recreation and Access, rather than just seeing this as a topic policy.

- The settlement plans are focused on housing but do not make sufficient reference to how they relate to the core path plan, access strategy, transport plans for the park etc.

Economic growth

- Concern that some of the policies may constrain future economic and employment opportunities.
- LP seems to offer little additional capacity for businesses in the Moray area.
- Concern that the plans emphasis on development control (particularly sections 1-3) may overly constrain the future economic and social development of local communities and also some aspects of legitimate recreations.
- With direct reference to Crofting - Support in General development initiatives that enhance and further the Crofter's Commission's policy statement of achieving a thriving crofting community.
- Where croftland is proposed for development, the Commission advise full consultation with the occupiers prior to final designation; this should facilitate the release of the land from crofting.
- The commission finds the draft acceptable as it provides protection for inbye croftland and safeguards the continuation of crofting.
- Suggest potential sites for affordable housing on common grazings on land adjacent to Klondyke Cottage, Tulloch and on croftland at Inchbroke/Topperfettle.
- Crofting landlords are not obliged to equip a croft, the application of Section 75 on the majority of croftland would be counter productive to the benefits crofting brings to communities, suggest practical application on a case-by case-basis.
- Welcome the recognition given to the importance of tourism and the commitment shown in particular to sustainable tourism and to quality and associated efforts.
- Welcome the presumption in favour of tourism accommodation businesses remaining as such.
- Suggest that it may be beneficial to extend the 'change of use' powers this to include visitor attractions and other tourist facilities.
- There should be stronger statements on the issues of displacement and dilution of product regarding the two pages on tourism.
- Needs to be more emphasis placed on promoting, encouraging and enhancing sustainable economic activity.

Design and sustainability

- In terms of Design Quality, the LP does not include PAN 68 nor does it pick up on the importance of design in a comprehensive way in its Strategic Objectives.
- Other than a reference within General Policy 5, there is no over-arching policy to raise design quality throughout the Park.
- There is no policy to reinforce and enhance local distinctiveness across the park or between communities within it.
- Recommend that the LP include supportive design management initiatives within the Local Plan itself.

- The first, third and particularly the fourth aim of the Park can be interpreted as having some bearing on the promotion of design quality in the Park's built environments.
- Although the Plan does list 'Designing Places', SPP20 and a number of design orientated PANs, it does not include PAN 68, nor does it pick-up on the importance of design in a comprehensive way in its Strategic Objectives.
- Apart from a reference in General Policy 5, there is no over-arching policy to raise design quality throughout the Park.
- Nor is there a policy to reinforce and enhance local distinctiveness across the Park or between communities within it.
- A stronger representation of the importance of opportunities to promote design quality other than just reference to the Sustainable Design Guide mentioned in General Policy 5, should be made within the Local Plan.
- Some design initiatives involving management rather than physical development may lend themselves to inclusion in the Park Plan rather than the Local Plan.
- The concerns highlighted in the SEAs Non-Technical Summary should be investigated through the use of Design Statements, as promoted in PAN 68.
- It should be the role of the Plan to promote high quality development with low environmental impact. Rather than the SEA pointing to the problems of villages growing into towns, it is more important to promote sustainable communities than to resist development for landscape or natural heritage reasons.
- The Sustainable Design Guide must not be too prescriptive, but sets out a viable, affordable sustainable model which can be copied by other NPs.
- Would prefer to see the Plan as a spur to innovation in design and layout rather than making a virtue of traditional styles in a way which fails to take the opportunity for excellence.
- Suggest that the CNP adopt the Highland Council Sustainable Design Guide as a basis for adding requirements relevant to the Park to avoid repeating work already carried out.

Links with other plans and legislation

- Suggest it necessary for the CNPA to undertake an appropriate assessment of the Local Plans implications according to the European Court of Justice Decision in October 2005.
- The Local Plan should reflect its duty to further the conservation of biodiversity set out in The Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004, through suitably detailed policies.
- Reference should be made to the appropriate adjacent Indicative Forestry Strategies, the forthcoming Park Plan and also to consultation procedures the CNPA may adopt.
- **Paragraph 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 & 1.29** – Clarification required, statements should be stronger, include a flowchart to show relationship between parties.
- Concern that little new land has been added to the existing land allocation and that land introduced is likely to be required to meet the high environmental test of the SEA.

- Feel that more cross-referencing of policies would be helpful, especially when relating to other documents such as the Park Plan.
- The national significance of the Park should not be ignored or referred to as “*other interested parties*” as in **paragraph 1.39**.
- **1.10** – All Park Planning decisions should also reflect current Scottish planning legislation and NPPGs. Also local plans are inter-dependant and should be developed and delivered in partnership with overlapping LAs.
- **1.11** – the views of the overlapping LAs should be taken into consideration.
- Would be helpful to include a table containing and summarising a list of the reports plans etc that are mentioned in the text as being relevant to the LP.
- Suggest using more up to date OS maps as the ones currently used contain imperial units of distance and altitude but scales seem to be metric.
- Recommends that evidence is provided to ensure a scoping exercise is done to ensure that the Local Plan conform to existing Structure Plans and the Park Plan.
- Recommends that clarification is given of the Plans legal relationship to other documents.

Other topics

- Suggest an additional policy regarding Environmental Impacts and noise and light pollution.
- Excessively pro-development impression
- Concern that some of the policies may negatively impact on the vital role of the private sector.
- These should be streamlined so that the Local Plan has a more positive developments focus, delete policies which merely reflect legislation, or place them in an appendix to the development plan or the forthcoming Park Plan.
- Omission of second tier sites.
- Forestry should be included as a main heading.
- Infrastructure - no figures available for present and future infrastructure for service providers.
- The lack of credible information renders any projections for these as meaningless and inaccurate.
- Greater pressure should be placed on service providers to improve networks.
- Feel that these issues should be earmarked with a site as part of the process of compiling the Plan; this would highlight areas of deficiency and aid creating a framework for improvement.

Other general comments

- A number of policy statements are much too vague and give the impression that proposals will be permitted if they contribute something vague to the area.
- Example: **Policy 3** – where if biodiversity is increased then the proposal will be more likely to be approved. Does this mean a housing development with a pond in a remote corner of the site?

- Example: **Policy 26** – where a farm proposal improves diversification then it could be approved easily.
- These general statements should be omitted or replaced with very specific requirements and linked to controls from other aspects of the LP.
- **1.22** – would be useful to explain the consultation process. And a statement on how development forums, community groups etc contribute.
- A lack of practicality in some policies.
- Feel that to be justified the CNPA LP must 'Add Value'
- Feel there is a lack of quantification of targets and evidence to support the policies.
- Lack of clarity of language and of definition of key terms.
- Imbalance of focus between local and national/international interests and communities. Many problems associated with above points come together in paragraph 1.11
- Consultation with the national community is only mentioned in **paragraph 1.27**.
- Concern that there is insufficient consultation with interested individuals and groups from outside the Park area.
- It would be useful if the groups who have been consulted were listed in an Appendix.
- Attach equal weight to local and visitor views and interests. Issues with the weight applied to national and international communities compared with local communities.
- Concern that the LP demonstrates a lack of priority given to people and quality of places for people.
- Suggest the predicted effects of the Local Plan policies should be altered as follows:
 - To provide a framework for development while conserving natural and cultural heritage.
 - To promote sustainable use of the natural resources while conserving natural and cultural heritage.
 - To promote understanding and enjoyment (including enjoyment in the form of recreation) of the special qualities of the area by the public while conserving natural and cultural heritage.
 - To promote sustainable economic and social development of the areas communities while conserving natural and cultural heritage.
- At present the plan is giving a misguided impression of the area as a large museum rather than as an area of vibrant working communities with access to outstanding scenery and activities.
- Feel that the SEA and Draft LP are negative and anti-development. Need to have greater emphasis on promotion and positive outcomes
- The LP should be a framework for the future of the landscape, habitat and outdoor activities for the people of the Park.
- Inconsistency – most policy statements use “will” or “will not” while others (**Policies 20A, 21, 24, 26, 28, 29 and 30**) use a variety of other terms.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

Special Qualities and aims of the Park and the aims of the Local Plan

- The Local Plan should demonstrate innovative policies that go beyond practice being followed elsewhere in Scotland.

- In respect of the development strategy, the LP provides confusing mixed messages, sometimes promoting development and sometimes not, but with an over emphasis upon an underlying strategy of no new development.
- Policy of giving a greater weight to the first aim of the park if a conflict arises = very 'anti-development' and could therefore undermine the statutory objectives of the NP.
- Aims – Meeting aim 2 is an essential part of meeting aims 1 and 3 as can be demonstrated and delivered in Glen Tanar.
- Park Plan Objectives – Native Woodlands – Many are managed to provide high quality timber, recreation opportunities and habitats for a wide range of species, it is important to bear this in mind.
- It must be demonstrated that the utmost has been done to ensure the aims operate together in all circumstances.
- Stage 2 of the bill makes a statement regarding the importance of integrating the aims. Therefore the following must be ensured:
- Decide whether to take the view that there is a conflict between the first aim and another aim.

Housing

- Difficult to identify how the LP took cognisance of PANs such as PAN 74 on affordable housing.

Natural and Cultural Heritage

- Appendix 2 - The River Dee and its tributaries SAC appears to be omitted from **Map 2** of Natura 2000 designations and the accompanying Schedule of designation sites.
- See no justification to extend constraints regarding national nature conservation, to new areas or add constraints to existing areas throughout the planning system.
- The Draft Local Plan not only excludes development from designated sites but it also aims to extend 'no-go' areas to non designated sites Strongly object to this.
- Need for local cultural/recreational facilities for resident and visitor.

Economic Growth

- Believe the LP is far too constrictive and will put off locally based business development, leaving future initiatives to those who have the experience and resources to win at appeal.
- The importance and value of tourism in the National Park.
- Full consideration needs to be given to the traditional activities within the Park such as Farming; Forestry; Fishing; Stalking and Shooting, as they provide a basis for rural life
- Would like to see a stronger special dimension to tourism in the LP.
- Would like to see recognition that visitor information etc is a legitimate use for High Street Sites.
- Include recognition of the importance of the environmental economy; stewardship, contingent valuation, number of jobs supported.

Design and sustainability

- Concern that there could be a more proactive approach in supporting policy priorities, such as use of renewable energy and sustainable construction techniques in house building.
- **Paragraph 1.11** – does not seem to be a specific reference to sustainable use of natural resources. Keen to see this highlighted and to ensure that development decisions facilitate the ongoing sustainable management of the forests and woodlands in the National Park.

Links with other plans and legislation

- Not clear on the relationship of this Local Plan to the Park Plan and the Local Authorities 4 Structure Plans.
- Would welcome clarification of when the local plan will be deemed a material consideration when determining planning applications.
- There is a lack of reference to the National Policies that must be addressed in the LP.
- The Draft LP seems to lack vision and slips back into a system of being generally anti development with excessive control – missing meeting the aims of the Park and the primary objectives set out in Scottish Planning Policy 1.
- The point about 'greater weight' should be quoted in full including the phrase in the Act "where it appears to the Authority" as quoted on page 9.
- If there is a conflict, give priority to the first aim.
- Therefore the paragraphs in the draft LP that promote heritage aims at the expense of other aims, including cultural heritage, sustainable land use, recreation, education and social and economic wellbeing are contrary to the Act.

Other topics

- Concern over lack of reference to woodlands and forestry.
- There is rising interest in community involvement and opportunities from community management, such as Anagach.
- Seems that some of the Strategic Objectives quoted in Appendix 1 have not been picked up by the policies in the Local Plan, e.g. that on **page 124** under Integrated Land Management.

Other general comments

- Suggest reviewing the scale at which the Map 2 is shown in.
- If greater involvement had been had from SEPA, Highland Council, the Enterprise Company and SNH in advance of Community meetings the communities could have had access to important information.
- There is a lack of background information.
- Destructive development should not be permitted in the Park
- Growing pressures from outward commuters.
- Enhanced public transport.
- Implication of climate change.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

Special Qualities and aims of the Park and the aims of the Local Plan

- Too many limitations will dampen the vital dynamics needed to keep the Park area prosperous.

Housing

- Not possible to encourage agriculture and crofting at the same time as you build houses on the best soil. Nothing about flats with allotments?
- To use alluvium for house building and call rough grazing 'untouched' is irrational given that the grazing ground has already been altered by liming, heavy grazing, manuring and drainage.

Natural and Cultural Heritage

- Water cannot at the same time supply life to fish and wading birds and humanity's washing-up. If you get rid of flood water it does not sink in to re-supply summer needs. Therefore some reforestation / dams and allowing water to spread in winter/spring is required and local population for local employment/enterprise is preferred to disturbing tourism.
- Health requires functional foods (and reduces waste), happiness and fulfilment in work and genetics, not just clean air, exercise and water – though they help.

Economic growth

- Wild grasses are indeed rare, look at old crofts and shielings which are still showing results after 200yrs non-cultivation. Also, the post war changes of hill ground.

Other topics

- Concern that there are no policies relating to noise or light pollution included in the LP.

Other general comments

- Feel that the present use of language within the LP is giving an unnecessary negative tenor.
- Phrases such as 'presumption against' could be usefully replace with 'will be considered on individual merit'
- Phrases such as 'could be', 'may be' and 'in light of the circumstances' would help to swing the general tone of the document to one which is seen to be meeting individual; aspirations which still aims to protect the areas concerned.
- Feel that the LP should be a set of polices planning can be judged by.
- The baseline surveys were walk-over and should be carried out properly before any action takes place.
- Abattoir/creamery/cheese factory, yoghurt making for low food miles and less stressed animals?
- Broadband in the country for workaholics on holiday.
- Any research on thermo-energy and granites – suspect below average – and/or nuclear waste burial/reuse?
- Rapid changes in agriculture as well as costs for commuting/longevity/education for leisure as well as climate cannot be

quantified, but should be expected. Therefore policies should be more flexible than implied by these papers.

- Thus should we change our minds about the position of our Save-the-Local-Aspen project at the old land-fill site?

INDIVIDUALS

Special Qualities and aims of the Park and the aims of the Local Plan

- The word "Park" suggests beautiful countryside, a peaceful rural setting, not miles of suburbia.
- **Paragraph 1.11** The phrase "to support" the fourth bullet point in this paragraph is not strong enough.
- The different order of the bullet points to that of the aims of the Park is not acceptable.

Housing

- The plan should provide a maximum number of dwellings which can be accommodated for each site, with any site specific criteria – currently it does not.
- A park should surely be something different in its housing policy.
- Housing has to be restricted in the NP.
- Concern that housing developments may not be appropriate in design and setting to the NP.
- A scattering of houses like the west coast townships, if discretely placed, should not be discarded.
- A sensitively placed human dwelling in the countryside, with occupants sympathetic towards wildlife, will have a positive effect upon wildlife.
- There is room in Tulloch, outside Nethy Bridge for a few more families to bring this community back to life and have a positive impact upon wildlife.
- Grateful that the services of Herriot-Watt University have been employed. Would appreciate if the CNPA could come up with a forecast on population.
- Issues of monitoring housing provision over time.
- Specifically the requirement for '*a fully reasoned case why housing elsewhere is not suitable*'. This effectively means that a person could not buy the land and build a house on it to enable working of that land as a small holding.
- Feel that a Section 75 alone would suffice
- The penultimate paragraph of **Policy 39** appears to preclude the possibility of new build residences in remote locations where there may not be existing houses. Surely the CNPA do not intend to prevent people moving back into the deserted straths in the Park?

Natural and Cultural Heritage

- The Local Plan would be an excellent opportunity to highlight the shambles of conservation designations.
- The NSA system is flawed and of limited value.
- Strongly support the move to give greater protection to Ancient woodlands.

- Feel that woodland that is not on the Ancient Woodland Inventory should also be given protection.
- The Plan should make clear that large building schemes will not be permitted.
- No policies regarding the cultural heritage of the Park.
- Expansion of our present settlements has an immediate negative effect on wildlife inhabiting the edges of current boundaries.
- It is important that the remarkable diversity of drystone heritage within the Park is preserved, protected and even added to.
- However if any drystone structures are found to be beyond their viable life and have no habitat value they are just as well to be recycled.
- No developments in woodland listed in the Ancient Woodland Inventory or Semi-Natural Woodland Inventory.
- Buffer zones should be included around the most sensitive conservation sites (particularly where species especially prone to disturbance such as capercaillie are concerned)
- Sites should be identified which are of particular importance to conservation but which are not covered by a national conservation designation – such as area **H2** in Boat of Garten.
- Strongly support the move to give greater protection to ancient woodlands, but feel that woodland not on the Ancient Woodland Inventory should also be given protection.

Recreation and Tourism

- CNPA in conjunction with Highland Council and the Roads Authority should designate certain roads as suitable for shared use by cyclists, walkers, horse riders and cars. Signs could be used to re-route heavy vehicles and faster travelling traffic onto larger roads. This is already being carried out in Europe, and in England under the Transport Act 2000. This would help to fulfil the third aim of the NP.
- Understanding and enjoyment of the Park should lead to policies on education and recreation. Unfortunately they do not appear to be fully addressed in the Plan. Particularly on issue of ski centres.

Economic growth

- Better design, setting, landscaping and integrating small business would be more sustainable.
- Recognise benefits of incomers/holiday cottages
- The importance of sporting estates has not been mentioned. Suggest a policy to cover this.
- **Paragraph 3.74** “hunting” should read “country sports”
- Tourism developments should focus on proposals which encourage visitors from within the Highlands and Scotland due to future high fuel cost of long-haul tourism.

Design and sustainability

- Development plans should be planning for this change by encouraging sustainably designed communities.
- Things that might be done include:
 - encourage energy conservation in all developments (added to 12th paragraph of Policy 5) .

- A presumption in favour of extensions which enhance passive solar gain for houses. **Policy 21** should encourage installation of renewable energy schemes for individual houses
- Should be stated intent for cycle lanes in all communities and between communities (Kingussie-Newtonmore)
- Creation of allotments and community gardens should be encouraged
- Encouragement of smallholdings. Relates to **Policy 39**

Other topics

- No mention of light pollution.
- Note references in "Lighting in the Countryside" 1997 Office of the Deputy Prime Minister; Parliamentary Select Committee 2003 and PPG23.
- Suggest a new Topic Policy to be added regarding light pollution.
- A need for policies on forestry, farming and fishing, especially addressing the marketing of local produce.

Other general comments

- It should be possible for a prospective developer to be able to work out within broad limits the likelihood of obtaining planning permission for a particular project; this is not possible with the draft local plan.
- The plan must state what spare capacity is at present available in each sewage works catchment area and must specify its known weaknesses in the water supply system.
- It is not acceptable that an applicant has to consult two different planning offices. The CNPA and the Local Authorities must have agreement in an application.
- Because planning so often is based on maps it is a pleasure to see the statement in the second sentence of paragraph 2.5.
- The future should not be determined on the basis of maps drawn for other purposes.
- suggest that the sentence in paragraph 2.5 be expanded in the final draft to read: "some criteria (such as species, woodland or areas that are too small to be shown clearly) that are protected by the policies cannot be shown accurately on the proposals maps, and so must be identified at the time of a planning application through more detailed site investigations or consultation."
- Social mobility encourages the exercise of choice of living anywhere.
- Unless development is restricted in the three Straths of the Park, incomers will be moving into that which they are trying to escape from – Suburbia.
- Consultations have been inadequate and unstructured.
- Lack of draft Park Plan before the draft Local Plan.
- The overall message of the Local Plan is far too pro-development. It appears little different to what a normal Local Authority would produce for an area of normal countryside.
- The CNPA has the responsibility to educate both the residents and visitors to have a caring and proactive involvement with the native species of the CNP. Remind them that this is their Park, and then they will care for it.
- Development should be for the enjoyment of the park and its communities.
- Should include room for innovation

- No large scale developments, which would radically change the character of the community, should be allowed.
- Feel that the plan contains one central flaw – it fails to take adequate cognisance of the fact of a looming energy crisis.
- Consider that the Plan should make clear that large building schemes should not be permitted.

CNPA response on General Comments

- **Many general comments were received regarding the overall tone and content of the Draft Local Plan. In its revisions of the policies for the Deposit Plan, CNPA have taken into account the views made, and have simplified the number and tone of the policies to make it clear how planning applications will be judged in light of the plan. The Deposit Plan therefore contained overarching policies which must all be read together, and does not focus certain types of development towards individual policies. In the way, it is hoped that the impact developments have on the Park will be in line with promoting its aims and protecting its special qualities.**
- **In rationalising the range of policies, there is also greater clarity on the links with other relevant plans, including the Park Plan and those produced by the Local Authorities, and also with Scottish Executive guidance and policy.**
- **To further clarify this direct reference has been added to each policy to indicate the relationship with the Park Plan.**
- **In reviewing the content of the policies, a broader view has been taken to adequately address the aims of the Park, and how this links to the Planning Process. It is hoped that the policies now take a balanced approach to promoting all forms of development which have been designed to adequately reflect the importance of the National Park, its aims, and its special qualities.**
- **Specifically highlighted through the consultation process have been the issues of sustainability and housing provision, and it is hoped that by creating explicit policies to address these, their importance as key issues to the success of the Local Plan has been established.**
- **The general comments regarding use of text and correctness of maps have been noted and a consistent approach is taken in the Deposit Plan.**

General Policies

PUBLIC BODIES

General Policies 1-3.

- Suggest individual maps for each General Policy area.
- Suggest strengthening the emphasis on the national importance of social & economic benefits being required to outweigh adverse effects.
- Although not implicit in the legislation, in terms of policy category A listed buildings carry similar weight to scheduled monuments and could perhaps be included in the criteria for **General Policy 3** rather than **2**, however agree with the principle set out in **General Policy 2**.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

General Policies 1 – 3

- Difficult to follow which could be remedied by breaking down into several sub or bullet points.
- Meaning and use of "significant adverse impact".
- Revise to reflect the importance of paths to mountain summits being protected from and enhanced through development and not just in **General Policy 2** areas.
- Welcome the emphasis placed on conservation of the natural environment.
- There should be mention of third tier sites.
- Clarify definition of "sustainability" used.
- Suggest that mitigation be taken from **General Policies 1-3** and placed in a new General Policy 6.
- Concern that the importance of "landscape" has not adequate consideration.
- Need consistency when talking about adverse effects, should be referred to as "significant adverse effects"
- **General Policy 1** areas are considerable in extent. Protection of heritage assets within these areas could be secured technically, yet policies may fail in respect of ambiance or sense of place.
- Strongly feel that special planning in this context will have to make considerable allowance for buffer zones. Suggest the SEA be based on tiered surveys of heritage interest.
- Issues regarding economic and social benefits, feel that these statements are inappropriate for a National Park Local Plan.
- The rationale behind these three policies is not stated.
- The wording these three policies is imprecise and there are small variations in similar phrases between the policies, the reasons for which are not evident. e.g. **General Policy 1** refers to: "...the aims if the national Park or any of its special qualities" whereas **General Policy 2** refers to:"...the aims of the National Park or objectives of designation."
- Concern that the principal to give greater weight to the first aim only where there is a conflict of aims, will may be taken as a presumption.

Table 2.1

- Hard to believe that amenity open spaces, core paths, rights of way or other path networks do not extend or could not extend, within the lifetime of this Local Plan, outwith **General Policy 2** areas.

- Revise to reflect the importance of paths to mountain summits being protected from and enhanced through development and not just in **General Policy 2** areas.
- land without designation does not mean it should not be protected. Define "important croft".
- Need to clarify the three categories for protection
- Unsatisfied with the treatment of landscape, in that National Scenic Areas in **Table 2.1** are given lesser protection than areas designated for their value to wildlife conservation or science.
- Landscape forms the foundation of the Highland tourist industry and is the chief economic asset of the park. Urge that it is therefore given strict protection.

Overview Map

- a mix of imperial or metric units
- Colour coding of areas could be misinterpreted as traffic light system.

Other comments

- Need for precise and consistent wording with definitions were needed
- Suggest the plan needs more innovative policies such as a new General Policy regarding restoration and enhancement of the natural and cultural heritage of the Park.
- Do not take into account adequately social and economic benefits and are too restrictive
- Do little to encourage investment in the long-term sustainability of the park
- Concern that the topic policies will not catch many of the subtler issues which combine to define the essence of a National Park.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

General Policies 1-3

- These policies are welcomed.
- Particularly pleased to see that ancient woodland has been afforded a high level of protection through General Policy 2.
- Any loss of ancient woodland would not be compatible with the Parks 4 aims.
- Would strongly support flexibility in dealing with development outside settlement areas. Clarification regarding aims/vision differentiation.
- Would support strong flexibility regarding Settlement Development Areas.
- The approach to these policies appears to be too arbitrary.

Table 2.1

- **Core Paths** – These do not exist yet, inclusion of them within **General Policy 2** criteria could lead to a resistance to create them within existing **General Policy 1** areas and other problems, suggest they are dropped from the list of criteria for **General Policy 2**.
- Local Sites and Monuments Records – many are in existing **General Policy 1** areas rather than **General Policy 2** areas.
- Reservations regarding criteria used
- The column for General Policy 2 omits Local Authority designations such as Aberdeenshire's Sites of Interest to Natural Science. Less protection

will be therefore be afforded to these sites within the Park than in the neighbouring areas and is at odds with the CNPA vision and strategic objectives.

- Find it odd that such general identifications as “amenity open space” and “poorly drained areas” should be afforded protection ranking with SSSIs and Geological Conservation Review Sites.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- ‘Ancient Woodlands’ designation is totally flawed as it fails to recognise that much of the areas is now commercial timber forestry.
- General Policies should include a commitment to review all designated areas on a regular basis.
- Essential that errors such as these are corrected in the final draft.
- Some of the designations owe their existence to the presence of livestock. This means that the survival of such areas is dependant on being grazed in the traditional manner.
- There are a number of ‘draconian’ phrases such as the opening sentence to **General Policy 2** which should be revised.
- Concerned over an apparent loop-hole within **General Policy 2** whereby it appears to allow developments – ‘*where it is considered that these would be outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance or of importance to the NP*’. This suggests that the LP provisions could be ignored. The LP needs to be more pro-active in how to deal with such situations.

INDIVIDUALS

- Not clear
- Issues of the height criteria.
- Find General Policy hard to accept – unreasonable to expect small development in the countryside to comply with the criteria, should be ambition rather than obligation.

General Policy 1

PUBLIC BODIES

- Suggest rewording to make it supportive of developments which benefit Natura sites.
- Suggest breaking down into two points regarding social and economic issues and mitigation measures.
- Greater definition required of the criteria in table 2.1.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Propose a rounding off of **General Policy 1** area boundary to exclude some sensitive areas.
- Reword to show CNPA's commitment to promoting sustainable social and economic sustainability.
- Is fairly negative and open to interpretation and is ambiguous. May fail to comply with PAN 49.
- Recommends incorporating PAN 49 into all policies especially **General Policy 1 and 5**.

- Welcomes the wording in **General Policy 1**, however this has to be reconciled with the more restrictive wording used elsewhere such as in **Policy 5**.
- Welcomes this policy, a balanced approach is necessary.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Fully support **General Policy 1**. – suggest this is proper interpretation of The National Park (Scotland) Act 2000.
- Too restrictive
- **General Policies Overview** – the boundary runs through the centre of Lynchat where there are no **General Policy 2** criteria designations in existing planning policy.
- Negative and anti-development, especially if the aims are to be interpreted at site level.
- Important that sensible development is planned for and allowed, and that the aims should only be applied in a wider park area context.
- Define “Significant Adverse Effect”
- It should be made clear that adverse effects need to be significant as defined in NPPG 14 and as such would affect the overall integrity of the National Park.
- Paragraph 33 of NPPG14 should also be referred to as regards giving weight to social and economic interests of local communities.
- As it stands the wording of this policy would restrict any new development except that on zoned land. This does not accord with the views of the National Parks Aims.
- Fails to give sufficient weight to first aim.

INDIVIDUALS

- The policy appears to apply to all areas which do not fall into one or more of the conservation designations listed for **General Policies 2 or 3**. It is misleading to a prospective developer and is simplistic. A policy such as this must be founded on a careful survey of the area.
- This is a far too permissive statement. Is more pro-development than that of Highland Council.
- No recognition of the cumulative effects of developments.
- This policy should ensure that the general countryside area in the lower ground should remain without further development except in the most exceptional circumstances. A very strong presumption against development should be clearly stated in this policy.
- The extract in **paragraph 2.3** does not accurately reflect what is written under section 9 and 1(a) of the National Park Scotland Act. It should read “the NPA shall give greater weight” and not “should give greater weight to the first aim”
- **General Policy 1** needs to be reworded to reflect the presumption in favour of heritage in accordance with the National Park Scotland Act. It is essential that the Plan reflects the statutory requirements.
- Recommend the Precautionary Principle be introduced into the introduction, along with rewording General Policies 1 & 2 to better reflect the requirements of the National Park Scotland Act.

General Policy 2

PUBLIC BODIES

- 1st bullet point should refer to the first aim of the Park.
- Concern regarding possible impacts to natural heritage if it is clearly outweighed by social and economic benefits.
- Reference to Inventory of Gardens and designed landscapes in criteria in table 2.1
- General Policies 2 and 3 - The proposed criterion for housing eligibility seems too restrictive and may be difficult to enforce.
- In **General Policy areas 2 and 3**, one of the criteria to demonstrate that no alternative site is available could be time consuming in terms of confirmation and corroboration.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Support these policies.
- Wish it to be stated that renovations and improvements to existing buildings in the remote areas of the park will be permitted provided that the proposal does not change essential character of the existing structure or create significant visual impact.
- Crofting regulation can be used to increase the number of crofts by subdivision or by apportionment from the common grazings, the need for housing in these newly created crofts would require planning permission – suggest this be built into **General Policy 2**.
- **General Policy 2** should be reworded to be less restrictive as it covers the majority of land in the NP, and as it stands could have major sterilising effects.
- **Use of the 400m contour as a Policy Boundary** - Using this contour for the application of **General Policy 2** seems too inflexible For most of the visiting public, often car borne, the scenic quality of the lower ground is at least as important as that of the higher hills.
- **400m as Threshold** - No explanation why this is a threshold for **General Policy 2** Criteria.
- By applying this threshold, considerable areas of lower lying but sensitive, scenically and environmentally important ground has been included in the **General Policy 1** category.
- Need to reduce the altitudinal criteria or to exclude the sensitive areas in **General Policy 1**.The Aviemore-Glenmore corridor therefore needs to be protected from creeping urbanization.
- The requirement in **General Policy 2** applying to land above 400 metres for power schemes to demonstrate there is no alternative, would have the effect of excluding most potential hydropower development (including possible community schemes) because it would be impossible to meet. The remaining provisions would represent a stringent policy test for any development proposals without this requirement.
- Using this contour for the application of **General Policy 2** seems too inflexible
- For most of the visiting public, often car borne, the scenic quality of the lower ground is at least as important as that of the higher hills.
- The Aviemore-Glenmore corridor therefore needs to be protected from creeping urbanization.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- **General Policy 2 and 3** sets a broad presumption against development of any kind.
- Suggest removing the words “no suitable alternatives” from **General Policies 2 & 3** to bring them into line with correct interpretation of the statutory aims of the NP
- **Paragraph 3.19 – Development above 400m**
- Benefit where managing existing and new path routes above 400m. Some such paths can develop through use (under the SOAC) and not through the planning process – having the ability to manage them over time should not be unduly constrained by the Local Plan.
- There may well be properties, farms located above 400m where it would be inappropriate for **General Policy 2** to apply without any modification. This could have adverse implications for farm diversification.
- The application of **General Policy 2**, to land above 400m would have the effect of arbitrarily excluding most potential hydro development in the park, it would be impossible to demonstrate an alternative.
- To include all land over 400m is highly restrictive
- Paragraph 3.19 – 400m restriction is a crude rule of thumb.
- Is a disincentive and will not deliver the first point from the vision strategy.
- Land in the Ancient Woodland inventory should not be a reason for clarifying it under **General Policy 2**.
- Some land designations should not be used to impose a presumption against development, such as NSAs, semi-natural woodland, some SSSIs.
- Aims and objectives of land owners should be considered along with the aims of the NP.
- Restrictions on future development caused by the majority of land in the NP under General Policy 2 or 3 will result in a decline on economically sustainable activities and an increasing reliance on government funding and employment.
- Suggest that the words “there is no alternative and” be deleted from the policy.
- Too restrictive, effectively sterilising vast areas from any development.
- The Woodland Initiatives are meant only as a guide.
- The General Policy 2 area should be reduced in size.
- Overly restrictive, there will always be an alternative. Duplication of areas already under designation, protected again through **General Policy 2**. Suggest redrawing as shown on attached map.
- The opening statement of is very negative and does not accord with the aims of the Park.
- The last point is also too negative to achieve the aims. It should read “or are mitigated” not “and are mitigated”
- The special qualities of the park should be defined.
- Define “no alternative”. The term appears too restrictive.
- This does not accord with NPPG 14 which applies the alternative test only to International Designations.

INDIVIDUALS

- Needs to be reference to cumulative impacts.
- Should include all areas of native woodlands to be consistent with the commitment made at the 2002 World Summit.

- Needs to be recognition of possible adverse impacts coming from outwith the boundary of designated sites.
- Suggest identifying buffer zones around designated areas.
- Suggest identifying and protecting undesignated sites for their nature conservation and landscape features.
- Concern in same way with **General Policy 2**. 2nd Bullet point - if significant adverse effects then there should be a presumption of refusal, regardless of whether there are significant social or economic benefits.
- The Precautionary Principle be introduced into the introduction, along with rewording General Policies 1 & 2 to better reflect the requirements of the National Park Scotland Act.

General Policy 3

PUBLIC BODIES

- Within the **General Policy 2 Criteria in Table 2.1** "Flood Consultation Areas" are referred to, but are not defined anywhere. This should be clarified, especially as the functional floodplain is included within the criteria for **General Policy 3**.
- Unlikely to comply with Natura Regs.
- Suggest a statement that effects of activities arising from a proposal on important cultural heritage will be considered.
- Consideration to be given to local landscape designations.
- The proposed criterion for housing eligibility seems too restrictive and may be difficult to enforce.
- In **General Policy areas 2 and 3**, one of the criteria to demonstrate that no alternative site is available could be time consuming in terms of confirmation and corroboration.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Paths extend onto the Cairngorms plateau, yet paths do not appear to be a criterion of **General Policy 3** areas.
- Should also include candidate SPAs and SACs.
- The Criteria contained in **Table 2.1** should include Annex 1 species listed in the Birds Directive and candidate SPAs/SACs.
- Will this effectively block the improvement of access opportunities in these areas? Will path development be blocked as in the recent Glenmore SAC example?
- **General Policies 1 – 3 Criteria – Landscape** - Suggest re-considering the categorisations for landscape due to the UK signing the European Landscape Convention which will affect the National Scenic Areas designation through the Planning, etc. (Scotland) Bill.
- Given the importance of the Cairngorm landscapes the fact that no area is listed under **General Policy 3** is unreasonable.
- Areas that should be included are:
 - Strath Nethy, Bynack Mor, upper Water of Caiplich and upper Glen Avon.
 - The Headwaters of the Feshie – Geldie, and the upper River Dee, Glen Ey catchments (between the proposed General Policy 3 boundary of the Cairngorm massif and the southern boundary of the NP across to Glen Clunie.

- The Gaick area and upper catchment of Glen Tromie
- Northern Slopes of Lochnagar, across upper Glen Muick to upper Glens Mark, Lee and Clova.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- **General Policy 2 and 3** sets a broad presumption against development of any kind.
- Suggest removing the words “no suitable alternatives” from **General Policies 2 & 3** to bring them into line with correct interpretation of the statutory aims of the NP
- **Protected Nature Conservation Sites & Bio Diversity**
- 2nd paragraph - Suggest the deletion of words “where there are no alternative locations” and replacement with “where any adverse effects would be outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance or importance to the aims of the National Park and where appropriate measures are taken to minimise and mitigate the adverse effects”.
- Unreasonably restrictive, designations/restrictions should not destroy current use.
- Too restrictive – “adverse impact” rules out most developments.
- Overlapping of **General Policy areas 2 & 3** should be reconsidered in the case of Glen Tanar.
- This is the current legislation for Natura 2000 sites
- How does extending this type of constraint to contaminated land and near sewage works assist the Aims?
- Suggest demonstrating how it is proposed to take forward the four Aims of the Park together in preparation of all policies.
- All criteria other than the international ones should be removed from this general policy and placed in **General Policy 2**

INDIVIDUALS

- Needs to refer to cumulative impacts and recognise possible adverse impacts coming from outwith the boundary of designated sites.
- Suggest identifying buffer zones around designated areas.
- Suggest identifying and protecting undesignated sites for their nature conservation and landscape features.

General Policy 4

PUBLIC BODIES

- Suggest a requirement for development proposals to demonstrate a need for the development to be out with a settlement.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Suggest the cut off point for development in **General Policy 4** to be 600m not 400, as some properties in the park are above this height.
- Should mention socio-economic and economic impact assessments as part of the ‘due consideration’ process.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Would like to see a stronger statement on compliance with General and Topic Policies.
- Suggest replacing “proposals will be favourably considered if they comply with the policies in Sections 2-3” with a stronger statement “proposals that do not comply with General Policies and Topic Policies set out in the Local Plan will not be considered.”
- Further development should be considered on its merits.
- Too restrictive – “adverse impact” rules out most developments.
- The approach to consider housing outwith settlement in this policy is contradictory with other policies within the plan.
- Object to statement that the wider policies are deemed suitable to guide development within settlements.
- Consideration should be given to the fact that Lynchat was previously identified as a settlement and has potential.
- Considering development outside settlements seems to be contrary to the other policies in the Plan. Object to third paragraph.
- Must continue flexibility of this policy.

INDIVIDUALS

- Too permissive.
- **Paragraph 2.11** - Suggest using the term “carrying capacity” rather than “sustainable” when referring to finite resources, such as land for housing.

General Policy 5

PUBLIC BODIES

- Supports the requirement for adequate infrastructure such as sewage and SUDS facilities to be readily available or implementable for the site.
- Design Guide development is welcomed, suggest a sustainability checklist also.
- Until this guidance is developed suggest that the policy could be made clearer by expanding the paragraph on waste minimisation and adding the sentence “...and composting by making provision within the site for the collection, storage and segregation of waste.”
- Welcome the first paragraph of General Policy 5 regarding flooding criteria with the addition of “in full accordance with national planning policy”.
- The issue of air quality could be incorporated into this policy.
- General Policy 5 – numbering and guidance on how it is to be implemented would be helpful.
- Wording needs to be stronger and clearer.
- Suggest rewording 2nd paragraph so that all developments must avoid damage to the Parks special qualities.
- Suggest rewording of 3rd paragraph.
- The requirement for development proposals to be assessed against Sustainable Development Principles will present difficulty in enforcing compliance.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Suggest numbered breakdown, some rewording necessary.

- Suggest numbering, rationalising and ensuring they are relevant and enforceable. Include waste minimisation and light pollution.
- Suggest rewording to allow this policy to become an ambition rather than an obligation. Replace “will” with “should” and add to the following to the first paragraph: “...compliance with the following sustainable development principals which should be met where possible and reasonable. A balance of economic and environmental costs and benefits should be struck, and a statement of compliance will be required to accompany each application...”
- Concern over how easily this will be to implement. But support.
- Support all policy conditions listed as pre-requirements for sustainable development within the park.
- The above must be applied flexibly according to the nature of the development.
- Suggest a condition requiring design to ensure effective and efficient water use, given the problem of water demand within some areas of the Park.
- Needs to be a definition and criteria for unsustainable developments.
- Recommends incorporating PAN 49 into all policies especially **General Policy 1 and 5**.
- Needs to give a stronger lead in terms of defining the criteria.
- Some items such as provision of electricity supply are outwith scope of control.
- Concern over the stipulating of local labour and local materials.
- General Policy 5 should be accompanied by the Sustainable Design Guide.
- Welcomes the recognition of the importance of a viable Park economy.
- It should be made clear which of the various definitions of Sustainable Development has been adopted.
- Needs to be a definition and criteria for unsustainable developments.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Suggest changing the word “negligible” for the word “minimal” in the 2nd paragraph
- This policy is so restrictive that it is likely to result in an unsustainable local economy.
- Suggest rewording parts - too much detail
- Issues of attracting visitors leading to disturbance of wildlife etc, and detracting from wilderness. Encourage visitors to spend money.
- Unreasonable to include electricity supply as a criterion.
- Many aspects of this policy are subjective and open to interpretation.
- A Local Plan should not be prescriptive regarding infrastructure, choice of labour, whether shops can cope etc. These issues will be dealt with by separate negotiations with applicants and market forces.
- Numerous design details are mentioned here; some are best dealt with by building warrant, some are above and beyond the standards.
- A more positive attitude of encouragement rather than prescriptive insistence is required.
- There is no guidance as to which locally sourced materials are considered suitable.

- Regarding the reference to locally sourced materials, this could present a problem to the development industry as any attempt to dictate the use of a single source of material could be interpreted as being contrary to European Competition Policies.
- Over provision may in some cases lead to uneconomic development, wording may be too prescriptive.
- This policy should be based on the Scottish Executive's Sustainable Development Strategy. And the objectives states in paragraphs 7 and 8 of SPP1.
- For consistency it should reflect the Highland Council's Sustainable Design Statement.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Some recognition must be given to the fact that in some rural areas using local sources and utilising local labour skills is impracticable because of a lack of available skills, insufficient choice and cost implications.

INDIVIDUALS

- Any proposed development site should not conflict with adjacent areas of natural heritage importance.
- Should address the issue of light pollution.

CNPA response on General Policies

- **Many comments focused on the use of general policies which were overly complicated and lead to lack of clarity on their application. In particular how these general policies sat with the other policies of the Local Plan was difficult to understand. As a result of these comments, the Deposit Local Plan has broken the content of the general policies down and included them with the polices contained throughout the Plan. Policy 1 remains as an overarching policy linking all proposals for development back to the aims of the Park, and how these aims are considered in the development process.**

Policy 1 – Natura 2000 and Ramsar Sites

PUBLIC BODIES

- Require to be streamlined. Is it necessary to repeat matters enshrined in law or procedures/regulations in policy?
- Should be a policy or a statement of the need to take account of cumulative impact, especially in the case of Natura interests.
- Text should give reference to geological and Geomorphological interests.
- Mention Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004.
- Licences for research, education, etc available from SNH not SE

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Wording is not clear – as presented it appears to be in reverse order.
- Is contrary to the robust approach taken in General Policy 3.
- The wording should be significantly improved to conform to the needs of the Habitats Regulations.
- Needs to be more explicit and offer stronger protection to International designated sites.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Should take into account economic and social considerations when considering development close to or within a designated area.
- Some clarification is needed.

INDIVIDUALS

- Why is this policy in the Plan? It is no more than a statement of the legislative position and should be deleted.

CNPA response on Policy 1

- **The comments have been noted and the policy regarding Natura 2000 sites is now contained within Policy 2 of the Deposit Local Plan. The text better reflects the requirements of the Natura 2000 legislation and also explains how developments being judged against this policy will be considered. Greater reference is also made to the links with other legislation and the Park Plan.**

Policy 2 – Protected Species

PUBLIC BODIES

- Guidance on how criterion c will be assessed.
- Require to be streamlined. Is it necessary to repeat matters enshrined in law or procedures / regulations in policy?
- Should be a statement regarding a protected species survey required by developers.
- Does not fully capture all the protected species that require consideration in planning decisions.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Rewrite, strengthen in favour of protection.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support Topic Policies 2
- Suggest a more balanced statement.

CNPA response on Policy 2

- **The comments have been noted and the policy relating to Protected species is now contained within Policy 5 of the Deposit Local Plan. The revised policy makes greater reference to other legislation and also explains how development proposals which affect protected species should comply with the aims of the Park and the Local Plan.**

Policy 3 – Biodiversity

PUBLIC BODIES

- Welcomes the first paragraph in this policy.
- Request that the policy refer specifically to the requirement to protect and create natural and semi-natural habitats and to protect open and natural waterbodies, watercourses, wetland and river corridor habitats including a presumption against excessive engineering and culverting of watercourses and a presumption for the creation of riparian buffer zones and require the restoration of culverted or canalized watercourses.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Welcome the wording of this policy, in particular the emphasis on permission only being granted when habitats of equal conservation value are provided.
- **Page 20** – interest must go beyond NP boundary to prevent adverse impacts.
- Concern over the term “Biodiversity” in this context and concern that the first paragraph may be open to abuse.
- Concern over the current wording.
- Should apply only where the effect on habitats or species is significant.
- More importance should be placed on soils.
- Feel there should be scope to link biodiversity policies within the LP to a General Policy 7 proposed by The Mountaineering Council of Scotland in their submission to the draft LP.
- It is presumed in Policy 3 the criteria should be the Functional Flood Plain and not the Functional Flood Plan?

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Would like to see this policy expanded to enhance protection of valuable non-designated sites, which may not be identified through BAPs or LBAPs such as high conservation value woodlands.
- Suggest that the first paragraph of the policy should read therefore: “...*Nature Conservation Act*, **as well as other non-designated areas of high conservation value**, and that...”
- Support Topic Policies 3

- A survey should only be required where it is clear that the proposed development will have a significant adverse impact on a species or habitat at risk.
- Suggest some rewording.
- Some clarification is needed.
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24.**
- The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

CNPA response on Policy 3

- **The comments regarding biodiversity have been noted, and the policy has been changed, and is not largely contained within Policy 6 of the Deposit Local Plan, although other policies within the section regarding Conserving and Enhancing the Park also make direct reference to Biodiversity and should be referred to when considering any representation or proposal for development. The links between biodiversity and other aspects of natural heritage are clearly made as are the links to the Park Plan and other relevant legislation. The text has been modified to clarify the CNPA position on this important topic, and the impact made on biodiversity from any development is now explicitly considered along with the other policies of the local plan in line with European legislation on the topic.**

Policy RM9 – Soil Conservation and Management

PUBLIC BODIES

- outline or list principals of best practice.
- Suggest some rewording of the supportive text.
- Should define what might be unacceptable.
- Should be at threshold below which a soil management plan would not be required.
- As this is a completely new topic for Council staff, it would add a further aspect to the application process by way of having to assess the submitted soil management plan, especially since the current wording implies that all development would apply.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Should be specific mention of new hill tracks.
- Concern that the additional requirement for a soil management plan in all developments.
- This implies it would be irrespective of the extra burden of cost, possibly without any clear environmental benefits in many cases.
- Generally feel that some of the policies for development control may be difficult to enforce and add additional expense.
- If this increase were to be material to the raising cost of living and business in the Park then it could impact on the sustainability of future economic and social development therein.

- domestic land curtilages? Clarification needed.
- Inconsistent with the numbering in the plan.
- Requires more balance so that soil management plans are only required where the proposed development is significant.
- Replace “agricultural” with “agriculture”.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- There are forest industry best practice guidelines, such as Forestry Soil Conservation Guidelines and Forest and Water Guidelines.
- Support Topic Policies RM9.
- Suggest rewording to be more balanced.
- The requirement to submit a final soil management plan in advance of planning permission would present practical difficulties for those who use design and build contractors.
- With a design and build strategy, soil management can only be finalised after the contract has been awarded and the design phase is well advanced, after planning permission has been granted. It is the contractor who is in the best position to submit a final soil management plan.
- For the above reasons suggest the following:
 - A preliminary soil management plan to be submitted with the planning application.
 - The submission and approval in writing by the Authority of a final soil management plan prior to the commencement of development (could be a condition of the permission)
- To require any amendments which may be found necessary to be similarly approved before any work to which they refer is carried out.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- The curtilage of an existing house should be excluded from this policy in order to minimise the use of unnecessary regulations with their attendant costs in time and money.

INDIVIDUALS

- Soils are much more than just a natural resource. Without soils, there would be no above-ground vegetation, or animals, including man. Soils are the basis for all terrestrial life on earth.
- Issues of building developments on pinewood and moorland soils.
- Better to site developments on former arable soil where drainage problems seldom arise.

CNPA response on Policy 4

- **The topic of soil management and conservation is now contained within Policy 14 of the Deposit Local Plan, although other policies contained within the Plan are also relevant particularly where they relate to the impact on natural heritage and on the visual aspects of the landscape. It is important therefore that all the policies of the plan are read together and not in isolation. The revised policy, in its supporting justification recognises the importance of soil to the maintenance of a healthy**

environment and establishes the important role the development management process plays in protecting it from adverse development.

Policy 4 – Landscape

PUBLIC BODIES

- Require to be streamlined. Is it necessary to repeat matters enshrined in law or procedures / regulations in policy?
- Suggest some additions to text.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Acknowledge the inclusion of HLA data.
- Support and welcome this policy.
- Wish it to be stated that renovations and improvements to existing buildings in the remoter areas of the park will be permitted provided that the proposal does not change essential character of the existing structure or create significant visual impact.
- Consider that not all past human activity has been beneficial.
- Some inaccurate/misleading sentences. Suggest rewording **paragraph 3.14**.
- Hesitant wording over the issue of wildness.
- Suggest replacing “wildness” with “remoteness”.
- Feel that the absolute wording of this policy is not consistent with **General Policies 1-3** which would overrule it.
- Replace “some” with “sum” in **para 3.14**
- **Paragraph 3.19** – consideration must be given to the fact that land over 400m is used for; forestry; livestock shelter; grazing; a source of potable water supplies; renewable energy schemes; fieldsports; and general recreation.
- Wording is inflexible and should take account of the possibilities of mitigation and adverse effects.
- Development should be approved where it will make a positive contribution to park aims.
- Welcome the proposal to review PDRs as it is a crucial marker and statement of intent
- Suggest that the Cairngorms Landscape Character Assessment becomes a fundamental reference point for developers and will be material consideration in the identification and assessment of development proposals.
- The importance of landscape to the Park area is not recognised sufficiently.
- Landscape should be placed as Policy No 1 and given a key prominence on judging development opportunities, elements of this policy and other CNP policies.
- Seek greater prominence and protection for the NSA areas and not just to look at all land over 400 metres as being the same.
- **Paragraph 3.14** is an overstatement and inaccurate.
- This statement could be interpreted as a justification in support of further human activity, it should be noted that not all past and recent human activity has been beneficial to the Cairngorms.

- Disappointed at the timidity with which the subject of wild land is approached.
- Find it unacceptable given that the extent of wild land was one of the key reasons for designating the Park.
- Therefore object particularly to **paragraph 3.18**
- Support the rewording of **paragraphs 3.14, 3.18 and 3.19** as suggested by The Mountaineering Council for Scotland in their submission.
- Object to these paragraphs as they currently stand.
- **Paragraph 3.11** – entirely endorse this statement.
- **Wilderness – Paragraphs 3.18 & 3.19**
- Given the nature of the Cairngorms, the hesitant wording of these paragraphs in relation to wild land is unhelpful and surprising.
- It is generally agreed that the terms “wildness”, “wild character” and wild land” do apply to significant parts of the Cairngorms.
- These paragraphs need to be strongly rewritten to remove this hesitant language and to make the importance of such areas and experiential qualities clear.
- Policy should be included that recognises the fact that some past decisions and activities have led to landscape degradation in the Park, and which encourages restorative work of the affected sites.
- Would like to know what is proposed to help to protect the natural woodlands, natural areas of heather and areas of Scots Pines.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support this policy
- Would like to see it go further by committing to prevent development in areas which are of great value for extending and creating habitat networks.
- Suggest therefore the first paragraph of the policy should read: “...will not be permitted. **Development that is proposed in an area identified as suitable for expansion and creation of habitat networks will also not be permitted.**”
- Re-word policy as it is suggested in response so that it is no longer at odds with **General Policy 1**
- This may result in recreating a wilderness that cannot sustain the people who have invested in or depend on their land holding for their livelihood. Not compatible with the first point in the vision strategy.
- Need a more balanced statement.
- Access tracks can mean the difference between an economically viable and an unviable land holding.
- Disagree with wording in **paragraph 3.19**.
- Object to **Proposal 1**.
- The varied landscapes within the CNP are largely a consequence of land management practices that can only be maintained if existing land management practices receive support. Care should be taken to ensure that policies are not introduced which impinge upon existing good management.
- Concern regarding the removal of certain permitted development rights (**Proposal 1**). It must be ensured that this does not adversely affect the economics of farming and forestry.
- Endorse the content of **Policy 4** particularly the second paragraph.

- This policy should include an allowance for development, with the potential to have an adverse impact on such areas, subject to satisfactory and appropriate mitigation measures.
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24.**
- The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

CNPA response on Policy 4

- **Having taken the comments regarding landscape into consideration, the Deposit Local Plan now contains policy 7, although within the Conserving and Enhancing section of the Plan other policies also relate to the wider landscape and must be taken into account. The revised policy relates more closely to the aims of the Park, and aims to protect its special landscape qualities from insensitive development. There is an underlying resumption that all development will make a positive contribution to the Park and its qualities. Reference is also made in the supporting justification to other landscape assessments which will also be referred to in assessing the impact of any proposal.**

Proposal 1 – Permitted Development Rights in the National Park

PUBLIC BODIES

- Would welcome this being extended to cover PDRs which significantly affect the Park’s historic environment assets.
- This above could be useful for strengthening Policy 8.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Support **Proposal 1**
- Needs definition and should be tightened, especially to control vehicle tracks.
- The impacts of removing PDRs on economic development should be examined in detail.
- Strongly suggest this should include hill tracks.
- Any changes resulting from the consultation of the White Paper “Modernising the Planning System” regarding PDOs should be included particularly reference to hill tracks.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Object to **Proposal 1**.
- Concern regarding the removal of certain permitted development rights. It must be ensured that this does not adversely affect the economics of farming and forestry.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Would be helpful at this stage to know which permitted rights the CNPA wish to remove.

INDIVIDUALS

- Support these.

CNPA response on Proposal 1

- **The comments are noted but in the revised policies of the Deposit Local Plan it has been decided to remove proposals and policies which duplicate the content of other legislation. CNPA can therefore consider the removal of permitted development rights at any time in the future without the need for a specific reference in the Local Plan, and this is the proposed approach to be taken, to ensure the Local Plan is as streamlined as possible.**

Policy 5 – Archaeology

PUBLIC BODIES

- Require to be streamlined. Is it necessary to repeat matters enshrined in law or procedures / regulations in policy?

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Detailed areas for clarification.
- Special features given inadequate attention
- Feel that the 'Planned Village' is a special feature unique to Scotland, e.g. Tomintoul, resulting from lowland clearances and Ballater, originally planned as a Spa town.
- Feel that the relevant policies need to capture the social and historical significance of the 'Planned Villages'.
- Feel that the Military Roads are an important and unique feature that should be strictly protected.
- Restoration of unsightly areas
- Policies make no provision for the design and 'restoration' of areas such as the socially and architectural incoherence of Aviemore – this needs attention.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support Topic Policies 5
- Would welcome better support for the preservation of cultural heritage.
- A more pragmatic approach needed to the first paragraph of this policy.
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24.**
- The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

INDIVIDUALS

- The Local Plan does not reflect the fact that the prime responsibility for the protection of ancient monuments rests with Historic Scotland and not the Planning Authority.

CNPA response on Policy 5

- **The issue of Cultural Heritage has been recognised as of key importance to the Local Plan and as such an additional section on the topic has been added. A separate policy specifically relating to archaeology is included at Policy 9, where the wording has been clarified and aims to offer adequate protection with a preference to preservation and adequate recording. Wider sites which are not scheduled or otherwise recorded are also offered some protection through Policy 12 which looks at the wider issue of cultural heritage in the Park area.**

Policy 6/ 6a - Listed Buildings and demolition

PUBLIC BODIES

- Require to be streamlined. Is it necessary to repeat matters enshrined in law or procedures / regulations in policy?
- The Memorandum may be subject to change within the lifetime of the LP, so there may be merit in building more flexibility into this policy.
- **Policy 6A** - has been abbreviated from NPPG 18 and omits some significant factors. In particular it omits the need to submit a feasibility study which explores the viability of retaining the building in active use, addresses the importance of the building and the extent to which the community would benefit from redevelopment.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- As written this policy will not be effective.
- **Policy 6A** - Disagree with this policy.
- Add 'their associated land' so that the last sentence reads: "*changes of use to listed buildings and their associated land*"
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24.**
- The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

CNPA response on Policy 6 & 6a

- **The issue of Cultural Heritage has been recognised as of key importance to the Local Plan and as such an additional section on the topic has been added. The policy relating to listed buildings is contained within Policy 10, and has been redrafted to better reflect national guidance on the subject. The underlying aim of the policy is to protect listed buildings where possible and ensure that new development does not adversely affect the buildings or their setting. The policy will enable the wider aims of the Park in regarding to cultural heritage where this relates to listed buildings in particular.**

Policy 7 – Conservation Areas

PUBLIC BODIES

- Requires to be streamlined. Is it necessary to repeat matters enshrined in law or procedures / regulations in policy?

- This policy could be strengthened with a proposal to produce conservation area appraisals and supplementary planning guidance for conservation areas.
- The policy could then be more positive and proactive.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Unduly negative and should be reworded to be consistent with the memorandum of Guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, Historic Scotland 1988
- Suggest some rewording.

CNPA response on Policy 7

- **The policy regarding Conservation Areas is now contained within Policy 11 of the Deposit Local Plan, and has been redrafted in light of the comments received. The text is now in line with current guidance on the subject, and it is anticipated that supplementary guidance will be produced to add further detail, although this does not need to be specifically mentioned within the policy.**

Policy 8 – Locally distinctive and vernacular architecture

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Should be combined with **Policy 6**, buildings should be identified using criteria.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Consider the potential of existing buildings to accommodate housing, economic and recreational needs.
- Some rewording/clarification is needed to the second paragraph.
- Object as overly restrictive. This policy should allow a pragmatic approach to the alteration and conversion of vernacular buildings, preserving features while allowing innovative alteration to suit modern requirements.
- Support the content of **Policy 8**.
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24**.
- The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- This can be a matter of perception.
- Who will decide on what is worth retaining?
- Will there be a common date throughout the Park which marks a building out as 'in the vernacular style'?
(Harling and corrugated iron are vernacular in some areas at some periods)

INDIVIDUALS

- Support this policy.

CNPA response on Policy 8

- **The topic of local distinctive and vernacular architecture falls within the consideration of the wider cultural heritage found within the Park boundary, and the policy relating to this in the Deposit Local Plan is at Policy 12. The text has been amended to broaden its remit from developments affecting architectural sites to any site of local or wider cultural heritage. The supporting text provides information on the method of implementation and explains in part what is meant by local and wider cultural heritage. The revised policy is aimed to assist in protecting the cultural heritage of the Park in line with National Park aims.**

Policy 9 – Local Cultural Heritage Features

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- **Paragraph 3.26** – the importance of the Park for recreation should be expressed more strongly.
- Support this policy.
- This section contains the only reference to bothies. Do not consider this section truly represents the importance of mountain bothies.
- Many bothies have been present for over 100 years and form an important link in the tourist accommodation chain and serve as valuable (sometimes lifesaving) refuges in adverse weather.
- The true status and value of bothies should be clearly stated in the draft Local Plan, either in this section or elsewhere as appropriate.
- “Known” should be “listed”.
- Regarding Mountain bothies it is unclear what attitude is likely to be taken to proposals to extend, renovate or remove mountain bothies, shelters or bridges.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Hope that **policy 9** will ensure that we do not lose any more milestones of Scotland’s natural and cultural heritage.
- **Paragraph 3.26** – would be helpful to have an indication of how the Local Plan sees the “cultural importance of trees” in relation to planning decisions.
- Support Topic Policies 9
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24.**
- The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

Paragraph 3.27

- An effort should be made to codify many features referred to.

- Wide spread publicity should be used to enlist the help of the public in drawing up a comprehensive list.
- Additional features could include limekilns; former mills, bridges, churchyards.

CNPA response on Policy 9

- **The topic of local cultural heritage features has now been included within Policy 12 of the Deposit Local Plan. The text has been amended to encourage in a more positive way, the protection of any site of local or wider cultural heritage and the supporting text provides information on the method of implementation and explains in part what is meant by local and wider cultural heritage. The revised policy is aimed to assist in protecting the cultural heritage of the Park in line with National Park aims.**

Policy 10 – Protection of the Water Environment

PUBLIC BODIES

- Reword
- Any development that would cause damage to waterbodies should be refused.
- Recognise impacts on water quality, quantity flow rate habitats and species, floodplains and catchments.
- Suggest an amendment to allow soft engineering approaches to flood management to be favourably considered.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- **Policy 10** should include protection of water where it is important for recreation purposes.
- Consider in context of PD provisions, Habitat Regs and Natura 2000.
- This should be worded to make it more precautionary (*"if they are likely to adversely affect the water quality etc..."*)

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Wording is a very black and white statement. There can be short term localised impacts which are reasonable.
- Suggest that in most communities within the Park water is not a scarce resource.
- Should make clear that the policy refers to new development and not to maintenance of existing.
- Believe that **Policy 10** requires some qualification.
- From time to time 'in river' and river bank works are required as a matter of absolute necessity.
- Should be recognition within **Policy 10** that river bank works, if carried out correctly can have negligible impact on the river environment.
- Failure to carry out maintenance can have a severely detrimental impact due to large volumes of silt released from damaged banks.
- SEPA control this, so why have it in planning policy?

INDIVIDUALS

- The PDO has a material impact, and should be mentioned.

- This policy should be reworded as SEPA will shortly have detailed control over these matters and there is a danger of duplication of bureaucracy.

CNPA response on Policy 10

- **The response to all issues regarding water as a resource is now contained within Policy 13 of the Deposit Local Plan, and aims to give guidance on the importance of water protection, flooding, environmental quality, supply and disposal without duplicating other legalisation which exists, and also guidance which has been produced by the Scottish Executive on the topic. It is hoped that the policy as redrafted will be complimentary to this additional information and form a clear and simple statement on what is expected within the National Park.**

Policy 11 – Water Supplies

PUBLIC BODIES

- Object to wording: does not require the environmental impact of such abstractions to be considered.
- Should recognise the potential for public water supplies.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Sentence addition
- RSPB encourages the CNPA to work closely with SEPA and other water users to ensure sustainable use of water resources.
- Due to problems regarding provision of public water supplies in the CNP **Policy 11** should therefore recognise potential for private water supplies.
- An issue for SEPA and Scottish Water.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Disapprove of the statement that states that new development will only be approved where it can be connected to a public system.
- No need to incorporate water minimisation measures.
- This is a matter for SEPA, Scottish Water and the applicants.
- Surely in a mountainous region in Scotland the shortage of water is not a problem that requires such restrictive policies.
- Dependant on Scottish Water Making available the resources at sustainable price, otherwise this policy may frustrate new development within the Park – flexibility is needed.
- This policy should be neutral about competition so the use of alternative supplies to those of Scottish Water should be permitted if certified by the LA.

INDIVIDUALS

- Reference should not be made to whether a development can be connected to the public system, but whether or not adequate capacity exists.
- Natural resources become exhausted if too many people are living in the one place. Loch Einich's water table is dropping; this will affect the char, it may be necessary to look for alternative water supplies.

- Do not agree with water minimisation in NP countryside areas.

CNPA response on Policy 11

- **The response to all issues regarding water as a resource is now contained within Policy 13 of the Deposit Local Plan, and aims to give guidance on the importance of water protection, flooding, environmental quality, supply and disposal without duplicating other legislation which exists, and also guidance which has been produced by the Scottish Executive on the topic. It is hoped that the policy as redrafted will be complimentary to this additional information and form a clear and simple statement on what is expected within the National Park.**

Policy 12 – Foul Water Drainage

PUBLIC BODIES

- Recommends that a policy should be developed to be consistent with SEPA's Policy on Provision of Waste Water Drainage in Sewered Areas and Memorandum of Understanding with Scottish Water on the Management of Development Constraints caused by Sewage Systems and Waste Water Treatments.
- Could make an important contribution to limiting diffuse pollution if it could be confirmed that development outside the public sewerage system would be permitted in exceptional circumstances.
- Definition of "shared facilities"

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Appropriate wording should be inserted to state that land drainage should be managed in a way that improves and enhances the status of wetland habitats.
- Statements regarding SEPA and Scottish water are vague.
- Great care should be taken to ensure that everything possible is done to avoid build up of phosphates and nitrates and occurrences of organic pollution through necessary intercepts and processes.
- Recommends that the plan be more specific on the types of foul water drainage systems likely to be acceptable.
- Needs to put pressure on Scottish Water.
- The plan should ensure allocation of land for development free from constraints caused by infrastructure constraints.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Developers should not be forced to connect into a public system where foul water can be adequately managed and treated locally.
- Private foul drainage infrastructure for developments is supported, however the cost of this provision may render the development unviable unless development is of an appropriate scale.
- Why Scottish Water? SEPA are the relevant agency and can take SW advice if they wish.

INDIVIDUALS

- Not enough is being done with recent housing developments to recycle water.

CNPA response on Policy 12

- **The response to all issues regarding water as a resource is now contained within Policy 13 of the Deposit Local Plan, and aims to give guidance on the importance of water protection, flooding, environmental quality, supply and disposal without duplicating other legalisation which exists, and also guidance which has been produced by the Scottish Executive on the topic. It is hoped that the policy as redrafted will be complimentary to this additional information and form a clear and simple statement on what is expected within the National Park.**

Policy 13 – Surface water Drainage

PUBLIC BODIES

- Reword the policy to clarify an number of issues:
 - Whether SUDS will be required for all new developments creating surface water discharge
 - Recommend that all developments require surface water to be dealt with sustainably.
- Recommends that the policy refer to PAN 61 Paragraph 23
- Does not consider that interceptors to be a SUDS measure.
- Text should refer to requirement for developers to demonstrate how SUDS will be maintained.
- Currently in the Moray LP, only developments within settlements, in excess of 10 residential units, or 2000 sq m of non-residential land require SUDS provision, to apply this to all developments as the LP implies, could add to work involved with this issue.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Support this policy
- SUDs and reedbed treatments should be used as sustainable solutions to waste treatment problems, where connection to mains is not an option.
- Due to problems regarding adequate sewerage infrastructure in the CNP **Policy 13** should take account of very small rural schemes and allowances should be made.
- The CNPA should also be encouraging local authorities and Scottish Executive to put in place mitigation measures to reduce water runoff from public roads.
- Recommends that a threshold size of development/number of units be set in relation to this policy.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Allowances should be made for small local schemes involving no more than 4 or 5 houses.

INDIVIDUALS

- How does an inceptor catch salt in solution?
- Is not valid where surface water helps to process foul water.

CNPA response on Policy 13

- **The response to all issues regarding water as a resource is now contained within Policy 13 of the Deposit Local Plan, and aims to give guidance on the importance of water protection, flooding, environmental quality, supply and disposal without duplicating other legislation which exists, and also guidance which has been produced by the Scottish Executive on the topic. It is hoped that the policy as redrafted will be complimentary to this additional information and form a clear and simple statement on what is expected within the National Park.**

Policy 14 – Flood Risk and Management

PUBLIC BODIES

- This is a policy of flood management rather than flood avoidance.
- Clarification of **c)** is needed.
- The Local Plan does not take a strategic view of flood risk.
- SPP7 states what should be included in Local Plans.
- There is no evidence in the Local Plan that flood risk has been assessed for all land allocations.
- Recommend that where a site is identified at risk of flooding, it should be removed and alternative sites allocated.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Should mention encouragement of natural floodplain storage areas, habitat management and soft engineering.
- Welcome the presumption against building on a floodplain.
- No mention is given to new flood defences. A policy should be incorporated, stating where new flood management of prevention measures are required for existing developments, preference will be given to sustainable, soft engineering approaches.
- Recommends that the policy take account of advice in PAN 69.
- Recommends the policy considers the issue of flood storage areas, and addresses any housing shortfalls that occur as a result.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- There should be a presumption in favour of maintaining and repairing of flood defences.
- Flood risk assessment should only be required where there is a significant risk and no existing flood alleviation system.
- If risk is too great to allow private sector development, it should be too great for public sector development also.
- Suggest alternative wording.
- Possibility of identifying areas at risk of flooding.

CNPA response on Policy 14

- **The response to all issues regarding water as a resource is now contained within Policy 13 of the Deposit Local Plan, and aims to give guidance on the importance of water protection, flooding, environmental quality,**

supply and disposal without duplicating other legislation which exists, and also guidance which has been produced by the Scottish Executive on the topic. It is hoped that the policy as redrafted will be complimentary to this additional information and form a clear and simple statement on what is expected within the National Park.

Policy 15 – Safeguarding Mineral Resources

PUBLIC BODIES

- Supporting text should clarify whether assessment of commercial viability is to be based on the Cairngorms area.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- A cordon sanitaire around existing workings of 400 m, due consideration of noise, dust etc.
- **Policy 15** is unclear and requires some redrafting.
- The safeguarding mineral resources for the future should be made on the basis of value and scarcity, relative to the value of the proposed development to the locality.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- The decision to sterilise workable reserves should be made on the basis of value and scarcity of reserve being sterilised relative to the value of the proposed development.
- Anticipate the possibility that resources may be extracted before development takes place.

INDIVIDUALS

- This policy is simplistic and therefore of no assistance. Most of the CNP is covered by a blanket of sand and gravel, which is a workable mineral reserve.
- Suggest "to prevent working of a mineral reserve"

CNPA response on Policy 15

- **All proposals which affect any mineral or other earth resource will be considered under Policy 14 of the Deposit Local Plan. The revised text includes consideration of minerals, peat and soil and considers these as an earth resource which, being finite, must be protected where appropriate. However the wording has been so written to facilitate the use of minerals found within the Park area to meet local need, or, where appropriate, meet a commercial need outwith its boundaries. The supporting text also recommends careful use of conditions to ensure works do not have a significant adverse impact which cannot be controlled.**

Policy 16 – Mineral Extraction and Processing

PUBLIC BODIES

- Suggest agreement of operating procedures for new mineral extractions.
- Could be strengthened by requiring to demonstrate there is no suitable alternative.
- Extra time and work will be involved in having to assess whether the 'market' is genuine and would justify approval of the application.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Important to appreciate that recreation can provide a positive after use of mineral extraction sites.
- Recommend rewording to detail in what circumstances mineral working will be acceptable.
- Where a site is deemed suitable for mineral extraction, a planning condition relating to site restoration and aftercare must be attached to any consent.
- Do not believe it is sufficient to include imprecise references such as "*combined with other policies*" in the Local Plan
- Policy against future developments of this indigenous primary industry could hamper future rural economic development.
- Policy requires refinement so that small-scale and large excavation activities are treated differently. To allow, for eg. estates to have a small quarry for road maintenance etc.
- Limiting the market to one only within the boundaries of the CNP could have a significant impact on business viability; applications should therefore be treated on their own merits.
- Flexibility should be built into the policy regarding reinstatement and restoration, as there may be opportunities for the provision of recreational activities; rock climbing, water sports.
- Provision of a bond as a guarantee should not be a blanket requirement but should be treated proportionately.
- Reference should be made to the need for restoration as a result of a range of activities (not just excavation) which may affect peat
- No mention of follow-up measures on how to minimise and mitigate peat damage from activities such as forestry or engineering works.
- Suggest a policy statement is needed to address this or cross reference to other policies which address the issue.
- Welcome the recognition of the importance of peat areas and strongly worded policy.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Feel the policy would be a disincentive to business development. Too restrictive to expect any new mineral workings to only service a market within the CNP.
- Need to continue to use local stone.
- Concern that bonds are being used as a means of taxation.
- Requires further thought.
- This policy is interfering with the market.
- The importance should be put on the site itself, its reserve, and how it is developed rather than where the material will be used.

- Feel the Local Plan should adopt a positive policy regarding small scale mineral extraction for own use.
- This must be far preferable than bringing non-local material into the Park. It is far less likely to blend in and implicated additional transportation costs etc.
- Consider schemes that generate employment within the Park, it may not be economically sustainable to supply an internal Park demand.

INDIVIDUALS

- Too all embracing – should differentiate between small and large scale excavation.

CNPA response on Policy 16

- **All proposals which affect any mineral or other earth resource will be considered under Policy 14 of the Deposit Local Plan. The revised text includes consideration of minerals, peat and soil and considers these as an earth resource which, being finite, must be protected where appropriate. However the wording has been so written to facilitate the use of minerals found within the Park area to meet local need, or, where appropriate, meet a commercial need outwith its boundaries. The supporting text also recommends careful use of conditions to ensure works do not have a significant adverse impact which cannot be controlled.**

Policy 17 – Commercial Peat Extraction

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Should be a review of the existing permission for the Tomintoul peat extraction site.
- Believe that a policy against future developments of this indigenous primary industry could hamper future rural economic development.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Peat harvesting is a historic part of culture. Suggest rewording.
- Due to the abundance of peat in the Park the policy should be less restrictive.

CNPA response on Policy 17

- **All proposals which affect any mineral or other earth resource including peat will be considered under Policy 14 of the Deposit Local Plan. The revised text includes consideration of minerals, peat and soil and considers these as an earth resource which, being finite, must be protected where appropriate. However the wording has been so written to facilitate the use of minerals found within the Park area to meet local need, or, where appropriate, meet a commercial need outwith its boundaries. The supporting text also recommends careful use of conditions to ensure works do not have a significant adverse impact which cannot be controlled.**

Policy 18 – Contaminated Land

PUBLIC BODIES

- Include reference to PAN 33
- Policy and text should recognise the potential effects on contaminated land on the water environment.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Inadequate, greater protection is required. Include a definition of "contaminated land"

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Should follow national guidelines.

CNPA response on Policy 18

- **The policy relating to contaminated land is now within Policy 15 of the Deposit Local Plan. It has been redrafted to reflect national guidance, in line with the comments received, and aims to protect the valuable ecosystems found within the Park and ensuring that inappropriate development does not occur.**

Policy 19 – Waste Management

PUBLIC BODIES

- Policy should be expanded to include non-municipal waste.
- Add a further category to regarding waste management facilities.
- **a)** Important to liaise with LAs
- **c)** Expand to reflect SEPAs thermal treatment guidelines.
- **d)** Amend to take account of instances where residual landfill may be required.
- Expand policy to cover: locational and directional guidance, and the safeguarding of existing strategic waste management facilities.
- Need to identify and safeguard existing and proposed waste management facilities.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- **Paragraph 3.45** – example should be set by practice.
- The CNPA should be proactive in ensuring its own targets are produced in collaboration with the targets of the other local authorities.
- It should be part of the CNPA's role to secure involvement of local communities in recycling and composting.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Need a proactive and practical approach to the inconsistencies in what is described as waste and how it is dealt with.
- Production of energy from waste should be supported.
- There will be a need for landfill in the Park in the future.
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24.**

- The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

INDIVIDUALS

- Para 3.45 - Waste disposal is the responsibility of the Local Authority.

CNPA response on Policy 19

- **In reviewing the policy regarding waste, and in line with some of the comments made, it was felt that there was an element of duplication between the text and the operations of the 4 Local Authorities in their role as the waste authorities. As such it has been decided to remove the policy and include within the other policies of the Deposit Local Plan locational guidance which would apply to waste disposal sites as well as other forms of development. Also policies have been included to encourage recycling and further guidance on this topic will be included in the sustainable design guide.**

Policy 20 – Energy Efficiency and Saving

PUBLIC BODIES

- **paras 3.48 and 3.49** - Would welcome further consultation on sustainable design guide and assessment, and Interim Planning Policy No 2.
- On what basis will these energy saving measures be assessed?
- What/how much is regarded as compliance?
- How can applicants be encouraged to exceed the Building Standards for insulation etc.?

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Give further consideration to undergrounding
- Should be noted that underground cabling of transmission lines has the potential for impact on birds through loss of habitats.
- There should be a requirement for the submission of an EIA as required by The Electricity Works (EIA) (Scotland) Regs 2000.
- add d) siting and control of external lights to avoid light pollution and to conserve energy.
- Needs to be some flexibility to take account of any potential conflicts that might arise when developing historic buildings.
- **Paragraph 3.49** refers to Interim Planning Policy 1 on renewable energy, but the footnote refers to Interim Policy 2 also on renewable energy.
- The undergrounding of cabling in a NP should be a presumption, based on a targeted amount each year.
- Where cabling can not be undergrounded it should be re-routed.
- Energy efficiency must be accompanied by conservation or demand reduction in order to be effective, the latter may be outwith the scope of the Local Plan, but should be clearly linked with a supporting strategy somewhere within the CNPA policy remit.
- Support but only where the undergrounding would not result in significant damage to the environment.

- Suggest that a percentage is identified of the existing wirescape to be put underground each year.
- Proposal of undergrounding of all power lines in the park is unnecessarily onerous.
- This will affect the costs of all new development from the smallest house to any large new tourism projects. It may also impact the ability of the wider Highlands and Islands to develop its substantial renewable resources and secure downstream economic and social benefit.
- Fully support **a)** and **c)** and are prepared to consider participation in **b)**
- Strongly support **Policies 20, 20a** and **21**
- Welcome the commitments to ensuring proposals have energy conservation measures.
- Welcomes encouragement of small-scale local power developments but concern over the policy of permitting high voltage cables to be undergrounded.
- The bland statements in the Plan regarding reinstatement of land after undergrounding cables are inadequate.
- Regarding the first paragraph of this policy, it is unclear in several ways; what baseline? Within what scale? The word “these” presumably refers to “levels”. Impossible to judge compliance with an unpublished Design Guide. The best practice examples are vague and should not for part of a policy statement.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support Topic Policies 20
- Would prefer to see a presumption in favour of energy efficiency rather than the rigid statements as they are.
- Welcomes the statement in paragraph 3.47.
- Designing to the highest standard may be uneconomic in some circumstances.
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24.**
- The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Agreement with **Policy 20.** (undergrounding new cable.)
- Suggest that the sustainable design guide be available for consultation before the final version of the LP is published.
- Concern over the lack of general design guidelines – not just those on energy efficiency and saving.

INDIVIDUALS

- Not aware that energy conservation is a legitimate function of the development control process. This policy is ultra vires.

Policy 20A – Transmission and Distribution Infrastructure

PUBLIC BODIES

- Disagree with this policy as it could prejudice potential for alternative energy production and the rural economy.
- Recognise undergrounding not suitable in all areas.
- The potential destructive nature of undergrounding cables on archaeological resources needs to be highlighted and balanced in this policy.
- Although the General Policies should address this, to a large extent, there may be conflicts between this policy and the provisions of the General Policies.
- This could be addressed by inclusion of a reference to careful planning and routing to avoid adverse archaeological impacts together with a caveat stating that in some cases above ground cabling will be considered where underground cabling would have a detrimental impact on nationally important archaeology.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support Topic Policies 20A
- Practicality and cost effectiveness issues in undergrounding, suggest rewording.
- In some cases it is more detrimental to ecology to route power cables underground.
- In some cases it is impossible due to rock.
- Due to the cost involved in undergrounding cables concern that otherwise viable hydro schemes might be made uneconomic.
- Suggest that this policy be amended to require that where new overhead lines are proposed, the applicant should demonstrate that there are environmental or economic reasons why underground cabling is not a practicable alternative.
- Feel the policy as a blanket policy could threaten welcome development due to associated costs.
- Needs to be much more flexible with each proposal/site considered on its merits.
- Might not always be achievable due to physical conditions or economically viable, should not rule out alternatives to undergrounding.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Concern that this requirement will prove expensive to the developer and may dissuade them from building houses that are needed.
- Suggest that each application is considered on its own merits and the decision should take into account existing overground cabling.
- The community strongly supports this policy.

INDIVIDUALS

- The cost implication of this would be significant in terms of capital cost and increased energy losses. Should be deleted or revised to give greater clarity.

CNPA response on Policy 20 and 20a

- **The issues regarding undergrounding of the grid network through the Park boundary is currently being discussed in a Public Inquiry, and as such the view has been taken to exclude this part of the policy from future policies. However the impact any new cabling has on the landscape should be considered under the relevant policies within the Deposit Local Plan relating to visual and landscape impact.**
- **With reference to energy efficiency, it has been decided to include this issue within the sustainable design guide which will supplement the Local Plan. This will allow changes in technology and legislation to be quickly incorporated into guidance.**

Policy 21 – Energy from Renewables

PUBLIC BODIES

- Suggest a similar approach to Highland Council's Renewable Energy Strategy.
- Policy has 'presumption against development' in relation to new commercial wind farms within the park. Whilst this policy is aimed at large scale wind farms, which impacts may not be permitted under other policy areas in the LP, such a policy is in direct conflict with Policy 5 of NEST.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- "Commercial" to be defined. Distinction to be made between storage hydro schemes and run of river schemes. Some re-jigging of b) and c)
- The plans presumption against commercial schemes and support of small scale or domestic schemes appears to be based on the assumption that community schemes will be small in scale – this may not be the case. Therefore believe this could be restrictive.
- Believe the CNP should take a wider responsibility towards climate change.
- Clarification on use of "wind farms" and "wind energy" Impacts caused outwith boundaries. **Footnote 23** should be 1 not 2.
- Support **Policy 21**, most sensible renewable energy policy statement produced in Scotland to date.
- Large scale land based wind turbines should not be pursued as they are a stop gap technology until more reliable marine technologies mature. The adverse impact they will have on upland areas after their short lifetime is disproportionate to the benefit they produce.
- Increasing the number of domestic and community schemes will be more beneficial.
- As regards promoting community wind farm schemes, it should not be assumed that these will be small scale.
- Interest in **b)**
- Disappointed that the LP includes a general presumption against the development of all commercial hydropower schemes. Believe that hydropower developments are not incompatible with National Parks.

- There are no intrinsic reasons for differentiating between community and commercial schemes nor should size of scheme be a limiting factor.
- Many commercial hydropower schemes are run-of-river schemes that do not require large impoundments.
- The industry has a range of measures to meet and counteract environmental impacts.
- Believe that environmentally sensitive development of hydropower could be undertaken without undue negative impact on the National Park.
- Suggest that a presumption against commercial hydropower schemes would not be justified and that every scheme should be assessed on its own merits.
- Inconsistency in the text and wording of **Policy 21**. Needs to be clarified.
- There should be an impact condition here corresponding to that stated in Policy 25.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support Topic Policies 21
- **In b -** Replace the words "*this Local Plan*" with "*Cairngorms National Park Authority*" - as it is the Authority which will support this clause and not the plan.
- There should be a presumption against inappropriately sited energy schemes that have a severe detrimental effect on the landscape or local environment, rather than the rigid policy as it is.
- Ideally the Park should aim to produce all the energy it consumes.
- Believe that not all hydro-electric schemes are incompatible with the National Park.
- Disappointed that the policy establishing a general presumption against all commercial hydro scheme development. And also provisions in General Policy 2 which would preclude exploitation of the hydro resource in the Park, whether commercial or otherwise.
- Large scale impoundments are not a necessity for large-scale schemes and a run-of-river design can be used.
- Run-of-river schemes do not require a large dam or impoundment but only a small intake weir perhaps 1 – 1.5m high, pipeline is buried, powerhouse are small & discrete. It is possible to develop such schemes with minimal impact on the landscape.
- No merit in limiting the acceptable generating capacity of a hydro scheme. If a scheme is acceptable it makes environmental sense to obtain max power output which is economically feasible within local environmental constraints.
- No valid planning reason for excluding commercial as opposed to community schemes.
- Each hydro scheme must be assessed on its merits, and are opposed to a blanket presumption against commercial hydro schemes.
- With regard to Interim Planning Policy RE5. This policy states that small scale hydro would be permitted subject to restrictions; see no reason why this should not be continued.
- As hydroelectric development is expensive, by restricting development to community groups only, many valuable hydro resources may not be developed.

- Concern that a presumption against hydro power in the CNP could lead to pressure on other authorities to adopt a similar blanket presumptions.
- This could greatly restrict the scope for future hydro development in Scotland having a direct impact on renewable energy targets.
- Prohibiting developments that utilise the natural hydro resources in the Park is contradictory to the second aim of the Park.
- Policy is overly restrictive and proposals should be considered on their own merit.
- Cautions are advised in NPPG6 and PAN47 but they do not promote an embargo on wind farm development within NPs
- National policy aims to encourage commitment to renewable energy and NPPG advises that areas designated for protection should not pose unreasonable restrictions on the ability to meet the overall requirement for renewable energy.
- Suggest the LP consider the degree of protection afforded to the NP as a whole, and specific areas within the National Park area.
- Suggest that the LP consider areas within the National Park that will be affected visually by renewable energy developments outside of the park, and identify the CNPA position in respect of such situations.
- No policy or text within the draft LP that considers the potential impact of proposed developments on the setting of National Parks (as stated in PAN45)
- Suggest that a policy should be included to identify the position of CNPA in respect of the setting of the National Park and development with the potential to affect that setting. Such a policy should be contained within the landscape section of the Plan
- Definition of "commercial" required.
- If a scheme is economically viable is it therefore commercial?
- In some cases local wind driven schemes may provide the most sustainable addition to local power supply.
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24**. The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Strongly support this policy in principle
- Suggest the word 'commercial' be dropped from **(a)** as any renewable project needs to be economically viable.
- If larger projects are meant by this statement then wording needs to be brought in which recognises scale as an important factor and that scale could vary according to circumstances without damage to the environment.
- Some developments could be hidden from view and could usefully provide jobs, economic benefit and diversification for estates.
- Welcomes **Policy 21**. (Supporting community small-scale renewables.)
- Item c) - Commercial biomass or bio-fuel projects, should, wherever possible have a community benefit.

INDIVIDUALS

- Strongly support the view that wind farms should be prohibited.

- The policy on renewables appear to be at odds with itself; while supporting renewables, the document does not appear to support renewables in the Park, if this is the case, this stance needs to be justified.
- Strongly support the Parks stated view that wind farms should be prohibited.
- Strongly support the encouragement of small scale/micro renewable energy schemes.
- Currently investigating the viability of such a scheme at Gaskbeg Farm.

CNPA response on Policy 21

- **The issue of energy generation is now contained within Policy 16 of the Deposit Local Plan. The policy has been reworded in light of the comments received and now focuses attention on small scale and micro generation schemes rather than on specific forms of production. The policy will be read in conjunction with the other policies contained within the plan specifically regarding landscape and visual impact and should therefore not be read in isolation. The policy is however generally supportive of schemes which assist the National Park Authority in addressing climate change, where the scheme is designed to be in line with the aims of the Park.**

Policy 22 – Integrated Transport Network

PUBLIC BODIES

- Paragraph 3.52 – the initial phrase is very sweeping.
- Para d – timing an implementation is not clear.
- The LP should support upgrading of the A9 and A95 and recognise the benefits of the rail network. The A9 Services policy does not represent the Councils position.
- Supporting text should consider issues relating to the maintenance of rural character.
- Insertion of “well-designed”.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Although the Plan refers to an “integrated” transport network, there is no mention of Rail transport.
- Aviemore railway station is a major gateway to the Park.
- Recognition of Part One of the Scotland Rail Planning Assessment, stating that improvement of the service between Central Scotland and Inverness is a major objective, should be given.
- Amend to include reference to rail service and the objective to extending to Grantown-on-Spey.
- Para a- it is important that consideration is given to how public transport can be adapted to accommodate the needs of recreational users in the Park, - promoting public transport to recreational areas and options for transporting recreational equipment (bikes, canoes) on public transport should be considered.
- Some general comments including parking facilities.
- Paragraph 3.50 – unsustainable, requires explanation.

- Paragraph 3.51 – positive ethos here not carried over to policy text
- Include new cycle paths, footpath signage/interpretation.
- Agree with **policies 22 & 23**.
- Would like to see more initiatives to secure safe walking/cycling/riding routes within the Park.
- The proposed study to rationalise existing road signage must also include all the design issues associated.
- Support but would like to see inspirational statement on walking /cycling path networks provision.
- Need policy to enhance connections between communities by ensuring off-road links between them.
- Support **Policy 22a)** Communities Scotland housing grants is for housing purposes only and cannot be used for contributions to transport infrastructure.
- Strongly support but agree with The Mountaineering Council for Scotland's submission that there is a need for a fresh look to permit development of selected and carefully sited roadside facilities.
- Endorse the proposal to address the issue of unnecessary and intrusive road signs.
- Greater emphasis should be placed upon the existing rail network.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Road maintenance issues - Difficulty in past in contacting the road maintenance Contractor as regards lack of road maintenance. *It is essential that a system is put in place at Community level for determining a desirable standard of maintenance, monitoring it and communicating comment to a responsible office as and when necessary.*
- Statement c) – essential that the LP ensures adequate parking in Aviemore for those who use the bus and rail links – due to rural locations people may need to leave cars parked for days at a time, this needs to be taken into account when considering parking facilities.
- Statement d) – this statement is welcomed, together with a recommendation that local knowledge be utilised to give correct place names etc.

INDIVIDUALS

- Support point **d)** of this policy. The public need not be spoon fed but encouraged to use initiative, maps and written details rather than signs for every eventuality.
- No mention of rail transport, this is a major omission and requires to be rectified.

CNPA response on Policy 22

- **The revised Integrated transport policy is now in Policy 30 of the Deposit Local Plan. The revised text simplifies the CNPA position to refer to all forms of transport within one concise policy. The policy aims not to repeat guidance from the Scottish Executive and others which is already in existence, but to give the National Park Authority position. The importance of integrated transport networks within the Park is acknowledged in the supporting text, and the use of green travel plans**

will be used to ensure the most sustainable approach is taken when considering proposals that would have a significant impact on transport network.

Policy 23 – Roadside Facilities on the A9

PUBLIC BODIES

- Suggest strengthening by adding a requirement to consider natural heritage impacts in proposals.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- this should be restricted to the main entry points.
- Agree with **policies 22 & 23**.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Should include Blackmount, north of Carrbridge, as an area for commercial refreshment facilities in line with the existing Badenoch & Strathspey Local Plan.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Fully supportive, however can only be justified if such services (Petrol) are available for longer hours than is currently the case.

CNPA response on Policy 23

- **In the revised Deposit Local Plan it has been decided to remove all policies which refer to specific proposals and consider them under the other policies of the plan relating to siting, design, impact on the landscape, etc.**

Policy 24 – Upland Vehicle Tracks

PUBLIC BODIES

- Suggest some amendments to the supporting text.
- Suggest insertion of a caveat recognising the possible occasions where tracks may have a beneficial effect on designated sites and features.
- reference should be to "paths" rather than "foot paths"
- Not clear if the second bullet point in this policy, regarding designated sites would include scheduled monuments.
- Would be clearer if the first sentence of the second bullet point in this policy specifically mentioned archaeological factors.
- Welcome the reference in this point to cultural heritage issues. Would like to point out the potential damages that can occur by use of historical routes by bad use of upgrading.
- Wish to see an amendment to the final sentence in the last bullet point in the policy to cover the potential archaeological/historic interest of some long established tracks. This should be added to the end of the last sentence of the policy: "....*unless a significant historic route/track*"

- Policy tends to be focused on managing the development of new tracks rather than controlling the upgrading of old ones. This could be more clearly addressed through a slight rewording of the second sentence of the policy to read: *"In exceptional circumstances, new tracks, or the upgrading of existing tracks, may be considered..."*

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- It is important that this policy is not used to restrict potential proposals that might arise for mountain bike facilities.
- Check paragraph 3.56 for accuracy and compliance with Circulars. Include prehistoric landscapes.
- Needs to be stronger and the presumption should include the creation of tracks for red grouse management.
- An active rather than passive approach to the reinstatement of tracks would be appropriate and suggest the final sentence of the policy be amended to read "...tracks which are no longer essential for the efficient working of the estate/farm..."
- Add a positive encouragement of non- vehicular access. Add key points of SNH Good Practice Guide
- The term "demonstrates it is vital" is undefined
- Suggest rewording of policy using General Policy areas as criteria.
- If **Policy 24** is to replace Interim Planning Policy 3 then this should be stated.
- Comments in **paragraph 3.55** should be substantiated or replaced. Estates require properly designed track which will not wash out every winter. More damage will occur, in the absence of properly maintained tracks by the use of off road vehicles.
- These developments should be permitted with safeguards in place.
- The wording should be amended; the first bullet point should revert to Interim Planning Policy 3: "The proposal can be demonstrated as necessary for the efficient working of the estate/farm..."
- The policy statement should perhaps consider and initiative to undo the damage which has already been done.
- Support Policy 24.
- Trust that the criteria referred to in **Policy 24** will be applied to forestry access tracks through a review of PDRs.
- The damage done by use of tracks which have not been designed and constructed should be recognised in the policy.
- Should be a strong statement that all new or upgraded track proposals would be refused (whether they are deemed to be essential by the land owner or not) for areas covered by **General Policy 3**.
- This policy ignores the history of this issue within the Park area where planning controls have been ignored or evaded. This policy needs to be replaced by a proactive policy which fulfils the first aim of the park. Suggest rewording as suggested by The Mountaineering Council for Scotland.
- An important issue not even mentioned is that of the use of ATVs. And the damage they can cause through multiple tracking.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Note that tracks established or upgraded for forestry purposes are covered by the Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) (Forestry) Regs 1999.
- Last bullet point appears to refer to a laudable intention that lengths of the track made redundant by new proposals should be “*reinstated to an approved natural condition or reduced to footpath width*”. Consider this should be rephrased as a separate criterion for consideration of proposals.
- The requirement of a bond for such work (as in **policy 16**) should be included.
- To deny a land occupier vehicular access to parts of his land may make the business unviable.
- Disagree with presumption against new vehicle hill tracks and suggest rewording.
- This policy would greatly restrict the possibility of hydroelectric development within the Park.
- Believe an absolute ban on tracks for hydro development purposes is excessive.
- Suggest this policy be amended to include the efficient construction and operation of a hydro scheme as a reason why new access tracks can be considered.
- Essential that the plan recognises the importance of upland vehicle tracks for land management.
- Feel that it is essential that **Policy 24** makes a clear distinction between the creation of new roads and tracks and the maintenance of existing networks.
- Suggest that the plan incorporates some clarification to ensure that regular maintenance is not interpreted as upgrading.
- As a minimum the policy should state that the repair and maintenance of existing upland roads and tracks can continue.
- No mention of how the steps that should be taken to reinstate tracks that are no longer required is to be achieved or who will foot the bill.
- Should be more explicit in recognising the scope that exists for tourism related opportunities associated with many of the policies: **Policies 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, and 24.**
- The above policies could play a much more prominent role in providing experiences for visitors that would enhance sense of place and understanding of the importance of conservation.

CNPA response on Policy 24

- **The Deposit Plan has removed this policy, instead deciding to consider issues such as track creation and maintenance under the over arching policies relating to natural heritage, impact on the landscape, design, etc. It is hoped that this approach will create a more consistent Local Plan where all the policies are considered together rather than particular developments looking solely at certain policies which refer directly to them. It will also help reduce confusion between applicants and officials in understanding the weight to attach to certain policies.**

Policy 25 – Telecommunications

PUBLIC BODIES

- Some clarity needed.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- **Item 2** – rewrite.
- Suggest rewording of parts **3), 4)** and **5)** of **Policy 25** in order to tighten it up.
- If **Policy 25** is to replace Interim Planning Policy 2 then this should be stated.
- **Point 1** should refer to "significant adverse impact"
- The requirement in **Point 6** to remove access tracks when equipment becomes redundant should be reconsidered when that time arises as the track may have been developed for other in that time, such as a route for non-motorised recreational access.
- Welcome the intention to limit the spread of telecom masts and to address access track issues
- needs a qualifying phrase on mitigation.
- **Criterion 1)** "sites" presumably include "areas"?
- **Criterion 2)** what does "established" mean?
- **Criterion 3)** would the investigation of any one (or two) alternative sites be sufficient?
- **Criterion 4)** why is "should" used in the first sentence but "will" in the second?
- **Criterion 6)** the structure is unclear: does the bond attach only to access tracks?

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Condition in **1)** and **2)** too restrictive.
- Access tracks after decommissioning of masts etc may be useful for other purposes. Bonds should not be used.
- Agree with **point 1**.
- **Point 2 and 3** – wording is awkward and contradictory in terms of mast/site sharing.
- Suggest rewording as follows:
- 2) "There is an operational need to justify the proposed location of the development."
- 3) "If proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that all alternative options for the siting and design of the development have been explored, including the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Mast/site sharing will be encouraged where it represents the optimum environmental solution and does not result in any adverse visual impact to the surrounding area."
- The last sentence in **point 2** fails to recognise that a mast of suitable design for sharing, which in itself will be a bulkier and taller structure than normally required, may not be the most appropriate design for the proposed location. Note the advice contained in Paragraph 45 of PAN62.
- Given the need to balance the demand for a high standard of mobile phone coverage with the sensitive setting of the National Park, suggest removing the provision from **point 2** to require all masts to be structurally

capable of mast sharing and to consider each proposal on its merits thus allowing for the optimum siting and design solutions to be achieved.

- Note that Class 67 of the Town & Country Planning (GPD0) (Scotland) Amendment Order 2001 removes permitted development rights to alter a mast granted planning permission until the expiry of the statutory 5 year period for commencement of the development from the date of permission.
- **Point 4** is generally supported, but the provision to locate all power lines underground does not take account of possible conflicts with archaeological sites etc. Suggest that the second sentence in **point 4** is reworded as follows: "Related power lines should generally be routed underground where there will be no adverse effect on archaeological sites, important habitats or other ecological site."
- **Point 5** fails to take account of necessary signage required for operational and Health and Safety reasons. Note PAN 62 Annex G. Therefore object to **Point 5** and suggest it be deleted.
- **Point 6** - Object to the inclusion of this provision and suggest it is deleted. Note PAN 62 Annex G.
- Typing error in **footer on page 38** – it should refer to NPPG19 and not NPPG15.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Item 6) – Not clear whether this stipulation applies to new installations or will also affect existing equipment.
- What would the implications be if the owner of a transmitter (perhaps a community in the case of the Deskie Self Help Transmitter) is not able financially to remove the structure?

CNPA response on Policy 25

- **The policy relating to telecommunications within the Deposit Plan is Policy 31. In light of the comments received, the wording has been clarified and it is hoped that the requirements for telecommunications developments will be understandable to all applicants. The impact of such developments on the landscape remains a key consideration and this policy must be read in conjunction with the other policies within the Deposit local plan relating to natural heritage, and visual and landscape impact.**

Policy 26 – Development on Farming and Crofting Land

PUBLIC BODIES

- make clear that housing development is not diversification.
- Concerns regarding wording.
- Should have definition of diversification.
- Suggest that explicit reference be made to protection, enhancement or management of natural heritage. Suggest alternative wording.
- Wish to highlight the potential to re-use redundant traditional farm buildings and the need to protect their character.
- This could involve the drafting of the legal agreements before proposals are approved.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Should be a precautionary mention of possible adverse diversification activities e.g. large scale quad biking across agricultural land of nature conservation value, such as fields important for breeding waders.
- Concern at the open-endedness of this section.
- Concern that wording leaves a Carte Blanche for any kind of development.
- Viability of a business is not a relevant planning consideration
- Suggest rewording **Policy 26** using General Policy areas as Criteria.
- **Para 20** refers to **Policy 20** as a means of supporting development of agricultural or croft land. The relevance of this is questioned. The SRPBA endorses support to “diversify or increase the viability of the farm or croft business” but the fact that not all diversification will be agricultural should be noted.
- Current CAP policies should be reflected in the preamble and brought out in the development proposals, particularly with reference to new subsidies
- Diversification should be subject to the farm enterprise remaining as the major activity, unless there are environmental gains.
- The current opening wording is almost an open door for any development of whatever scale.
- A reworded policy should be limited to the area defined for **General Policy 1**; it should reflect the scale of development that is subsidiary to the farm or croft. Viability of a business is not a planning consideration and should not be included in this policy.
- Not clear why there are no environmental conditions attached to this policy.
- An impact condition as under **Policy 25** should attach to all development proposals, including farm/croft diversification ones.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Adjust to be consistent with SPP15 need to remove the requirement for conditions or agreements to secure appropriate or long term agricultural management of a farm or croft.
- Consideration should be given that not all diversification will involve agriculture.
- Tying diversification to the long-term management of the farm/croft is contrary to NEST.
- Requires further consideration to allow better encouragement of diversification.
- Support the content of **Policy 26**.
- There is potential for conflict however with **General Policy 2** in relation to any agricultural units located over 400 metres. (see comments under General Policies)
- Due to pressures on agriculture it should be recognised that diversification may be away from “agricultural” activities.

INDIVIDUALS

- Why have a chapter on agriculture but not one on Forestry.

- Policy not specific enough where it refers to encouragement of diversification.
- A few paragraphs on Agriculture and Crofting are insufficient to give due attention to and appropriate guidance for such a major industry within the Park.
- Suggest Policy 26 is amended to make reference to the Parks Policies.
- Too permissive.
- Whether the proposal is economically viable is irrelevant in planning terms. Should not extend into upland areas.

CNPA response on Policy 26

- **In the revised Deposit Local Plan, in light of comments received, it has been decided to amend the approach taken to considering all forms of economic development and business growth under one over arching policy. There is not therefore a separate policy dealing with farming and crofting land. Developments on farming and crofting land will now be considered under Policy 20 which separates forms of business by location rather than operation, and it is hoped that this will allow greater flexibility in considering the wide range of business activity that occurs within the Park, particularly where it has a rural focus.**

Policy 27 – Access Rights

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Need strengthening to include reference to possible adverse effects of recreational route development and adverse environmental effects of large outdoor recreation centres.
- Access rights are not generally matters of planning policy and **paras 3.62-63** might be condensed.
- Suggest tightening up on wording concerning developments which impinge on or improve physical access arrangements.
- Welcome section on tourism
- Confusion over policy reference numbers in **paragraph 3.67**.
- Should be more proactive in this area.
- In respect of large outdoor recreation centres, the SCNP recognise the possible effects of climate change on skiing opportunities, therefore, will be supportive of sustainable improvements to recreational opportunity at these sites.
- Concern that **Policy 27** does not actively promote access.
- Would like positive statement on planning of a managed path networks, including the core path network and sustainable transport routes, and statement on how this would relate to **General Policies 1-3**.
- Should be provision for ensuring that development results where possible in improved access infrastructure.
- Would like to see stated policies regarding important paths and tracks including, Speyside Way, the Larig Ghru, the Larig an Laoigh, Glean Einich and Glen Tilt.
- The meaning of an “appropriate” alternative solution when development would mean loss of “significant” access rights is unclear.
- Do ROWs not involve existing legislation?

CNPA response on Policy 27

- **The issue of access is covered in Policy 34 of the Deposit Local Plan. The local plan will be supplemented by the Core Paths Plan once it is adopted, and the policy has been revised to reflect this. The Policy also reflects the importance of outdoor access to all those living and visiting the National Park, and it is hoped the revised text will clarify the position regarding access when applicants are considering any development proposal.**

Policy 28 – Large Outdoor Recreation Centres

PUBLIC BODIES

- Text should mention Speyside Way.
- Definition of “large” needed.
- Suggest some rewording and strengthening.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Clarification needed. Is the policy intended to apply to existing centres only? It could be interpreted to mean that it allows for development of new and additional centres which are not linked in any way to existing centres.
- Need strengthening to include reference to possible adverse effects of recreational route development and adverse environmental effects of large outdoor recreation centres.
- The relevance of the European Charter should be explained in more detail.
- Concern regarding whether the CNPA should be able to resist proposals that would reduce the tourist facilities of an area where they are not viable.
- The above applicable also to **Policy 31**.
- concern regarding whether the CNPA should be able to resist proposals that would reduce the tourist facilities of an area where they are not viable
- There should be specific mention in this section to field sports and its contribution to tourism, the landscape and environment of the Park. A separate paragraph is required justifying a policy which permits development associated with field sports.
- Suggest the wording “...*best practice in terms of sustainable design and business*” does not adequately cover the situation. Suggest rewording to secure the need for sustainable environmental use by the business, economically viable proposals and good design.
- Agree with **Policy 28**.
- Although existing centres provide economic and recreational benefits, the fact that they have been established should not mean that they have to be retained through diversification.
- Policy should not be written to artificially facilitate survival if the centre is environmentally or otherwise unsustainable.
- The proposal that extensions to ski areas will not be permitted may have a negative impact on the future sustainability of these centres.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support Topic Policies 28
- Unclear what is meant by “*Sustainable Design*” in the first sentence.
- Consider that the words “*and low environmental impact*” should be added to this first sentence.
- See no reason why extensions to existing ski centres should not be allowed.
- Would like to see a more balanced narrative about recreation and access.
- No definition of “Large Scale” in Policy 28.
- Ski Centres & Outdoor activity centres face severe challenges in the future and this should be reflected in the LP.
- The narrative on tourism could be strengthened by using more facts and figures.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Delete in the final sentence ‘*Extension to ski areas will not be permitted*’. The earlier wording is adequate.

INDIVIDUALS

- The sentence “*extensions to ski areas will not be permitted*” is harsh since tourism is the principal economic activity in the Park and the skiing industry provides valuable winter revenue.

CNPA response on Policy 28

- **The deposit Local Plan has been revised in light of comments received and the relevant policy is now Policy 35 regarding formal recreation facilities and open space. To avoid confusion and add clarity, it has been decided that one policy covering these topics will be more easily understood than separating them into forms of operation. Any proposal for such development will also be assessed against the other policies of the Plan particularly those relating to natural heritage and landscape and visual impact. It is hoped in this revision, the clarity requested has been included, and applicants will be clear on the approach the National Park Authority take to recreation and associate developments.**

Policy 29 – Tourism Development

PUBLIC BODIES

- there is reluctance within the Local Plan to accept second homes and new caravan sites.
- Needs to include a requirement to follow good practice in terms of location and design.
- Possibility of supplementary planning guidance for tourism.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Mention potentially adverse effect, rather than just assuming there will be catered for by general policies.
- **Paragraph 3.71** – Include the value of youth hostels.

- **Paragraph 3.70** – feel that eco-tourism is replaced with nature based tourism.
- The sustainable nature of tourism in the European Charter should be explicit.
- What is the threshold for new 'large' tourism developments to provide staff accommodation?
- Should show evidence from Switzerland regarding tourism and damage to communities.
- Find this section to be inadequately tackled.
- Tourism should be THE principal driver of the parks economy and needs particular attention.
- The consideration of tourism and associated policies within the LP does not consider the fundamental Key issues in sustainable tourism
- At no point do the policies on tourism developments consider broader impacts on the environment nor do they consider potential social impacts on local communities.
- These policies need to be revised to take heed of these problems.
- The Plans commitment to sustainable tourism is welcome.
- What is required is a "geography of tourism" to enable policies to be tailored to emerging trends and would provide the foundation for a stronger spatial dimension to the Plan.
- Paragraph 3.68 is ugly English and not entirely clear.
- The definition of "sustainable tourism" in paragraph 3.69 seems weak. In the last part of the sentence "needs" can be highly contentious.
- The following sentence should not mix up "significant" tourism developments and "all proposals which require a site-specific countryside location"
- Not clear why eco-tourism projects (undefined) should "ideally" be located in the countryside.
- Not clear how this proposal would "reduce the tourist facilities of an area"

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Relevant parts of European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas should be included.
- Disagree with the last paragraph. The LP should not insist on retaining an unviable visitor facility.
- More emphasis for self catering accommodation.
- Need for more flexibility to allow diversification of tourism businesses.
- Support this policy.
- Strengthen to recognise the requirements of a modern tourist industry.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- The policy makes reference to the '*ethos of the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas*' as of obvious importance, feel that the 'ethos' needs to be spelt out.
- Uncomfortable with **para 3** as circumstances can change and interests switch to other things.

CNPA response on Policy 29

- **The development of Tourism development is considered in Policy 33 of the Deposit Local Plan. The policy as redrafted reflects the comments made and the text has been clarified to reflect the importance placed on the development of tourism developments within the National Park boundary. Further detail has been added regarding what supporting information will be required with applications, and it is hoped that applicants will now be clear on what level of detail is expected. The impact on the environment remains vital, and this is also reflected in the text.**

Policy 30 – Tourist Accommodation

PUBLIC BODIES

- there is reluctance within the Local Plan to accept second homes and new caravan sites.
- Could be strengthened with the inclusion of associated infrastructure.
- Clear guidance needed in relation to what may be permanent structures.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Parking issues.
- Should be specific mention of potentially adverse effect, rather than just assuming there will be catered for by general policies.
- The policy not to allow new caravan parks on undeveloped sites even when appropriately screened from view could be overly restrictive if facilities for touring caravans were not exempted.
- It would be helpful to clarify the meaning of the principals of eco-tourism.
- The last sentence of part **(d)** should also refer to other accommodation sectors, with the possible exception of B&B where this is offered in a family home.
- Strongly feel that the same principal should apply to visitor attractions.
- Feel that the Local Plan should at least discuss the problem caused by supermarkets in small towns and villages who 'poach' staff from tourism business by offering a more attractive package.
- Recommends that advice in SPP15 is incorporated into the policy.
- Mention should be made of the positive influences that such development can bring to rural areas.
- Policy 30 & 31 – needs guidance on types of evidence that is required regarding the un-viability of the existing use.
- B) - This may have impact on existing parks such as Ballater.
- The second half of **b)** is not a policy statement.
- In **d)** it is not clear why "adverse impact on existing residential amenity" and "scale" are mentioned here but not elsewhere.
- The first part of **e)** is not a policy statement
- In **f)** revise wording of the wording "provision of staff accommodation must be provided by..."

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Request that this policy is considered carefully in light of the need to be able to respond to the needs of a competitive international tourism market.
- **Paragraph 3.71** is contradicted by **Policy 30**.
- **a) & b)** should encourage and promote appropriate landscaping and design of further campsites and caravan sites.
- **d) & e)** should not force property owners into maintaining unviable businesses.
- **f)** in some cases it is inappropriate to provide staff accommodation close to their place of work.
- Suggest some rewording as follows:
- Camp sites: Proposals for the development of new camp-sites, or enlargement of existing **campsites**, will be permitted on the basis of them making a minimal impact on the environment and landscape. Basic **services and** amenities should be provided, but principles of eco-tourism should be applied, **where appropriate**
- Caravan parks: Proposals for new caravan parks will not **normally** be permitted on undeveloped sites within the Park, **unless the siting location and appearance of the proposals will not unduly impact upon the character and appearance of the area.** Extensions **and improvements** to existing sites may be considered **appropriate where they can be accommodated without having a detrimental impact upon its surroundings.**
- Caravan parks **can have** a considerable visual impact on the landscape and community in which they are sited, and **can** require sites to be levelled and cleared of most of their vegetation, as well as requiring considerable areas and installation of services.
- c) Chalets/**Log Cabins**/time-share: Proposals for chalets/**log cabins**/timeshare, which are most likely going to be in rural/semi-rural locations, should be sited to minimise their impacts; developments by woodland settings are preferred **and where such developments are well screened from its surroundings.**
- Object to parts (d) and (e) as the restrictions may deter investment by restricting flexibility.
- Part (e) should recognise the benefit that environmentally sustainable self catering accommodation can make.
- No mention of second homes/weekend retreats; these should be catered for as tourist accommodation.
- **a)** – Do not assume “minimal impact”. **f)** – should be “provision of **necessary** staff accommodation”
- The estate supports the social inclusion policies by way of the provision of caravanning and camping.
- Coylum Bridge Caravan Park has space to expand and needs to be modernised.
- Wish the LP to be amended to enable caravan park expansion and for new sites.
- **Hotel Staff Accommodation Policy 30(f)** - This needs to be thought through. In the past, staff have been recruited, housed in the staff hostel, loose the job, become homeless and need to be re-housed, exacerbating the housing shortage as happened in Aviemore in the

1960's and 70's the result is a build-up of social problems and then piecemeal development to try to alleviate the problem.

- The issues regarding staff accommodation in (f) is a wider issue than is dealt with.
- Would like to see the concept of "housing for key workers" applied to those employed in the tourism and hospitality industry.
- Should recognise the importance of key villages.
- The importance of good design needs to be stressed.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- **(d)** restrictions on change of use of small hotels to private residential property, might be a disincentive to potential buyers if there is no longer the need or economic viability to retain it as a hotel.
- **(b)** is too exclusive and should be amended to allow static caravans for tourist purposes.
- Wording is currently to negative
- **(b)** Suggest the wording 'Caravan Parks' *need not 'make a considerable visual impact.....'* as can be easily screened by vegetation.
- Prefer to see the last sentence of **(b)** deleted in its entirety or at least a substantial rewording to give encouragement to show how intrusive effects can be mitigated.
- **(d)** places a restriction on the selling of commercial property back into the private sector. Appropriate maybe for large hotels but not for guest houses. The B&B sector has always enjoyed a certain amount of freedom of choice by the authorities and this should remain.
- **(e)** Cannot understand why it should not be permitted to switch these to permanent residential accommodation. Where certain changes in personal circumstances or market changes occur, a change of use should be allowable on review. Possible redevelopment for the affordable sector.
- **(f)** his raises an issue of scale which is cause for concern. Large scale developments threaten smaller scale traditional tourist accommodation and/or attractions. Needs to be rephrased.

INDIVIDUALS

- **Para c -** far too permissive and will allow unrestricted developments in the countryside. This type of development should only be allowed within the settlement boundaries of villages.
- Object to clause in **d** regarding change of use of hotels. Small hotels (less than 8 rooms) should not be imposed upon in this way by the CNPA. It is a bureaucratic restriction on enterprise and entrepreneurs. This restriction will limit enterprise in this sector. It is unfair as it could have a devastating effect of the lives of the owners, who have invested their life savings into the venture.
- Welcome the requirement for staff accommodation for large developments. Would also be useful to ensure that accommodation would also include homes suitable for workers with families.
- Policy 30 does not sit well in more rural areas.

CNPA response on Policy 30

- **Tourism accommodation is now covered in Policy 33 of the Deposit Plan, and in order to clarify the position regarding such developments, it has been decided not to separate out tourism business development from accommodation. All forms of economic enterprise which involve the tourism sector will therefore be considered under this one policy. Proposals will also be measured against the other policies of the plan and Scottish Executive and other guidance on the subject. The policy as written will create a level playing field among all types of tourism development, and applicants will not feel that particular sectors have been more penalised than others.**

Policy 31 – Proposals for Retail/Commercial Development

PUBLIC BODIES

- **Policy 31 and 35 -** The residency criteria in both of these policies will involve obtaining, checking and assessing this information in addition to drafting Section 75 agreements, and is not currently part of the housing policies in the Moray area.
- Whilst the intent of the policies are well meaning concerns exist about:
- Additional workload - Use of ambiguous or differently interpreted wording; The practicalities of implementing the policies as they stand. This is likely to lead to fewer applications being determined within 8 weeks and have a knock on effect on performance indicators. This has financial and staffing implications.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Welcome section of Town centres and retail/commercial with a tightening up of wording in **Policy 31(e)** in terms of scale Likewise in **Policy 35(d)**
- .The above applicable also to **Policy 31**.
- Policy 30 & 31 – needs guidance on types of evidence that is required regarding the un-viability of the existing use.
- Support **Policy 31c)** with minor rewording: include "underutilised or empty" upper floors.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Should not force property owners into maintaining unviable businesses by refusing or unreasonably restricting a change of use.

Provide Planning Policy Support for Established Retail Uses

- Concern that there are no specific policy allocations for the existing Co-op Market Town Stores at Ballater, Kingussie and Newtonmore.
- Consider that the Local Plan should recognise the existing retail use of these sites as main food shopping destinations and are an integral component of retail provision for the residents of these towns and villages.
- In order to ensure consistency with NPPG8, the Local Plan should offer more explicit support for existing supermarkets in small towns.

Implementation of Sequential Approach as part of Retail Planning Policy

- In addition to **Policy 31a** the CNP should adapt a 'sequential approach' in relation to retail development in accordance with NPPG8, to allow out-of-centre locations to be considered when it has been demonstrated that all town centre and edge-of-centre options have been thoroughly assessed.

Policy Support for Extensions and New Stores

- In Accordance with NPPG8 the CNPA should identify the need for new retail floorspace, beyond existing commitments in the area for the Local Plan period, review the need for convenience retailing if a need is identified but is not sufficient to support a new store and address this deficiency through the expansion of existing convenience stores.

Define Designated Town/Retail Centres in All Settlements

- There appear to be no identified retail centres in Ballater, Kingussie, Newtonmore or Grantown-on-Spey within the Local Plan, where there are established stores.
- The support for traditional High streets contained in Policy 31a are not identified on the proposals maps. Also the statement for Grantown-on-Spey identifies an "existing shopping core" but the proposals map does not show this.

Consider it imperative that the proposals maps define the boundaries of retail centres in all settlements as this would provide retailers and developers greater clarity as to the policy allocation of premises and sites.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- It has to be possible to take account of the economic knock-on result of such developments (the Tesco effect)
- Maintaining financial viability must be recognised.
- Where the above is not occurring, a change of use must be made possible.
- Current wording is too restrictive.

CNPA response on Policy 31

- **The Deposit Plan considers retail and commercial development in Policy 31, and the text has been clarified to consider development proposals by location rather than form of operation. It is hoped therefore that this approach will allow greater flexibility in the forms of development that can be considered, and that applicants will easily be able to see which section of the policy their proposal falls into. The policy has been written to reflect the importance the National Park Authority place on the economic wellbeing of businesses in the area, and on the important role the commercial centres within it play.**

Policy 32 – Proposals for Retail/Commercial Development in Aviemore

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Parking issues.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support this policy.

- The policy should be amended, to make reference to any updates to the Aviemore Masterplan or other change in circumstance that may supersede the existing masterplan.
- The intention to prepare a Masterplan for Aviemore does not fulfil the states purpose of the LP in terms of retail/commercial development in Aviemore. Insufficient guidance in the plan to adequately frame development during the plan period. No time frame for the Masterplan.
- AHR reserve their position with regards the Aviemore Masterplan

CNPA response to Policy 32

- **The Deposit Plan has tried to rationalise the policies contained within it, making overarching policies against which similar forms of development can be judged. As such the specific policy regarding proposals for Aviemore has been removed, and proposals will be judged against all the policies in the plan, together with the emerging Masterplan which will supplement the Local Plan once adopted.**

Policy 33 – Proposals for Large Scale Retail/Commercial Development

PUBLIC BODIES

- Acceptability of large scale proposals.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- not clear whether the requirement of impact and transport assessment applies only to Aviemore.
- Should address the issue of soil being dumped in Landfill due to lack of recycling facilities available.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Commercial developments that will have little or no impact on the retail sector should not be obliged to produce a retail impact assessment.
- No clarification why a retail impact assessment is required for proposals over 1000m² when in NPPG 8 the figure is 2500m².
- NPPG 8 also states that within the setting of a town centre a retail development will enhance the area and therefore a retail impact assessment is not required.
- Various Ministerial Statements address this point.
- SPP8 also addresses this issue. Policy should therefore be amended to reflect the provisions of SPP8 and NPPG8.

CNPA response to Policy 33

- **All forms of retail and commercial development will be considered under Policy 21 of the Deposit Local Plan. In considering the comments made, it was decided that the distinction between scales of development was not helpful and it is hoped that the revised approach will clarify the position regarding this form of development. Guidance produced by the Scottish Executive will supplement the implementation of this policy in the normal way, and the text of the policy has not duplicated the content of this additional guidance.**

Policy 34 – Improving the Town Centre Environment

PUBLIC BODIES

- Paragraph (a) – should make clear that where appropriate these issues are subject to listed building or other built heritage considerations.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Access should be fit for the purpose; it is not always practical to change access facilities.

INDIVIDUALS

- (a) - This is a duplication of existing legislation, enforceable through other parts of the statutory system, has no relevance as part of a Local Plan and should be deleted.

CNPA response to Policy 34

- **Policy 22 of the Deposit Local Plan considers improvements to town centres and other centres within the National Park area. The text reflects national guidance on the approach to take for improving settlements within Local Plan areas, and it is hoped that the policy will have an overall positive impact on the quality of the built environment of the key centres within the Park.**

Policy 35 – Proposals for Business & Economic Development

PUBLIC BODIES

- There is a need for directional guidance for new developments regarding waste management facilities, this could be incorporated into **Policy 35** or alternatively a further policy developed.
- **Policy 31 and 35 -** The residency criteria in both of these policies will involve obtaining, checking and assessing this information in addition to drafting Section 75 agreements, and is not currently part of the housing policies in the Moray area.
- **Whilst** the intent of the policies are well meaning concerns exist about: Additional workload; Use of ambiguous or differently interpreted wording; The practicalities of implementing the policies as they stand. This is likely to lead to fewer applications being determined within 8 weeks and have a knock on effect on performance indicators. This has financial and staffing implications.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Should be specific mention of potentially adverse effect, rather than just assuming there will be catered for by general policies.
- Welcome section of Town centres and retail/commercial with a tightening up of wording in **Policy 31(e)** in terms of scale Likewise in **Policy 35(d)**
- In the table relating to para 3.74 replace “hunting” with “field sports” as this term includes gamekeeping.
- Suggest the term “*permanently unviable*” needs to be defined in **Policy 35b).**

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- **Policy 35d** - Support this policy as it will be helpful in locations such as Laggan where buildings for business have constrained the development of the forest partnership in the area.
- There should be no attempt to maintain uneconomic businesses. Suggest alternative wording.
- Should adopt a proactive approach to business.
- Part (a) misleading.
- Part (b) is overly restrictive.
- Part (c) has been omitted.
- Part (d) overly restrictive.
- Mention should be made of a steady and sensible supply of new houses providing healthy levels of employment in the building and maintenance sectors as well as the service sectors.
- Policy 35 should recognise the potential for diversification in countryside settings for new types of recreational/tourism products and support given for all tourism businesses/enterprises, research and development.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- **(b)** The comments raised in relation to **Policy 30 (d)** are equally relevant here.
- Debatable whether smaller premises would be lost to the business sector forever.
- Some freedom of movement between private and commercial use should be permitted.

CNPA response on Policy 35

- **In light of the comments received the policy relating to economic growth and business development is now contained within Policies 20 and 21 of the Deposit Local Plan. The revised text separates proposals by location rather than scale and considers their impact accordingly. This rationale is hoped to simplify the process and clarify to all using the policy what is expected in terms of development of the proposal. It allows a degree of flexibility in terms of dealing with unforeseen development opportunities, and allows a more reasonable approach to be taken depending on the location.**

Policy 36 – Proposals for Business & Economic Development in Aviemore

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Should be specific mention of potentially adverse effect, rather than just assuming there will be catered for by general policies.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support this policy.
- The policy should be amended, however, to make reference to any updates to the Aviemore Masterplan or other change in circumstance that may supersede the existing masterplan.

CNPA response to Policy 36

- **The Deposit Plan has tried to rationalise the policies contained within it, making overarching policies against which similar forms of development can be judged. As such the specific policy regarding proposals for Aviemore has been removed, and proposals will be judged against all the policies in the plan, together with the emerging Masterplan which will supplement the Local Plan once adopted.**

General Comments on Housing

PUBLIC BODIES

- **Policies 37-41**
- Analysis of needs and issues not accepted – need to take into account projected trends.
- Consider the role of developer contributions.
- The Local Plan should refer to Local Housing Needs Assessment
- Particular emphasis in terms of affordable housing provision should be placed on the Badenoch and Strathspey area as it is a housing stress area.
- Clarification is needed regarding affordable housing contributions and diversion to an enhancement project.
- Consider allocating land for affordable housing as part of a wider set of initiatives (PAN 74)
- The principle of restraint on the housing market by residency criteria etc as set out is not supported.
- A policy restricting infill to single houses is not appropriate.
- Due weight should be given to the principles of PAN 72 in relation to derelict land and property and rural business development.
- Might be better to provide a clear statement establishing expectation of excellence in design.
- Insufficient attention placed on location and design.
- The rate of housing proposed is not clear.
- The provision of services to developments out with settlements is not mentioned.
- Housing policies could benefit from a similar clause to **Policy 20A**.
- **Paragraph 3.81** - Ensuring an adequate supply of housing land is provided in the Aberdeenshire part of the Park is an important consideration, but this paragraph states that this assessment will be done at the next stage. The preferred areas shown for housing indicate a level significantly higher than that in NEST which would require justification.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- **3.80** – would like to see evidence provided to support the three statements in this paragraph.
- **3.81** – suggest rewording the final sentence so that it reads: “*some small scale sites will.....*” to be in line with PAN 74, para 29.
- **3.82** – instead of the requirement to undertaking local housing needs studies, which would lead to problems and repetition, suggest the CNPA undertake housing need assessments, and then any development could be assessed by them.

- **3.87** – the issue of affordable housing could be more fully developed within the Plan.
- Very few references to the role of low cost home ownership and intermediate housing tenures.
- Would expect to see explicit references to the fact that LA housing need assessments and strategies show that low cost home ownership and shared equity housing can play a significant role in meeting housing need.
- Agreement should be reached with partners regarding ways to look for more housing provision/allocation where it is required.
- **3.88** - The expression ...[Those] “who also do not qualify for affordable “social” housing” would be more accurately replaced with “who are unlikely to be able to access affordable rented housing” as there are no qualifying data, other than age, relating to applicants for social housing.
- Expect to see reference to intermediate housing tenures. Specifically relevant to those who cannot afford to purchase in the private market.
- **3.90** – crucial to receive feedback form Scottish Water on both waste water and water supply.
- **3.92** – the final draft should make use of GROS estimates.
- **3.93** – welcome the strategic objectives in this paragraph
- The proposed policies would need to be developed to ensure this happens.
- Suggest the CNPA should ensure consensus amongst stakeholders, including communities, on this issue before any such policy is introduced to the area.
- **3.94** – definition of “local need” and “residency” has to be dealt with carefully.
- Policies on affordable housing must allow for essential incoming workers, especially for low cost home ownership options.
- Consideration must also be given to the Homelessness etc (Scotland Act 2003 and homelessness duties of authorities and registered landlords.
- **3.96** – Clarification is needed on the time period for this allocation.
- **3.99** – Suggest this paragraph should include references to be made to all categories of affordable housing set out in PAN 74.
- Very few areas for housing development designated in the Plan.
- Considering the demand and shortage of supply this would seem to be inadequate.
- This part of the Plan is not based on any information and therefore is not of any use.
- Concern that by limiting the designated areas for affordable housing only, this will further reduce development, and is economically unsustainable.
- Would expect some form of encouragement for a younger population to counteract the trend of an older/retired population in this area.
- The estimated number of affordable homes required, which was deemed unsustainable in the LP was not based on any evidence at all.
- There are conflicting statements in the LP regarding concentrating new development in existing settlements and discouraging housing in the countryside.
- Need to show population/housing projections/allocations for consultation purposes.

- Should mention the fact that the population of the Highlands will rise by more than half a million in the next 20 years.
- Very little factual background/analysis and no clear opinion of number, locations and categories of houses to be planned for.
- A need to provide evidence.
- Unclear why the 2400 new homes would be unsustainable.
- The CNPA should not proceed to the finalised draft stage without population/housing projections/allocations have been made available for consultation.
- The legality of proposed restrictions on allocation for housing development set out in **paragraph 3.101** should be checked.
- The comments in **paragraph 3.90** fail to do justice to the chronic under investment by Scottish Water in its Badenoch and Strathspey assets.
- Good opportunities for sustainable housing within a woodland setting, e.g. Forestry Commission land. However the definition of local areas may determine such opportunities unacceptable to the Park – Suggest exceptions where a small development of for affordable housing in perpetuity would provide good examples of sustainable development.
- **Paragraph 3.79** – identify not allocate sites.
- Recommend that a Housing Needs Assessment be produced, along with population /household information projections.
- Recommend a housing land audit be carried out.
- Welcomes the recognition of the role of the private sector in the provision of housing within the NP.
- Concern over the lack of population/housing projections/allocations.
- **Paragraph 3.87** should be extended to include data tables to further illustrate problems in accessing the housing market.
- Need for a further paragraph after **3.88** to explain that the overall housing need within the Park is higher than the 132 figure in the Heriott-Watt Study.
- An additional paragraph should be inserted before the summary of issues on **Page 52**, to refer to the findings of Dr Mark Bevan's research into the impact of second and holiday homes in rural Scotland. Essential that any relevant information relating to their role and impact is included in the document.
- Needs to be better cross-referencing of housing to the paragraphs on business and economic development, and vice versa. There cannot be one, without the other.
- **Summary of Housing Issues**
- Needs to be consistency when referring to the figure of affordable homes, within this section this figure is referred to “nearly 600 affordable homes to rent” and “around 600” and “possibly more than 600”.
- If this figures relates to the Heriott-Watt study of 132 houses per year for 5 years equates to 660, this is not clearly reflected in any of the three references mentioned in this section.
- Paragraph 3.92 appears to imply that affordable housing is limited to homes for rent, however the Heriott-Watt study clearly notes that “affordable housing could encompass any housing opportunities...”
- Suggest that both findings of the Heriott-Watt research and the issue of affordability should be expanded considerably.
- **The Local Plan Strategy for Housing**

- The SRPBA question the aim that all rented and low cost housing is provided in perpetuity.
- To provide all affordable housing in this way will impact on the desirability of housing and the ability of the occupant to access property on the open market in the future.
- Such a restriction would preclude the use of certain grant mechanisms to create affordable housing.
- Communities Scotland Empty Property Grant would appear to be supported by **Policy 39**, but would be prevented by a policy that all affordable housing must be in perpetuity. The scheme would not meet the requirement set out in **paragraphs 3.93 and 3.94 part 1**
- Supportive of a proportion of new housing being affordable and/or meeting local needs. Suggest that in the CNP area this proportion should be significant. But would not support a policy in which all new housing developed in the Park to be affordable and meeting local need.
- **Paragraph 3.96** needs to be expanded to include an explanation/reasoning for the inclusion of this land allocation.
- **Affordable Housing**
- Welcomed with expansion to **paragraphs 3.87 and 3.88** as previously stated above.
- As mentioned **paragraph 3.92** does not accurately reflect all the options for delivering affordable housing. Even though they are listed in **paragraph 3.99**, suggest they should be detailed within the **general housing paragraph**.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- In identifying land for affordable housing the CNPA must ensure that any forest sites do not contain Ancient Semi Natural Woodland, Planted Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) or other woodland with existing high biodiversity value/potential.
- There should be a buffer area between development and woodland.
- Suggest as an absolute minimum the following conditions to apply to any relevant permission:
 - Provision of services through woodland areas should not generally be accepted. However in exceptional circumstances the developer must consult with the landowner well in advance of permissions being sought.
 - The development should not impede any management access routes assigned to a woodland owner.
 - The developer is responsible for ensuring that any drainage from their site, including that from pre-existing field drains is effectively prevented from entering adjacent woodlands, the developer shall ensure that natural drainage from the wood is not impeded by the development.
 - The developer shall not, without prior permission, remove any boundary fences or markers or otherwise use woodland for access, dumping or storage purposes. They will also be responsible for ensuring that litter etc. resulting from the development is cleared daily from woodlands.
 - The principals and safeguards recommended in BS 5837: Trees in relation to construction 1991, are applied as a minimum requirement

and referred to in planning guidance. Particular measures required to protect trees:

- An adequate stand-off distance of 15m between mature woodland and development
- Works likely to damage root systems should not take place, within a minimum protection area as set out in BS5837.
- Works to be avoided within the protection area are those likely to cause, asphyxiation of root systems, poisoning, root-cutting, physical damage to stems and branches.
- Bitumen, concrete and oil should be kept at least 10m from the edge of the canopy, no fires within 20m of canopy.
- Suggest that in planning only for a 5 year timescale is contrary to SPP3, even the finalised draft which will take a longer term view of up to 10 years is not sufficient and therefore suggest this should be extended to look up to 15 years ahead.
- Suggest that the assumption that the new LP should take historic completion rates as the basis for future housing targets is woefully inadequate.
- Fundamentally disagree with the last sentence in **paragraph 3.92**. There is no evidence to support this statement and therefore suggest it is deleted.
- Paragraph 3.81 – zoning for affordable housing needs full agreement with landowner.
- Restrictions in house building completions in last years due to a lack of service infrastructure.
- Therefore it is misleading to base future housing needs on previous house completions.
- Housing market issues resulting from imposing residency criteria.
- Urgent need to address problems rather than further restricting development.
- **Housing -** Population/housing need projections /allocations are essential
- It is vital that the LP recognises and provides for increasing the accessibility of rented and owned housing and ensures land and investment for affordable housing.
- To limit the housing in the park to affordable and local need is unthinkable for various reasons:
 - Breach of human rights.
 - Nimbyism should never be tolerated as a planning argument.
 - Supply and demand imbalance causing price increases, consequently leading to a market dominated by wealthy incomers/second home buyers.
 - Buying then selling on open market.
 - A lack of housing within the Park would force people to live outwith the Park boundary and commute in, increasing car journeys.
 - Such a policy goes against of the Scottish Parliaments efforts to combat Scotland's dwindling population and their efforts to encourage incomers to settle here.
- **Affordable Housing**
- Keeping houses affordable should start with providing housing for everyone's needs, including second homes market, if second homes

market not provided for, second home buyers will continue to out bid locals.

- Polices must comply with Circular 12/1996.
- It is premature to set percentages of affordable housing without a Housing Needs Study being completed.
- Affordable housing should only be asked for where there is a proven need and therefore funding for same.
- In order to accommodate the affordable need and continue growing at a sustainable level paragraph 3.94 debates limiting all new housing to housing associations or to persons meeting residency criteria. Thus Policy 38 requires all persons buying the new houses to have full time employment in the area or have resided in the area for 3 years.
- This deterministic approach will cause serious harm to the areas economy.
- Unless they have a job to go to it will not allow economically active people to migrate into the area and buy a house.
- It will not allow people to retire to the area.
- It will increase the price of existing houses when they come on to the second hand market. Therefore only being available to the well off.
- It will dissuade housing developers from building in the area and will discourage inward investors.
- No evidence has been provided where such a similar policy has stood the test of time.
- No evidence that the local communities, environment and economy can sustain a building rate of 115 houses per annum throughout the NP.
- Planning against part-time workers is potentially highly discriminatory, possibly contrary to principals set out in SPP1.
- Therefore the Estate feels that the LP should not discriminate in the housing market in terms of residency criteria, but should pursue an effective affordable housing policy by maintaining land supply and encouraging developers to co-operate in new initiatives, particularly those emerging from Communities Scotland.
- **Advantages of the current LP housing allocation**
- The ability of a single, properly phased development to deliver:
 - A higher proportion of low-cost housing than could be obtained through the aggregation of smaller, piecemeal developments.
- A more secure vehicle for delivering infrastructure improvements (in particular water and drainage) than could be delivered via piecemeal and unpredictable development proposals for smaller sites.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- As regards to affordable housing development, it is essential that it is made clear to the Scottish Executive that Scottish Water has to give a firm commitment to planning for future provision. The problem with water supply in Badenoch and Strathsey should be acknowledged under **The Strategy for Housing** part of the Plan.
- **Second Homes (Paragraph 3.80)** Second homes within Chapletown in particular are more often that not owned by people with strong family and cultural ties to the area. And through time many become the owner's main residence.
- Majority of holiday homes for let within this area are owed by local people – vital for tourism, a mainstay of the local economy.

INDIVIDUALS

- The draft Local Plan does not attempt to express a view on whether or not it is necessary to allocate land for the foreseeable housing demand.
- Surely the phrase “housing needs” should apply to those people requiring a house to live here permanently or work here, not holiday homes.
- Affordable housing does not come without its negative impacts on the natural and cultural heritage of the Park.
- The reference in **paragraph 3.85** to the aging population of the Park is over exaggerated when looking at the 2001 census information.
- The question of how much immigration, if any, is desirable, is not directly addressed.
- The figures for housing need are unsupported.
- The report from Heriott-Watt is unavailable for scrutiny.
- The demand for housing within the Park (for affordable or otherwise) may arise from outside of the Park.
- Concern over the rate and scale of change in villages due to demand led housing completions.
- The demand for housing is coming from people who want second homes or houses for holiday lets.
- Strongly support the policy that permission for new housing should only be given to the people who work in the area or who have very strong local connections.
- Support emphasis on housing
- Support view that affordable housing should be of the same quality and density as other housing. However this could lead to added expense and reduced affordable housing provision. Suggest this is re-examined to give a degree of flexibility. Public transport provision for affordable housing.
- The 25% goal for affordable housing may need to be increased in some areas where local need is demonstrated.
- The prohibiting of residential caravans may need to be reviewed in light of housing need. This review should look at phasing out the use of residential caravans as and when housing is provided.
- Would strongly advise against affordable housing for any new developments outwith settlements. Suggest instead well-build homes that are properly birthed into the landscape and culture of the area.
- Houses should be allocated for rent to locals, which they could buy if, or when they are able.
- Young families wishing to continue to live in the NP should be encouraged, where possible to inherit the family home; this may help reduce the demand for new housing. Those living long term in the NP should think carefully to ensure that their family does not have a negative pressure upon the Park.
- Affordable “need” proven?
- in perpetuity is not a reasonable concept
- Provide work and with it housing.
- More thought needed.
- Strongly support the stated policy that permission for new housing should only be given to people who work in the area or who have strong local connections.

CNPA response on general comments regarding Housing

- The draft Local Plan generated much debate and comment particularly regarding the topic of housing and how best to address the pressures facing residents and those wishing to live within the Park boundary. As a result much further discussion has gone on since the draft plan consultation period to analyse the specific problems faced by the Park and consultants have been used to assess further the need and likely impact this may have on current housing trends. The issue of affordability has also been the subject of great debate and detailed discussions have taken place with key stakeholders including developers, Community Scotland, the Local Authorities, the local Housing Associations and others with a direct interest in the housing position within the park. The lessons learned from the 4 Local Authorities has been invaluable and the policies regarding housing have been much changed and amended to reflect the overall findings. It is hoped that the text within the Deposit Local Plan adequately explains the findings of our studies regarding need and in particular, the needs of those who cannot afford a house on the open market. The policies have also been redrafted to ensure that the best mix of houses is achieved to meet the need which has been identified, and it is hoped that the approach taken will achieve the overall aim of ensuring sustainable communities thrive within the Park boundary in the future.

Policy 37 – Proposals for Affordable Housing

PUBLIC BODIES

- This policy indicates an approach which is 'weaker' than that within the Aberdeenshire LP. Such an approach could have adverse implication for the implication of affordable housing policy in the Aberdeenshire LP.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Residency requirements could become unduly burdensome on local residents and possibly difficult to enforce.
- Within the specific context of the part of Moray in the national Park, the requirement to have a development of 4 or more houses to contribute 25% to affordable housing may be too high. And therefore may adversely affect the level of housing developments, ultimately *not* leading to increased affordable housing.
- Suggest providing more land for housing adjacent to existing settlements and housing designed to have a higher density and flexibility in the changes of use of existing buildings.
- Policies aimed at affordable housing can only regulate a small proportion of the total stock.
- Suggest consideration of Scandinavia system and log cabin projects.
- Suggest dropping "other 75%" wording in paragraph 3.92.
- Suggest restricting housing outwith settlements by S.75 local occupancy for 10 years.
- Wholly supportive of the statement at the end of the second paragraph in **Policy 37**.

- Strongly advocates the inclusion of a rural exemption site policy within Policy 37.
- Support zoning specifically for affordable housing, which will have a deflationary effect on the value of land, allowing housing providers to deliver affordable housing more cost effectively.
- Should the reference to **Policy H3** in the third paragraph, actually refer to **Policy 38**?
- The proposals for affordable housing and housing within defined settlements should be offered in the context of producing landscape masterplans for key settlements (not just Aviemore)
- Important characteristics such as cliffs, moraines, Scots pine/birch woodland should be protected and enhanced within a masterplan context, which will enable new development in settlements to be integrated properly with the surrounding landscape.
- Examples: Inverdrue expansion coalescing with Coylumbridge Hotel complex? Inverdrue expansion to penetrate pine/birch woodland north of the road? To what extent should the formal grid pattern of Grantown-on Spey be perpetuated into new developments?
- There should be a robust means of assessing the proportion of open market housing allocation.
- Regarding housing outside settlements, granting of permissions for single house plots should be conditional on permanent residence and a need to live on-site as a requirement of business etc.
- Restricting housing to affordable for locals only sends out a very negative message to those seeking to invest in the Park.
- Needs greater explanation regarding developer's contribution to an enhancement project. Must comply with the requirements of Circular 12/1996.
- Issues regarding the outbidding of locals for houses by a policy of restriction.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support **Policy 37** and the minimum 25% contribution required of **Policy 38**
- Suggest alternative wording for the first paragraph.
- Areas should not be zoned specifically for affordable housing.
- Last 3 paras are counterproductive in encouraging affordable housing, suggest alternative wording.
- Detailed zoning required to ensure appropriate community integration of housing developments.
- Suggest a policy in favour of affordable housing for developments over 4 houses.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Need some indication of what is 'affordable'
- Perhaps an indication of average income levels around the park might help.
- Affordable housing needs to address a wide range of situations and incomes
 - Good quality housing for rent

- Assisted purchase via housing associations and/or RHOG grants in the mid price band
- A variety of sites should be made available both within and out with settlements.
- Encouragement needs to be given to 'start-up' accommodation for young single persons.
- Enabling affordable housing to be developed on private estates without necessitating sale of the site would increase supply whilst adding a useful means of diversification.
- Concern of a tendency for conditions to be more restrictive for affordable housing than for free market developments.

CNPA response on Policy 37

- **The draft Local Plan generated much debate and comment particularly regarding the topic of housing and how best to address the pressures facing residents and those wishing to live within the Park boundary. As a result much further discussion has gone on since the draft plan consultation period to analyse the specific problems faced by the Park and consultants have been used to assess further the need and likely impact this may have on current housing trends. The issue of affordability has also been the subject of great debate and detailed discussions have taken place with key stakeholders including developers, Community Scotland, the Local Authorities, the local Housing Associations and others with a direct interest in the housing position within the park. The lessons learned from the 4 Local Authorities has been invaluable and the policies regarding housing have been much changed and amended to reflect the overall findings. It is hoped that the text within the Deposit Local Plan adequately explains the findings of our studies regarding need and in particular, the needs of those who cannot afford a house on the open market. The policies have also been redrafted to ensure that the best mix of houses is achieved to meet the need which has been identified, and it is hoped that the approach taken will achieve the overall aim of ensuring sustainable communities thrive within the Park boundary in the future.**
- **With specific reference to affordable housing, the Deposit Local Plan in Policy 24 outlines the requirements to contribute to affordable housing within the Park. The policy has been written to ensure that maximum benefit is achieved to address the need, in a way which allows an adequate profit margin for developers to ensure that the underlying aims are achieved and the market is not stifled. The mechanisms are outlined in the supporting text, and it is hoped that this will clarify to all interested parties how the policies regarding affordable housing and housing in general will operate. It is intended as information only at this stage and will form part of supplementary guidance to the plan on adoption rather than be contained within the final text of the adopted Plan.**

Policy 38 – Proposals for Housing Within Defined Settlements

PUBLIC BODIES

- Recommend rewording of c)

- Not clear under which circumstances the alternative clause would be added.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Recommend adopting Highland Council Policy with regard to road adoption (4 house rule)
- Concern that the Draft LP could be designating too little land for additional capacity for new housing or business expansion in Moray settlements.
- This might limit the ability of these communities to realise their share of the benefits from the Moray Community Planning Partnership's Vision and Strategy for the Diversification of our Economy, Moray 2020.
- Concern about the impact that the introduction of a conservation area in Tomintoul might be on sustainable economic and social development in the village.
- Suggest giving the fullest possible consideration of local resident's views.
- Due to agricultural support changes, diversification enterprises will be commonplace, requiring new buildings and facilities – **paragraph 3.105** provides some comfort but it should be strengthened to allow such development without linking to Section 75 agreements as a standard route.
- **Policy 38** is an example of this issue, specifically an RSL's ability to limit the age at which tenancies are offered or illegal residency qualifications.
- **Policy 38(c)**, integration of affordable housing within successful balanced communities is fully supported.
- This must be balanced against economic viability, however.
- Early dialogue with developers is important regarding this issue.
- The figure of 25% referring to affordable housing requirement should be detailed within Policy 37.
- SRPBA would not support the inclusion of the policy clause.
- However would support a policy which restricted a proportion of housing developed to those applicants meeting the criteria listed in **paragraph 3.101**.
- If this approach was taken clear guidelines on the proportion housing that would be required would need to take into account the following:
- If affordable element is required would it include any local restriction provision or would the housing for local people be in addition to the minimum affordable housing provision?
- People meeting the criteria, but who want rather than need a house would be prevented for doing so if a total/high restriction of new development must go to applicants meeting the criteria. Resulting in a reduction of lower priced properties, which would exacerbate the affordable housing supply problem. Suggest that a policy of this type may result in the out-migration of existing residents.
- Concern over the residency criteria under **Policy 38**. Feel a better solution is to ensure an adequate supply of land for housing in the LP and to use other policy mechanisms such as ensuring 25% of land is provided for affordable housing to meet local needs.
- **Policy 38b) -** Regarding the 25% allocation for affordable housing consideration should be given to issues of: valuation, costing and procurement.

- The policy requires to be clear and sufficiently flexible so as to ensure it can cater for both allocation of land for future use as well as housing units resulting from planning approval.
- Suggest the last sentence in part b (in brackets) be deleted from the policy, as it is unnecessary, where there is an up-to-date housing needs assessment and local housing strategy.
- **Policy 38d)** - Clarification on the meaning of "applicant" needed.
- No account taken of Homelessness legislation, believe this legislation would not allow letting of council and RSL properties only to local people.
- Inclusion of part d) would benefit from fuller evidence and the reasons for the specific criteria.
- To achieve the objectives it will be crucial that mechanisms put in place to ensure affordability in perpetuity are clearly set out in the Policy.
- Restricting access to housing provision – balanced and sustainable communities?
- Could be viewed as excluding people who want to move to the Park to set up businesses, it may have a detrimental effect on economic health of the area.
- Part d) could have far reaching consequences for Park Communities.
- Must be more carefully defined and discussed with the full range of stakeholders, including communities.
- **Alternative Clause** - If the percentage of affordable housing is correctly apportioned then this alternative clause would not be required.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Object to the alternative policy clause which is suggested at **paragraph 3.101** could be added. This would lead to virtually no new housing being built anywhere. Suggest that no house building company that would meet the criteria of this alternative to wording. In addition to being unworkable it is likely that such a policy would be unlawful and in breach of European Legislation concerning anti-competition issues and human rights.
- Disagree with para 3.100; villages should be capable of accommodating the full spectrum of housing demand.
- Suggest that the residency criteria will create anomalies and difficulties within the local economy.
- Should the CNPA dictate who lives where?
- Paragraph 3.101 –object to local occupancy criteria.
- Object as the affordable housing needs cannot be addressed through housing provision alone.
- The LP should contain a "Rural Exceptions" Policy.
- Objection to **clause (d)**, overly restrictive, contrary to SPP3, could stifle development.
- Should look at specific affordable housing developments rather than developments featuring elements of affordable housing.
- The LP should contain a "Rural Exceptions" Policy.
- Need a definition of "affordable"
- Need to recognise the role that communities outside the park play and the movement across the Park boundaries.
- Objection to **clause (d)**, overly restrictive, contrary to SPP3, could stifle development.

- Do not think it correct to add **policy clause (d)** to **Policy 38**.
- The market restriction suggested has the potential to severely influence house prices and render developments uneconomical.
- **Policy clause (d)** does not make it clear whether a developer would be required to enter a Section 75 Agreement and thus influencing the market in respect of any future sales.
- Would be serious implications for the mobility of labour and if it is not there will be considerable market distortion.
- If the owners of zoned sites and developers see significant gains being made when houses are sold on there is the potential for land being held back from development.
- For the above reasons it is strongly felt that there should be no interference with the market.
- The release of housing may reduce the requirement for affordable housing.
- The alternative paragraph d) is not required.
- Be bold in terms of allocations.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Unhappy with the presumption against affordable housing in the countryside.
- Support the *'integration within the heart of the existing community'* rather than 'Zoning'.
- Reference to zoning would appear to be redundant as would 'not separate or segregated'
- The 1997 HC LP recognised Lynchat and Drumguish as separate settlements.
- Would support defining maps for Lynchat and Drumguish, and feel that Inveruglas and Dalnavert could be usefully added.
- Think that the terms for commuted payments **(b)** should be spelt out.
- Consider that the **alternative policy 3.101** is not water tight and therefore should be deleted as it creates as many problems as it seeks to solve.
- Accept that rules will need to be set regarding who can occupy affordable housing, but do not think this is the place.
- Assessment of qualifications for occupancy should be made by the housing association at the time.
- Variation is to be expected depending on demand and the need to achieve occupation for most of the time (not good to have houses standing empty for any length of time)
- Welcomes **Policy 38** clause in favouring new build for residents.
- How will a ruin be judged as integral to the cultural heritage of the park and who will make the judgement?

INDIVIDUALS

Housing policy – provision for permanent employed residents

- Do not think there is any argument against an active discriminatory housing provision policy.
- It is clear from examples such as Glen Borrowdale that unless active measures are taken, the process of loss of housing for "locals" will continue. Do not think that there is any balanced state before full retired/holiday home ownership.

- Do not think there is any legal bar to a planning policy of absolute priority to affordable housing as long as that policy is carefully drafted.
- The actual design of the policy is critical to its achieving its end.
- An absolute bar on any other kind of housing development gets over the problem of treating the potential sellers of building land inequitably.
- It is vital to massively lower the sale price of land for building. The application of the clause above gets over the problem of price competition from private buyers.
- This in itself will not be sufficient. Current planning practice would be to allocate what the planners believe to be sufficient land to meet the need over the life of the local plan. The life span normally runs over and the provision is never enough to depress the market price of land.
- Way around this is to make provision that is massively in excess of the needs of future housing. Only this will drive the land acquisition price down. This will require the abandonment of many of the criteria, such as connection to a public water supply road standards etc. But these criteria are not necessary; a 'Perfect' policy which fails to achieve its end is a contradiction.
- However this will require ruthless political direction to overcome resistance from planning officials.
- The process regarding who will qualify for affordable housing must be robust.
- For the above reasons support the policies restricting new house building to those meeting residency criteria.
- **Part d) ii)** – remove words “*in a business*”

CNPA response to Policy 38

- **The draft Local Plan generated much debate and comment particularly regarding the topic of housing and how best to address the pressures facing residents and those wishing to live within the Park boundary. As a result much further discussion has gone on since the draft plan consultation period to analyse the specific problems faced by the Park and consultants have been used to assess further the need and likely impact this may have on current housing trends. The issue of affordability has also been the subject of great debate and detailed discussions have taken place with key stakeholders including developers, Community Scotland, the Local Authorities, the local Housing Associations and others with a direct interest in the housing position within the park. The lessons learned from the 4 Local Authorities has been invaluable and the policies regarding housing have been much changed and amended to reflect the overall findings. It is hoped that the text within the Deposit Local Plan adequately explains the findings of our studies regarding need and in particular, the needs of those who cannot afford a house on the open market. The policies have also been redrafted to ensure that the best mix of houses is achieved to meet the need which has been identified, and it is hoped that the approach taken will achieve the overall aim of ensuring sustainable communities thrive within the Park boundary in the future.**
- **With specific reference to policies within settlements, the Deposit Local Plan in Policy no longer identifies specifically a policy on site within settlements, but refers to sites allocated within settlements through the**

Proposals maps, and details the mix and nature of the development that should occur on these sites. To support these policies a series of development briefs will be produced to supplement the Local Plan on adoption which will look in greater detail at the issues of layout, design, impact on the landscape, visual impact and other issues that may arise in the planning process. It is hoped that this approach will better serve to create attractive and appropriate schemes which have been designed to reflect their specific setting. It will also clarify the economic constraints of the affordability part of any scheme from the outset.

Policy 39 – Proposals for Housing Outwith Defined Settlements

PUBLIC BODIES

- Some definitions/clarifications needed in the supportive text.
- As written Part 1 would allow anyone meeting the criteria to build a house outwith defined settlements irrespective to land management mentioned in the supportive text.
- Suggest rewording and strengthening.
- Welcome proposals set out in **paragraph 3.106** - Consider that this needs to be carried through into the wording of **Policy 39**.
- Restriction to local people is not consistent with the approach of the Aberdeenshire Council. The approach advocated in the CNPA LP could result in a dysfunction with NEST in the vicinity of the boundary of the Park.
- This policy states an existing group threshold of three houses, which is in conflict with NEST's and the Aberdeenshire Local Plan's threshold of five houses. This would require justification.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Recommend adopting Highland Council Policy with regard to road adoption (4 house rule)
- Housing in rural areas may have negative impacts particularly through traffic generation and disturbance to protected species such as Capercaillie.
- Wording must be clear that environmental impacts will be considered at all scales.
- Overly restrictive
- Would be a major disincentive to diversification and investment in rural businesses.
- The criteria set out does not reflect the positive message set out in SPP15 regarding small clusters and groups of dwellings.
- Consideration must be given to small-scale development outwith defined settlements, if housing need is to be met within the NP. SPP15 states that occupancy conditions tying dwelling units to agricultural and forestry use will no longer be relevant to these new housing groups – this Draft Local Plan appears to be contrary to that.
- Issue of economic justification must be carefully considered .e.g. unpaid contributions to crofting or agricultural units by family members.
- Suggest the criteria should be explained more fully and clarification to “applicant” is required.
- The statements regarding road upgrading for development over 8 units is contrary to LA policies but is welcomed in rural areas.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Suggest smaller groups of houses will have less environmental impact than larger groups of houses requiring tarred roads, pavements, street lighting etc.
- There should be fewer constraints on dwellings in the countryside.
- Feel that the proposals in this policy are neither practical nor warranted. They would be a major disincentive to diversification and investment in rural businesses.
- Object due to a lack of research into housing requirements.
- The restricting housing criteria for housing outwith settlements is contrary to SPP3.
- Suggest "Rural Exemption" sites for 100% affordable housing.
- Policy generally too restrictive.
- Objection to parts 1 & 2, due to lack of research into housing requirements.
- The residency criterion is contrary to SPP3, overly restrictive and could discourage people from coming to work in the Park area.
- Need more flexibility to allow a review of the need for this accommodation at the end of each tenancy.
- Suggest a direct affordable housing policy approach is needed rather than occupancy conditions.
- Feel that the last paragraph is an onerous and unnecessary burden which has the prospect of threatening the economic viability of a development.
- It appears inequitable to expect the developer to have to meet the cost of what could benefit up to seven other properties, with no share of the cost.
- For larger development schemes such a policy might be appropriate but the cost should form part of the negotiated planning gain package.
- To apply such a policy to all development is too rigid, danger of resulting in the suburbanisation of rural areas, which does not sit with the aims of the NP.
- Support sections of both **Policies 39** and **40** which permits the extension of existing rural buildings.
- **Para 3.102** – Consider new housing in the countryside in a wider context than just for essential workers.
- **Para 3.105** – Should not be too restrictive regarding development on crofts and agricultural units.
- Overly restrictive, does not comply with SPP15.
- Clear lack of research into housing requirements. Residency criteria unsustainable and contrary to SPP3. Employment criteria too restrictive. Should reword **part 2** of the policy to allow more flexibility, and review at end of each tenancy.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Unhappy with the presumption against affordable housing in the countryside. This should be determined on merit.
- An element of 'social engineering' here.
- Application of Section 75 clauses is clumsy at best and a presumption to use that legislation should be avoided.

- Conditions 1 & 2(1st sentence only) would suffice.
- Too much detail – the setting of principles is preferred.
- Regarding the last para, suggest this is left to a decision by residents,
- Statement No.1 – Merits of this are recognised, however, special consideration should be given to former residents or close families who have been resident for several generations.
- No apparent policy to prevent such a successful applicant building a home and selling it on.

INDIVIDUALS

- The policy should state that outside settlement boundaries, existing land uses are expected to remain for the most part undisturbed.
- The permission of additional dwellings adjoining groups of three or more is a dangerous policy which will lead to gradual erosion of the countryside.
- Allowing any person with 3 years residency in the area to build in the countryside is to open the flood gates to development.
- This policy is seriously flawed.
- The policy must be more tightly drawn to stop indiscriminate development outside villages, essential workers dwellings can and should be located in village settlements.
- The reference to 8 houses in the last paragraph of these policies conflicts with Highland Councils reference to 4 houses.
- As presently worded would appear to give a carte blanche to anyone who satisfied **criteria 1**) to build anywhere in the countryside.
- Such applications should also be required to satisfy **condition 2**).
- Suggest removing the word favourably from the 1st para, as this is too permissive.
- New housing outwith defined settlements - The further expansion outwith settlements must stop.
- Support insofar as it seeks to secure the sensitive siting of houses relative to the existing pattern of settlement, but argues that the requirement imposed under points 1-3 of this policy are unduly restrictive and are likely to conflict with the wider objectives of the Plan and with National Policy. Request a rewording of this policy.
- Suggest that **Policy 39** is not consistent with national policy set out in SPP3 and NPPG15 and SPP15, relating to support for dispersed communities and the introduction of proactive planning measures to increase the resident population.
- The policy as currently drafted will exclude development of potentially great importance to the National Park and its resident communities.
- Suggest the inclusion of a new policy or the introduction of a new **point 4 in Policy 39** as currently drafted, which supports the provision of a house or houses, where it can be demonstrated that there will be economic and social benefits in accordance with national and other local plan policies without environmental disbenefit.

CNPA response on Policy 39

- **The comments made have been noted and after much discussion and consideration the amended policy in the Deposit Local Plan, Policy 25 reflects the need for affordable and open market housing outside**

settlements. Fewer defined settlements have been identified in the Proposals maps and this policy will therefore be important to the maintenance of sustainable communities within the more rural areas of the Park. The importance of protecting the important environment found within the Park is underlying in this policy, whilst there is a realisation that there are often good reasons why people want to live outside settlements, particularly where this links to business activity

Policy 40 – Conversions of Existing Non-Residential Buildings

PUBLIC BODIES

- The principals are welcomed.
- Policy proposes non residential buildings may be extended by up to 50% and that more than three units may be created if for 5 affordable housing, but omits any requirements for a business space. This is all in conflict with NEST Policy 12. This would require justification.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Welcomes the comments made in **para 3.108** regarding the re-use of existing buildings for residential purposes.
- And would support the aim regarding incorporating space for an office/workshop.
- An error in paragraph a) should it read “The building is redundant” or “the proposal relates to a building which is redundant”?
- SRPBA is not wholly supportive of the restriction that no more than 3 residential units may be created from a conversion.
- The statement “tenure to be secured in perpetuity” requires further clarification.
- Policy is a hostage to fortune by being too generous with extensions to footprints. This should be pitched at 25% - 30% to allow existing vernacular building styles to predominate.
- The sentence “*unless they are for affordable housing*” is open to misinterpretation. Suggest changing to: “however, if they are for affordable housing this may be increased.”
- Conversion of existing non-residential buildings would need clarity in terms of defining and proving that they are no longer economically viable and therefore redundant for their original use.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Too prescriptive and a further disincentive to diversify existing businesses or embrace new business opportunities.
- There should be a balance between the needs of wildlife and the needs of people.
- Object to the restriction on the number of units to be provided for in a conversion to 3 units, this would result in inefficient conversions.
- Object to the requirement to maintain style/character in terms of materials and detailing, this is the level of protection for listed buildings.
- Refer to reporters comments in Aberdeenshire LP Policy HOU/5 on traditional buildings
- Object to the restriction on the number of units to be provided for in a conversion to 3 units, this would result in inefficient conversions.

- Object to the requirement to maintain style/character in terms of materials and detailing, this is the level of protection for listed buildings.
- Reference should be made to reporters comments in Aberdeenshire Local Plan Policy HOU/5 on traditional buildings
- Welcome policy 40.
- It is wrong to restrict a development proposal to the number of residential units, as in (a). It may be that no affordable housing need has been identified in the location. The existing non-residential buildings may be extensive and suited to conversion of four units or more. Believe that the policy should be general in nature only with each location and development site considered on its own merits. Feel it is inappropriate to stipulate that the development should incorporate space to allow for continued commercial use/economic diversification. If demand exists then development will proceed to provide business space.
- By applying the policy rigidly the business space will be created but may lie unoccupied, thus impacting upon the cost of the development and putting upward pressure on prices.
- Repeat comments on access roads as under **Policy 39**.
- (a)It appears inequitable to expect the developer to have to meet the cost of what could benefit up to seven other properties, with no share of the cost.
- (b)For larger development schemes such a policy might be appropriate but the cost should form part of the negotiated planning gain package.
- (c)To apply such a policy to all development is too rigid, danger of resulting in the suburbanisation of rural areas, which does not sit with the aims of the NP.)
- Support sections of **Policies 39** and **40** which permits the extension of existing rural buildings.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Feel that the conditions are too restrictive, given the almost unlimited demand for housing.
- Suggest that provided extensions are carried out in the vernacular, there should be no requirement to restrict the developed footprint to 50% of the original.
- Logic regarding the restricting of the number of residential units to three in any one conversion?

INDIVIDUALS

- The reference to 8 houses in the last paragraph of these policies conflicts with Highland Councils reference to 4 houses.

CNPA response to Policy 40

- **In light of the comments received, the Deposit Plan policy 26 considers the appropriateness of conversions to residential units. The wording of the policy is simplified but is supported by the other policies in the plan, particularly those relating to affordability which apply to all forms of new housing. The level of restriction found in the previous policy has been removed and a more flexible approach based on individual circumstances included to ensure that the best fit scheme can be developed.**

Policy 41 – Extensions and Alterations to Existing Residential Buildings

PUBLIC BODIES

- **Policy 41** should recognise that bats are resident in some existing residential buildings.
- Suggest some rewording regarding the “replacing” of roosts.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Unclear what the difference is between the Councils LHS identification and ‘demonstrable need’ is. This should be the same and partners would need to reconcile this as well as agree to how sites should be identified.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Agree with a presumption in favour of retaining character.
- Disagree with prescriptive restrictions on size and other aspects of the building.
- **Design Guidelines** - Suggest an exception to this proposal: “Where a development has been planned with clear guidelines, agreed by the planning authority, changes should only be permitted according to the terms of those guidelines. If in time the owners come together and make representations to the authority, the authority may consider a review.”

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- If the Caveat in brackets is applied, the building should still fit in with the area and surrounding development. The quality judgement is subjective - who will judge the quality of the existing?

CNPA response on Policy 41

- **Deposit Plan policy 28 relating to house extension has been revised in light of comments received and it is hoped that the overall aim of the policy has been clarified. The important role which the sustainable design guide will play is highlighted and the proper implementation of this will be key to the success of the policy.**

Policy 42 – Proposals for Residential Caravans

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Disagree with this policy, given the shortfall in affordable accommodation.
- In order to meet the demand for affordable housing allowing residential caravans that meet specified standards must be included in the list of solutions.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Unnecessarily restrictive in view of the quality of modern caravans, and when set against the shortage of affordable housing in the area.
- It is comparatively simple to merge such housing into a woodland situation to create an attractive living environment.
- Suggest 6 months ‘temporary necessity’ is far too short when such a facility is being used as temporary housing while a new house is built, or when an old building is being renovated or converted.
- 18 months would be more realistic.

- Or provision made to extend the initial 6 months on application.

CNPA response on Policy 42

- **In the revised Deposit Local Plan, in an effort to rationalise the policies and simplify their implementation policies which can be considered under more overarching policies have been removed. As a result, the consideration of proposals for residential caravans will be dealt with under the policies of the plan, particularly regarding siting and design in the landscape, housing and also in light of any supplementary planning guidance which may be produced to support the Local Plan on adoption.**

Policy 43 – Gypsy/Traveller Sites

PUBLIC BODIES

- Policies on this topic should make reference to Paragraph 26 of SPP3.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- **Policy 43** – include definition of “Gypsy/traveller”.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Provision for travelling people is a seasonal issue, giving rise to capacity problems at peak times.
- The Newtonmore site is under capacity for most of the time.

CNPA response on Policy 43

- **In the revised Deposit Local Plan, in an effort to rationalise the policies and simplify their implementation policies which can be considered under more overarching policies have been removed. As a result, the consideration of proposals for gypsy/traveller sites will be dealt with under the policies of the plan, particularly regarding siting and design in the landscape, housing and also in light of any supplementary planning guidance which may be produced to support the Local Plan on adoption.**

General Comments on Settlement Statements

PUBLIC BODIES

- Would be helpful to include a statement with each settlement regarding foul drainage provisions.

Settlement statements

- As things stand there may be a cumulative shortfall in the overall land stocks for existing settlements.
- Failure to include Cambusmore would be a fundamental deficiency.
- Must address deficiencies in land for business and economic development at Kingussie and Newtonmore.
- Concern over the tight drawing of settlement boundaries.

- Where white land is subject to infill, concern that piecemeal development could prejudice the opportunity to maximise the potential for development in the longer term.
- The plan should include more flexibility to enable upgrading and modernisation of services and community facilities and to dynamics for change.
- Priority should be given to upgrading or new provisions of schools, transport interchange, Aviemore Service Point, Landfill and Kingussie Civic Amenity sites.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- There are areas close to some settlements (such as Boat of Garten and Tomintoul) where there is significant nature conservation interest. It would be appropriate for the Local Plan to ensure that sites and areas known to be of interest that lie in close proximity to settlements are identified so as to ensure that inappropriate development proposals are not made.
- Issues due to new housing allocations being in close proximity to A9.

Badenoch & Strathspey

- Not enough land zoned for housing.
- Instances where land zoned in local authorities Local Plan has been taken out for this Plan – leaving fewer opportunities.
- In some cases land zoned is in communities with less need or demand.
- Section **3.92** suggests a figure of 600 new affordable homes, but the amount of opportunities in the mapping exercise does not appear to allow this rate of growth to happen.
- More land should be zoned for affordable housing especially on brown field sites and gap sites in Grantown-on-Spey, Newtonmore and Kingussie in particular.
- It is essential to understand the role and dynamics of stakeholders.
- A need for consistency/clarity regarding infrastructure, especially water supplies.
- Need to evaluate transport/access issues around eastern area of Park. A93 corridor requires strategic review.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

Tourism in the Settlement Statements

- Should recognise the possibility for the need for change from tourism uses if the product is no longer viable in the market place.
- Should be stronger policy support to enable tourism development to take place in new locations
- The scope to inject special differentiation between settlements.
- Suggest more proactive and positive approach to tourism development in communities outwith settlements.

INDIVIDUALS

- Delighted that there is to be no more building allowed outwith the settlement boundary lines.

CNPA response on General Comments

- **The comments received on the settlement statements, combined with the results of the drop in sessions have influenced how the proposals section of the Deposit Plan has been redrafted. Whilst there remains an amount of strategically allocated sites for certain types of development, many of the smaller settlements have been removed from the Proposals maps to allow a greater degree of flexibility and proposals within them will be considered in light of the policies section of the Plan. This approach ensures that the Park Authority meet its obligations to provide sufficient land for growth and development during the Plan period, but also allows proposals within small and rural communities to be considered on an individual basis. There is a general presumption in favour of retain current uses, particularly where they support the local economy, and this presumption has replaced the need to identify such uses on the Proposals maps.**

Angus Glens

PUBLIC BODIES

- Concern over Recommendation 1 – infrastructure, Angus Glens.
- No evidence to suggest road safety issues in the Angus Glens.
- Does not consider winter maintenance to be a land use planning issue.
- Several recommendations under the Angus Glens section with no details or suggestions as to what may be required.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Angus Glens – Oppose upgrading of local roads, part of the character of the area.
- The dedicated strategy here regarding tourism contrasts with the more urban areas of the Park where tourist infrastructure improvements are masked behind more traditional planning policies and zonings.
- Strongly supports new car parks in Glen Prosen, Glen Isla and Glen Clova.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Support for development opportunities associated with Glen Clova Hotel
- Propose 15 Holiday Chalets within Glen Clova village settlement
- 3 Sites each ¼ Ha (shown on attached map)
Aims of project: Sustainability; Employment; Quality; Improvement of existing infrastructure; Biodiversity

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Importance of weekend road maintenance through this part of the Park

INDIVIDUALS

- Positioning of visitors centre at Glen Doll car park is not at a natural entrance or access point. Obvious entrance to the park is at Glen Clova so the visitor centre should be at the Clova Junction
- Suggest possible conversion of the Clova Kirk building or add to the clova cluster of buildings to give it a community feel again.

- Suggest promoting the Angus Glens as the Southerly access point to the Park for walkers who could use the existing paths from Glen Muick to Doll to Callater. There is certainly a need for an official campsite in the Glen.

Aviemore

PUBLIC BODIES

- Consideration and regard should be given to: Urban Design Strategy; Expansion north and Community uses.
- **B4** – expansion likely to have adverse effects on birch woodland part of which is in AWI (Ancient Woodland Inventory)
- **H2** – small area currently zoned for environment/community.
- **E2** – requires rezoning to match designation of SSSI and SAC.
- **B2** – more appropriate than **B4**. if no need identified then suggest zoning as environmental.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Propose to develop this site 2007/8
- Concern over up-grading of Dalfaber Level Crossing.
- Suggest policy should state that no further development which would increase the traffic load carried by the Level Crossing will be approved until such time as upgrading is complete.
- Concern over the continuance to approve development in what is now a large village with only one vehicular access.
- The proposed site for a new primary school for Aviemore should be included in the Finalised version of the Local Plan. Provision for replacement playing field facilities, of enhanced quality should be undertaken.
- Support Cambusmore proposal as Aviemore must be given scope to extend its boundaries as the main driver for growth in the Park.
- Feel that the CNPA has stepped back from the clear commitment set out in the Badenoch and Strathspey Local Plan 1997, regarding the new settlement at Cambusmore.
- The development of Cambusmore is a unique opportunity for the CNPA to influence a planned new village based on sustainable design principals.
- **Cambusmore**
- Believe that a proposed development such as this should have no place in a National Park.
- Its location and scale bear no relationship to local needs.
- The argument that it would balance up settlement pattern on both sides of the Spey, has no substance as all Speyside settlements in the Park are contained on one side of the Spey.
- Cambusmore is required as a buffer zone in landscape and ecological terms to offset the expanding settlement of Aviemore.
- Feel that Aviemore still has considerable unrealised potential.
- Disappointed to see lack of support for the Cambusmore proposals.
- The issue of Cambusmore should be addressed in the plan.
- There is the opportunity to do something innovative and sustainable with the Cambusmore opportunity.

- Policy site **H1 in Aviemore** – there has been land set aside for community use on this site.
- The new Aviemore Masterplan must be done within a tight time scale.
- It must also include a creative brief.
- The proposed Cambusmore development is an essential component of the Aviemore growth objective.
- Owners of area south of Spey Lodge allocated on Draft LP to an Environmental Policy.
- Propose to develop this site 2007/8
- Concern over up-grading of Dalfaber LC
- Suggest policy should state that no further development which would increase the traffic load carried by the LC will be approved until such time as upgrading is complete.
- Concern over the continuance to approve development in what is now a large village with only one vehicular access.
- **Cambusmore Settlement Strategy**
- In considering the need for a new village at Cambusmore, impacts on Aviemore station and facilities will have to be considered as well as how developers will be required to address these impacts.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Environmental designations should not preclude development in a designated area.
- Better to develop new settlements such as Cambusmore than expanding existing settlements to the detriment of their rural character.
- **H4** – Cost issues, unsuitable for affordable housing.
- **B2** – do not believe that this area is included in the Ancient Woodland Inventory, as the SEA suggests.
- **C4** – currently in agriculture use, not all of the site floods.
- **E1** – does not support the inclusion of the land south of Coylumbridge.
- Dalfaber Crossing – Traffic Impact Assessment does not suggest upgrading.
- North Dalfaber – Object to the omission of land currently zoned for housing in Badenoch and Strathspey Local Plan.
- **Flooding – Recommendation H5 (Aviemore Settlement Statement)**
- Flood risk from River Spey.
- Should be addressed by flood protection/prevention works and enhancement of the river bank.
- Any works would need to demonstrate that flooding on the right bank would not be exacerbated by the new embankment.
- **Recommendation T3 (Aviemore Settlement Statement)**
- The Estate supports this recommendation.
- Note that the “tourist/recreation attractions” support environmental management through interpretation and by enabling people to enjoy these areas in a responsible way – contribute to all the aims of the Park.
- Wish the former BP Garage site and adjoining land at the southern end of Aviemore to be identified as an area for housing (a high quality flatted development.) for following reasons:
- Sustainable use of a brown field site

- Would reduce the amount of new land required to be identified as housing.
- Would conform to key sustainable policies and key housing objectives set out in the Draft Local Plan.
- This development will involve removal of contamination left by previous use.
- Redevelopment will improve the visual amenity of this site.
- Allocation of this site as suggested would comply with **General Policy 4**, **General Policy 5** and **Policy 38** of this Local Plan.
- Aviemore development area should be widened. Lack of identified sites in Aviemore to meet housing demand.
- **Proposal for housing at Kinkyle, adjacent to Aviemore**
- The proposal at Kinkyle is relevant to and would be capable of complying with; **General Policy 5**, **Polices 4, 13, 14, 20, 38** and the **Transport Section**.
- **Aviemore Settlement Statement**
- Does not actually address the fundamental issue of development over the plan period.
- **Aviemore Masterplan -** Contrary to SPP1 Section 41.
- No parameters set.
- The suggestion that development to the south is constrained by the conjunction of the road is untrue as Kinkyle is to the north of this convergence and is capable of integrating fully with the existing settlement.
- Provisions for consultation on the Masterplan should be included.
- **Cambusmore -** No critical analysis of the Cambusmore concept
- The Local Plan needs to incorporate a strategy for Cambusmore rather than examining the need for a new village.
- **Housing Policy**
- Insufficient housing sites identified/allocated for Aviemore. The structure plan requirement has not been met.
- The building rate in the past plan period is not an appropriate basis for calculating future housing demand.
- **LA2** should refer to the extant consent for a superstore.
- **LA3** is erroneously described in the LP as being a live application for a superstore – reference should be made to outline consent for a retail and commercial development.
- An error occurs on **page 62** where site **B2** is identified as **B3**.
- The plan identifies a concern that retailing is concentrating on visitor needs and not those of the local community. The new foodstore both consented and proposed will principally concentrate on the needs of the local community and this should be acknowledged within the Local Plan.
- The LP fails to designate the town centre of Aviemore. The town centre should be clearly defined in the LP as should the area to be covered by the Aviemore Masterplan.
- Concern that the Highland Structure Plan and Local Plan Policy regarding Cambusmore have been disregarded in this Local Plan.
- **Cambusmore -** Lack of forecasts for population and economic change and as a consequence, no settlements strategy.

- The settlement strategy within the current Local Plan justifies the development of a new community at Cambusmore. This is supported by the Highland Structure Plan.
- Estate studies have demonstrated that the site can be developed with an acceptable level of environmental impact, fully considered and mitigated.
- Concern that the LP has stepped back from the clear commitment to this new community which the current Local and Structure Plans contain.
- Feel that it is wrong for the LP to assume that this site will not be required to contribute to housing supply before 2017 as it is not borne out of current projections for the take up of housing land in Aviemore.
- At current rates zoned land in Aviemore will be running out by 2010 - before the end of this Local Plans lifetime.
- Therefore failure to reaffirm Cambusmore would be a fundamental deficiency in maintaining an effective land supply consistent with needs over the 5-10 year plan period.
- Care has been taken to progress this development with extensive community involvement, environmental/sustainability studies, and in accordance with all current planning policies.
- Interest in working with CNPA to mitigate flood risks and the raising of land for the creation of a sustainable location for housing.
- Interest in mitigating flood risks at Dalfaber Road in accordance with SPP7, SPP3 and SPP1.
- The raising of land could be balanced by the creation of wetlands
- The above proposals could therefore provide affordable housing within the extreme close proximity of the town centre addressing other needs also.
- Interest in development of Cambusmore

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Wish the area known as Dalfaber North to be zoned as an area of Green Belt/Amenity Woodland.
- Business Sites – Job developments to match housing expansion.
- Possibility of relocating commercial/industrial land, or including more.

INDIVIDUALS

- There is no justification for the Cambusmore scheme.
- With regard to the proposed Cambusmore development, would be useful if the CNPA conducted a survey of the level of houses in Badenoch and Strathspey that are second homes.
- Opposed to the proposed Cambusmore development.
- Strongly support the omission of the proposed Cambusmore development from the Plan.
- Wish for **Policy 36** area to be zoned for Commerce and Community use.
- Objection to the continued zoning of the northern aspect of Milton Wood (**H4**) for housing.
- The plan as it stands does not reflect public opinion given the level of opposition for previous development of this site. i.e. by Goldcrest 2004.

- Previous applicants and planning committees had agreed this area would be suitable only for *non-affordable* housing.
- The local population wish this area to be used for community purposes, as few areas available in Aviemore for local recreation, dog walking etc.
- Pleased that Milton Wood is nearly de-zoned from housing development
- Concerned that **H4** is still zoned for housing
- Understood from previous meeting that this area was to be used as a park/picnic area and the old mill was to be restored for public use
- Concerns over possible flooding to existing properties due to re-routing of the burn and subsequent flooding as has happened many times during past 8 years
- Concern over the access road not being suitable
- Concern over an overprovision of large unaffordable houses in the village
- Using Banff National Park in Canada as a model – owning of property tied to whether people live and work there and better road infrastructure.
- More green spaces and safer roads please.
- Pleased that Milton Wood is not zoned for housing however,
- The area to the north of the orbital path behind Grampian View is still zoned for housing – this is contrary to the planning committee's decision in Oct 2004 to view the whole area (both north and south of the orbital path) This decision was supported by the local residents
- Possible restoration of the mill and use with area for community use.
- Orbital path well used by local residents as an easily accessed local amenity
- This path already being compromised by access road for future development on other side of the A9
- Existing green pockets are an integral part of the village and should not be taken away
- Concern that new housing developments in Aviemore are used as holiday homes
- Cambusmore would be a more suitable site for housing, moving away from ribbon development and traffic pressure at the centre of the village
- Concern over the effect of development behind Grampian View would have on Butchers Burn as already sensitive to small and medium changes within the vicinity
- Given the extant planning permissions for housing in Aviemore, the settlement will grow by 50% within the life of this LP.
- It would have a detrimental effect on the existing social fabric of the community.
- No known support for this development within the village.
- **Overall Size of Aviemore**
- Feel that above the extant permissions there should be no other new housing constructed within or adjacent to the settlement within the lifetime of this LP.

- **H4** The community recently fought off developers proposing to build on land, of which part of is allocated as **H4**.
- The community wishes this land to be protected, perhaps by adding it to the adjacent **E1** area.
- **B4** This allocation is entirely inappropriate, needlessly extending a business area into an area of semi-natural woodland.
- Would extend the *de facto* boundary
- The existing business area **B2** is largely unused, so is inappropriate to create a new area.
- **Land to West of A9** - Aviemore should be bounded to the west by the A9.
- All land to the west of the A9 should be protected from development.
- Concerned that the unshaded area to the south of H2 has no current protection, this should be allocated as either community or environmental.
- The High Burnside development should not act as a precedent enabling expansion across the A9.
- Strongly support the omission of the proposed Cambusmore development.

Ballater

PUBLIC BODIES

- Wish for the business park site to be kept as opposed to being zoned for housing
- The council wish to retain employment land for future ventures and would find it very difficult to obtain an alternative site.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Agree with the statement that there is a pressing demand for more affordable accommodation for those who live and work locally. Would like to see a clear reference to the importance of low cost homeownership and intermediate tenures in meeting this need.
- A pro-active approach to tourism development is required.
- Policy should be developed to increase affordable housing.
- Need to promote and develop tourism, business and affordable housing within a positive and pro-active land use framework.
- Request to rezone area marked on attached map from **Policy 1** to **Policy 2** or **Policy 3** as the owner is about to sign a Conservation Agreement with the Trust.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- **Town Centres & Retailing/Commercial Business** Importance of Ballater due to the National Park Office is not recognised. Suggest the policies relating to business and economic development be expanded to acknowledge the increasing importance of Ballater.
- Support Polices E2, E3 and Proposal FE1 regarding Ballater.
- E2 and FE1 allow no flexibility for the future.
- C2 should be preserved and incorporated into a future development
- Possibility of use of brownfield site (former quarry) in Crathie as a site for housing development.

- LP fails to recognise heightened importance of Ballater as the home of CNPA
- LP underestimates the anticipated requirement within Ballater for new housing, business/employment, community and tourism needs
- Proposals for 21 new houses on 3 sites wholly inadequate – inconsistent with the conclusions of the reporter (Aberdeenshire Local Plan Inquiry)
- A substantial extension to Ballater could provide sustainable economic and social development of the local and wider area whilst conserving the natural and cultural heritage of the National Park.
- Suggest that the Preliminary Masterplan Study by PRP Architects should form the basis of an allocation within the LP.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Welcome the statement regarding affordable and local needs housing.
- Support sites **H1**, **H2** and **H3**
- Object to site **FH1**.
- Housing need in excess of the 21 units proposed for sites **H1**, **H2** and **H3** could be provided by:
Further gap sites The provision of rural exemption sites which would allow for small groups of affordable housing outside the settlement boundary.
- Public consultation carried out by BRD indicated that the majority of residents were in favour of establishing a community woodland to the north-east of the settlement, encompassing site **FH1**. Aberdeenshire Council supported this proposal.
- Creation of community woodland on **FH1** would enhance the landscape and biodiversity in accordance with **Policy 3**, and be of benefit to residents and tourists (**Policy 29**).
- Need info on the demographic study.
- The formation of the Plan should reflect the Park's Aims.
- Require local business activity to continue social coherence, increase sustainability and reduce transportation.
- Support **H2**, the continuance of tourist activities, **Paragraphs 3.67-70**, **Policies 28-29, 35b, paragraph 3.74**, a truly local letting initiative,, a variety of accommodation in **FH1** and the inclusion of Craigendarroch as part of Ballater.
- Not in Favour of housing at **H1**, **H3**, restriction of communal area east of Monaltrie Park, a letting initiative which permits affordable housing to be pre-empted by comparatively recent residents rather than longer term (**Policy 37**), Ghettos of affordable housing (**Policy 34**).

INDIVIDUALS

- Ballater School Premises should be put to use as soon as possible.
- School Premises to be used for either leisure use or low cost rental accommodation for young local people.
- Issue of second homes and pension portfolios.
- Issue of being able to afford a house locally on service sector pay.
- Current change of use of tourism accommodation etc within Ballater, to the detriment of the tourist trade.
- Need to ensure that any development on the triangle of land bounded by A93, the Pass of Ballater and Ballater itself does not become detrimental to residents and does not reduce the appeal of the town.

- A larger town will need a larger community space: should reserve an area equal to the size of Monaltrie Park – therefore **FH1** should be moved further east.
- Public consultation carried out by BRD indicated that the majority of residents were in favour of establishing community woodland to the north-east of the settlement, encompassing site **FH1**. Creation of community woodland on site **FH1** would enhance the landscape and biodiversity in accordance with **Policy 3**, and be of benefit to residents and tourists in accordance with **Policy 29**.
- If development is to take place in FH1 it needs to be handles with great sensitivity.
- Serious concerns about any sort of development within Ballater's Boundaries
- Similarities to Milton Keynes if development takes place.
- Possibility of developing an exercise area/business on site of old bus station :Climbing frames Trampolines, snack bar etc.
- The Majority of **H3** (Dee Street) is a children's playing field given only to be used for that purpose.
- Object to the other small area included in **H3** also.
- Factors to consider when planning for housing developments:
 - Environmental issues
 - Sustainability issues
 - Water availability issues
 - Engineering issues for sites dug into hillsides rather than using agricultural land
- Building aesthetics

Boat of Garten

PUBLIC BODIES

- Consideration should be given to the alternative to expansion to the south, of linear expansion of the village to the west.
- **H2** – has a high level of natural heritage interest.
- **H1** – should preserve existing contours.
- **H3** – Capercaillie/loss of woodland issues.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- **Site C4** - reference should be made to "Railway" not "train" museum.
- The boundaries of the railway land shown on the maps do not agree with either boundaries of use nor ownership.
- The map & text should make reference to the community scheme for the improvement of the area around the hotel and station to fit it for use as a village square.
- Major developments proposed at Carrbridge and Boat of Garten would benefit from higher than 25% affordable housing levels.
- Boat of Garten Current application – would welcome a high than 25% allocation of affordable housing or at least 25% land area.
- 3 proposed sites for a New Appliance Garage
 - Unused house site, end of Craigie Avenue
 - Farm owned by George Adams, Balnacruie Farm, Seafield Estates

- Lorry Park, adjacent to Craigie Avenue, heading towards Aviemore, Seafield Estates.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Object to the omission of woodland currently zoned for housing within the Badenoch and Strathspey Local Plan.
- Suggest the existing local plan allocation for residential development should be carried forward to this LP with appropriate amendments.
- The CNPA's apparent opposition to the continued allocation of this site has no basis in reasoned argument.
- Potential alternative housing sites have been promoted without any serious assessment being undertaken.
- Specific policies and proposals contained within the draft plan are not founded on any coherent strategic approach. For example although the plan contains site-specific policies in relation to housing, this is not linked to any forecasts relating to the economic aspirations of the area and the implications this may have for population trends and household information.
- Suggest the plan fails to recognise the importance of Badenoch and Strathspey as a primary contributor of the economy of the Highlands as a whole. Need to accommodate and encourage net in-migration to the area to ensure a healthy and regenerating population base.
- A clear settlement strategy is required in order to ensure that the fragile recovery of the economy of the Badenoch and Strathspey area is not jeopardised.
- Appreciate that the Park is aware of these deficiencies within the plan.
- No justification is given within the plan for the abandonment of the land allocated for residential development contained within the current LP for Boat of Garten and the replacement with a different approach in this new LP.
- Suggest this is a flawed approach and fails to address key issues in relation to the provision of housing land within Boat of Garten.
- Within the assessment of the proposed housing sites in Boat of Garten, the SEA concludes that **H2** should be deleted and **H1** and **H3** implicate a new and highly visible settlement edge and impacts on woodland.
- Nowhere within the draft local plan or the SEA is any appraisal made of the important and pressing infrastructure needs of the village.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- **H1** – Concerns about this site including access. It is feared that cost would preclude dev of affordable housing.
- **H2** has a significant level of support, easily accessible. As this area is being withdrawn as a result of the SEA, possibility of considering reduced housing development area.
- The character of the village must be maintained. Even though low cost may lead to higher density.
- Demographic change. The plan does not say who defines local need. The recent Housing Survey should be considered before decisions made about number and type of houses to be built

- Summary of issues **3.92**. Figures shown are for whole park, but the figure for affordable homes in BOG is far higher than 25%. The figures do not take account of people leaving the area.
- BOG needs housing which is affordable in perpetuity to allow for progression up the property ladder and free the affordable houses for others. The community v strongly feels we should be providing affordable housing for local need. To include anyone moving in to take up local employment and settle. But should not be used to reduce urban lists is not desirable.
- Development must take place at a rate whereby residents can be assimilated into the community Slowly
- The possible addition to **Policy 38 Clause D** should consider the situation of young people leaving for education then wish to return. Unless they have obtained a full-time post in this area (not easy) they would be unable to obtain housing under this clause.
- This clause does not take account of those who have 2 or 3 part-time jobs (common in area) or those wishing to set up own business. **Criteria V** seems to preclude people moving either just because the wish to or because they have saved enough money to move up the property ladder. This needs to be clarified in the Plan.
- As many residents only venture into areas of the National Park within 30mins of easy walking of the village so the environment surrounding is of prime importance. This needs to be recognised in the Plan (Local Footpaths set up as Millennium Project)
- A site to be definitely zoned for a new school. **E1** has not met with universal approval, suggest other sites: South of the Playing Field (where it would be if **LA1** went ahead), West of the new Community Hall or on **H2** if possible.
- Promotion of Sustainable Development. Fear that irrevocable decisions will be made by landowners, developers and planners, who do not have to live with the consequences.
- Little point in zoning land if the infrastructure cannot support any development. Strong pressure must be kept on Scottish Water & the Scottish Executive.
- Concern that the sale of the Campgrounds of Scotland Caravan and Camping Site will become a site for housing as it is adjacent to one of the proposed housing sites in the LP.
- Wish this area to be allowed to continue as a high-standard tourism business.

INDIVIDUALS

- Suggest that references to in-fill housing in Street of Kincardine should be deleted.
- Street of Kincardine is explicitly not a zoned area.
- The references to street of Kincardine on page 65 are inconsistent with the general approach of the Plan to small clusters of housings outside main settlements.
- **Wood Boundary -** Suggest that the boundary of wood around Street of Kincardine (**Category 2** woodland) should be extended as it currently extends past the break for the pylons.

- Suggest that woodland of the same sort should come under the same category and ownership should not be a material factor.
- **Environment** - The meadow land between Street of Kincardine and the RSPB boundary has not been reseeded or chemically treated and is rich in wild flowers.
- **General** - Little attention has been given to the categorisation of open countryside.
- Original consultation showed a clear desire to keep the whole of Badenoch and Strathspey as it is. To do that detailed plans will be needed for the open countryside.
- Suggest greater use of **Category 2**
- Leaving large areas of the park under **Category 1** would seem to be an open invitation to change.
- The proposed expansion areas are greatly favoured to the highly damaging proposal into woodland to the south.
- **Housing** - A small amount of affordable housing for local people would be welcome. Plenty of open market housing in other local villages, no more needed in BOG.
- **H1** is best site for housing adjacent to existing estate and caravan park.
- **H3** is the next best site for housing. TPOs needed, but generally a degraded area not of prime wildlife value, overused by people and their pets. Possible buffer zone to protect adjacent forest.
- **H4** infill is fine for housing.
- **H2** – Major concerns;
- Wildlife value and visual impact value of species-rich semi natural grassland and lowland heath
- Several UK BAP species are found there, also a poorly drained area.
- This area should be designated under **General Policy 2**; development should only be permitted if there is no alternative. As other sites are available **H2** should not be zoned for housing but for environmental use
- Possibility of establishing a local nature reserve at this site.
- **LA1** totally unsuitable as the proposal is in an area of semi-natural woodland, large part listed in the Ancient Woodland Inventory, with a capercaillie population – 1% of national population. This area should be proposed as an SPA for capercaillie.
- This proposed development is also on a large scale and would double the size of the village. It would have a huge effect on the character of the community and village atmosphere with adverse effects on both wildlife and tourism.
- **Business - B1** – This site is right at the gateway to the village, largely concerned with wildlife tourism. A Business site here would be inappropriate. Suggest a small car park and display area with information about local walks and nature reserve more appropriate for this site.
- Concerns that the sites identified for residential development in the LP are not commercially viable for development.
- The final outcome will be no further housing in the village resulting in no additional families being able to move into the village, jeopardising the future of the school.
- Suggest conducting feasibility studies about the whole structure if the village.

- **H1** - As the site is very boggy, drainage costs and issues would apply.
- Sewerage and access issues
- **H2** - This site is adjacent to moorland/grassland with as many environmental issues as the site on the other side of the road.
- **H3** - for the size of the site it will not be viable for any housing association/developer to make the sewerage system affordable for only 30 houses say.
- Area currently designated for housing in the existing Local Plan
- **Impact on Wildlife Habitat**
 - This area is used currently by local residents as a dog walking/recreational area – the revised plans for the site now propose to use less of the site so that recreational activities may still take place.
 - Previous objections have made reference to 'ancient woodland' within the site – this woodland was actually planted by a life long resident of the village who is still alive.
 - Previous objections - elements of NIMBYism
- **Existing Problems with Sewerage System**
 - Feel that the cost of one sewerage plant for all future housing in Boat of Garten has more chance of being viable and cost effective if carried out by one developer for one development. This will surely make the housing more affordable.
 - As there are no plans within the next five years to have any work done to the sewerage plant, current issues for some residents are not likely to be resolved just because no further housing takes place in the village.
- **Additional Benefits to the community**
 - Future site for relocating of school, if required.
 - Working group for liaison with local community regarding stages of development.
 - Safer Access Road to New Community Facility
 - 40% affordable housing
 - Suggest reconsidering the proposed sites and leave the existing area in the current HC LP to be the designated area in this new LP.

Braemar & Inverey

PUBLIC BODIES

- **H2** – concern that it will affect the appearance and setting of the village. Potential impacts to NSA.
- **T1** – visually intrusive. Would significantly change the southern approach to Braemar. In a prominent position within an NSA. Suggest fields between current camp site and the river is a better site.
- **H1** – part of this under AWI.
- Entire area within NSA.
- Site **H3** includes the Category B listed bus depot and a row of traditional cottages/workshops worthy of sympathetic re-use.
- Feel that Castleton hall (a.k.a Victoria Hall or Invercauld) Galleries is B listed, its community use under C2 must ensure the protection of its character and garden setting.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Should be reference to the important role low cost housing and intermediate housing tenures have in meeting housing need in Braemar, demonstrated in Aberdeenshire Council's recent Housing Needs Assessment.
- Will not be necessary to require an affordable housing needs survey as an up-to-date needs assessment has recently been completed.
- **H1, H2, H3 & H4** make reference to meeting local needs – is this covered by **Policy 38d)** or is there some other definition?
- Promotion of tourism needs development.
- Promote innovative type and tenure housing to support seasonal workers.
- More business/commercial land is supply analysis needed.
- Should be placed as the 'Heart of the Park' as a key tourist and leisure destination.
- **Glen Shee** Should take a robust and pro-active approach to the development and promotion of the Ski Centre as a leisure destination and gateway to the Park.
- Disappointing that nothing is said about how residential and economic activities in this location are to be encouraged, and the implications of Inverey being a "zoned" area are unclear.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- B1 should be a mix of business and affordable housing.
- Propose additional housing sites:
 - To the north of H3 forming a natural edge to the settlement.
 - To the west of Balnellan housing area.
- Need for a semi-wild and basic campsite in the Braemar area to cater for the campers who currently use the Clunie flats.
- Gordon Land are in control of land zoned **H2**.
- Has unreserved commitment from current land owner of another 2 sites within Braemar zoned for affordable and community housing.
- Believe this would provide an opportunity to retain local, young people within the area.
- Also that the housing should remain as affordable into perpetuity.
- **Site A (includes H2)**
- Feel that the land identified for 29 units does not justify or allow for the quality of plot size that would be required in this area.
- Propose to enlarge the outlined area which would:
 - Allow proper use of topography
 - Maximise the potential views
 - Allow for proper sized plot areas
 - Continue with the 29 house allocation over a larger area
- **Site Access**
- Current proposals for access are not ideal
- The junction at Marr Road/St Andrews Road will require upgrading
- The narrowness and steepness of the initial brae is not ideal
- Access along St Andrews Terrace is limited due to residents parked cars
 - Existing route towards Cairnadrochit not preferred for similar reasons
- **Alternative Proposed Access**
- Alternative access taken off of the Linn of Dee Road would provide a properly formed access meeting all current standards

- This could be positioned to maximise potential use of land from Linn of Dee Road to site **H2**.
- **Future Housing Allocation FH1**
- Have identified on attached map 2 areas for future housing.
- **Community Woodland** - Identified on attached map a section of the site to be put to use as community/environmental space.
- **Medical Centre** - As part of the overall scheme an area of land has been set aside for development of a new medical centre.
- **Site B** Access – good clear access can be taken from Cluniebank Road
- Site Location – ideal centrally located position within the settlement
- Site Size – 2.36 acres
- **Site C** Second alternative site suitable for affordable housing, felt that only a flatted development would be possible in this location.
- Access – no ideal having to be taken through narrow winding lanes, but achievable to current roads standards.
- Site Location – just off the centre of Braemar behind a variety of existing properties
- Site Size – 0.67 acres.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- **H4 & H5** on Chapel Brae are totally unacceptable, essential for parking at Braemar Gathering.
 - Suggest areas for housing just south of the existing Balnellan houses, piece of ground east of the track.
 - Gaps to the north of Chapel Brae are valuable views for visitors.
 - **E2** described in the LP as “communal green space” are in fact front gardens.
 - Support area **T1** but feel that this will have little impact on the Cluny wild camping problem.
 - Doubt that **B2** is fit for that purpose.
- Object to housing on sites **H4** and **H5** on Chapel Brae.

INDIVIDUALS

- Concerned about potential development of campsite on banks of River Clunie
- a) Scenic Landscape issues
- b) Suitable alternative sites
- c) Conservation/wildlife issues
- Part of the area marked **E2** is a privately owned garden attached to dwellinghouse known as 3 Castleton Terrace.

Policy Sites H4 & H5 - Believe that the proposed development at the two sites would compromise the scenic beauty of surrounding landscape

- Believe these sites should be under Environmental Policy
- These areas also presently used for parking for the Braemar Gathering
- **Policy Site T1** - Do not object the caravan park extension, however do not think it would reduce wild camping on the banks of the Clunie, as those sorts of campers do not wish to pay for site camping.

Site B2 Braemar

- Currently zoned in Aberdeenshire LP for potential low density housing in keeping with that which surrounds it.

- Sole reason for the siting of the water treatment plant was that the water supply runs there and not that the area should be rezoned from any other use than residential properties.
- Area to the west of this site and around 100 meters of it is the Birchwood Moss – an SSSI. This area would undoubtedly be affected by the siting of any commercial activity within the vicinity.
- The residential properties bordering the area on three sides would be affected by the siting of commercial activity there.
- Access issues within and out with the site.
- Possible alternative sites: – close to either the main road from Aberdeen or the road out towards Glen Shee. In the vicinity of the proposed dry ski slope on the road in from the south and on site **T1** where there is existing infrastructure already in place.

Business & Economic Development

- Para 3.76 – business units not to have negative impacts. Suggest this statement ought to be embodied in **Policy 35**.
- Objection to **B2** regarding the suitability for 2 – 3 small workshop units for local tradesmen.
 - a) Negative impact on residential amenity
 - b) Increase commercial traffic to area used for amenity/leisure activities
 - c) Goods may be stored outside, further adding to negative amenity impact
 - d) Proximity to a SSSI

Housing - Sites H4 & H5

- Possibility of ensuring that existing areas for housing are properly used and not left idle.

Recreation and Access

Not clear from the LP how the 3rd aim of the park will be taken forward. What are the specific plans for working with existing bodies and new ventures in *promoting* public enjoyment?

Carrbridge

PUBLIC BODIES

- SAC runs through **E1**

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Major developments proposed at Carrbridge and Boat of Garten would benefit from higher than 25% affordable housing levels.
- 5 Proposed sites for a new appliance garage
 - Main Street Car Park, Road End – Unused
 - Golf Club Car Park, Old Inverness Road
 - Police Station Garage or Grounds, Main Street
 - Vacant Ground, Station Road by Dulnain Cottage, Earmarked for Industrial/Commercial Use
- Land on Old Inverness Road, Next to the Spinney, owned by Mrs Rodgers.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Request to re-designate low quality lodgepole pine plantation south west of the village immediately behind and to the south of Landmark as General Policy 1 rather than General Policy 2. This differentiates it from the high quality genuine ancient woodland in the locality.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Considering a plan to provide an outdoor curling facility within Carrbridge
- Possible sites include existing pond on Station Road or another suitable site within the village.
- Possibility of rezoning the site at Station Road to Housing should a move to another venue be the preferred approach.

INDIVIDUALS

- Consider the scenario: **Policy 38d**) restricts new housing, therefore the market for houses in **H1** and **H2** will largely disappear, and they will not be built. By the time of the next Local Plan in five years, planning permission for **H1** and **H2** would have lapsed and the new Local Plan could be produced that answers the needs of the community rather than the developer.
- Gardens at Battanropie, The Broch and Lag na Coille have been designated to be environmental
- Suggest that the edge of the River Dulnain should be environmental as it is part of the River Spey Special Area of Conservation and the gardens coloured white.
- Rosevean House in Bogroy, Dalrachney Road has been omitted from the Plan.

Cromdale

PUBLIC BODIES

- **H1 & H3** – Boundary not clear, may include a BAP habitat.
- SAC runs through **E1**

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

Environmental

- Area next to Cromdale Burn bridge (highlighted Green on attached map, marked #1.) already been fenced off and is suitable for adding in as 'Environmental' this would act as a continuation of the area marked on the other side of the bridge.

Housing /Access

- Suggest that the area marked in yellow highlighter on the attached map (#2), be included within the village blue boundary. As there are already new properties on the Lethandary Road. This would offer a further infill possibility and a possible second access to the **H1** and **H3** future housing areas, relieving pressure on the single access onto the A95.
- If above point is accepted then moving the boundary line out from the original (in the area highlighted pink, marked #3) would permit an access way to be brought to **H1** and **H3**

General

- Concern over possible pressure on building plots within the area which may lead to developers acquiring land used previously for other purposes. The loss of non-domestic premises in any community can significantly alter the character and culture of a community.
- Suggest area (shown on enclosed map) to be zoned for private housing. This area is a natural extension to the area already zoned and would finish of the development.

INDIVIDUALS

- Supports the draft LP
- Delighted that the boundaries have been kept as they are, to keep the settlement small and attractive.
- Good to see an area outlined for community development and no zoning for further housing.

Dalwhinnie

PUBLIC BODIES

- **H1** – concern about the visual setting.
- **H2 & H7** – will breach current informal limit to the settlement set by trees.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Need to see more housing along the roadside in Dalwhinnie to give a more village atmosphere. No village centre equals no cohesion at present
- Urgently need better parking facilities for walkers – becomes chaotic at present during the summer especially along the railway track. Parking facilities are needed on the village side of the railway with good foot and cycle access on desired routes

Dinnet

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Aberdeenshire's Local Housing Strategy does not identify provision of affordable housing in Dinnet as a priority.
- It is not clear from the NP LP how this need has been identified.
- This is not a suitable site for large numbers of affordable houses due to the lack of services.
- Believe this proposal is counter to **Policy 37** and other statements within the Plan, with regard to basic services and facilities.
- Review business designations in order to facilitate a robust gateway for the village.

Mid Deeside & Cromar

PUBLIC BODIES

- Title of statement and map should match.
- There is the potential for Recommendation 1 (**R1**) to affect the River Dee SAC.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Consider including Glen Tanar as an identified settlement, due to size, employment, infrastructure, facilities and services.
- Object to the extent of land at Glen Tanar which has been designated as Designed Landscape.

INDIVIDUALS

- Confusion of whether Ordie is a designated settlement: Policy **H4** suggests it is, whilst verbal assurances say it is not. Is a zoned area the same as a

defined/designated settlement? What is the definition of an Existing buildings group? Present definition is ambiguous and will encourage attempts to exploit the loophole.

- As the current Structure Plan states that Ordie is termed as Countryside not designated as Green Belt and under Policy 12 of this there is a presumption against house building. Suggested infill development does not meet any of the criteria for exemption with this policy. Is this LP to comply with the Structure Plan?
 - Object to statement on page 107 of this LP that infill development be acceptable at Ordie for following reasons:
 - a) Historic and Cultural Landscape issues
 - b) Road Access & Safety issues
 - c) Drainage & Sewerage issues
 - d) Sustainable Development issues going **against General Policy 1**
 - Consider it more in-keeping with the General Policies if new development and infill be concentrated on communities at risk and in communities with existing facilities and regular public transport.
 - Request that the northern part of site **E1** Dinnet, be zoned for housing. (1 dwellinghouse).
 - The wooded sites across the road from the church are zoned for housing, can't see why the part of **E1** north of the church should not be zoned for a single house.
 - Concerned that unclear wording in the LP regarding housing may put some areas at risk of development.
 - On page 107 paragraph 3 in the LP "*the LP should seek ways to concentrate development in Dinnet and Ordie settlements within the drawn boundaries*" but Ordie does not have a drawn boundary within the LP.
 - The text then goes on to suggest that development should be consolidated, but not to compromise the high landscape value of the area. – how can Ordie be consolidated with out such a compromise occurring?
 - Ordie has not been zoned for development, but if it is recorded as being an area suitable for consolidation, it will be at risk of development in the future.
 - Local Residents do not wish for Ordie to become a 'Settlement'
- Total Lack of facilities makes Ordie unsuitable for affordable housing and any private housing might soon become empty holiday homes.

Donside

PUBLIC BODIES

- **Zone T1** Development of a tourism development at this site would have significant adverse impact on the setting of the scheduled monument, Doune of Invernochty, which lies immediately to the NE of the site.
- Do not consider that this land allocation accords with the commitment in the last sentence of **page 110**, to protect this monument.
- Feel that the area zoned as **E1** is not enough to protect this monument and feel that the area zoned as **T1** should not be zoned for any form of development.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Tourism potential needs to be reviewed and developed.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Feel it is important that the contribution to the local economy made by land based businesses other than farming is recognised, i.e. forestry and fieldsports.

INDIVIDUALS

- Disappointed that the settlement boundaries do not include Forbestown, Waterside and Heughhead, when noted as such in the settlement statement.
- There is restricted potential for housing development within the named settlements in Strathdon, whereas in Waterside and Heughhead there are several landowners who may consider land for affordable and local needs housing.

Dulnain Bridge

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- **H1** – the boundary should be extended to include the whole area in the current Local Plan.
- Currently working closely with Highland Council to secure provision of two affordable housing units on the Walkmill Croft site to the west of Dulnain Bridge.
- Area 1 is a natural extension to the Waulkmill development. Benefits: stretching the 30mph zone thus lowering speed in area.
- Areas 2a and 2b – natural extension to the east of the village. This forested area due to be clear felled over next 5 yrs. Plan to plant a buffer zone to the south east of the village

INDIVIDUALS

- Request to continue to safeguard area of woodland owned by Speyside Heather from Development.
- Request to include Speyside Heather Centre's ground as land identified for Commerce/tourism purposes, this will allow the company to continue to expand and improve a 4 star visitor attraction.

Glenlivet

PUBLIC BODIES

- Need to clarify if the area zoned for community use adjacent to Blairfindy Monument is one of the areas referred to in the last sentence of the fourth paragraph on **page 101**.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Concern that the proposals for Knockandhu/Auchnarrow and Chapletown of GLENlivet will lead to ribbon development and completely change the character of these areas.

Knockandhu/Auchnarrow

- Currently a scattered collection of houses

- Designating it as a formal settlement would lead to the development of a 'street' which would dominate the surrounding landscape and completely change the character.

Chapletown of Glenlivet (The Braes)

- Most residents would welcome more houses, but would not welcome the creation of a 'street' as this would drastically change the character.
- Felt that the scattered characteristic should be maintained from both a social and a scenic standpoint.
- Felt that the proposal to limit new housing in the countryside to sites already occupied by groups of at least three existing houses might be unnecessarily restrictive in this area. The lack of suitable water supplies already provides a natural restriction of development.

INDIVIDUALS

- Concern over proposed power plant on site adjacent to The Glenlivet Distillery.

Grantown on Spey

PUBLIC BODIES

- **E1 & H1** – fields to the north and east of the settlement – recommend a high proportion be allocated **E1**.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Last paragraph in the text section headed "steam railway" – the phrase "*should be made*" is not understood, it should read: "*provision is made...*"
- The Business zoning at the south end of Grantown should be redrawn to reflect the existing detailed planning permission for the proposed station.
- The Plan should be amended to show the alternative terminus site.
- Suggest that the land to the south east of the alternative site (**E1**) should in general be allocated to housing development.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- **H1** – but the designation between **C3**, **E1**, and **H1** are overly prescriptive.
- **H2** – should be extended to include whole area zone in the current Local Plan.
- The paddock and adjoining garage area on Mossie Road/Church Avenue should be zoned for housing as per the current Local Plan.
- Feel the LP is too prescriptive; this stifles creativity and common sense development.
- The area on the opposite side of the central green area from Mossie road has been designated as housing, feel this is an environmentally sensitive area as consists of 2-3 metres depth of peat.
- While there is an environmental designated area over some insignificant grazing land directly adjacent to Mossie Road.
- Would be better to shade the whole area as housing, then refer in the text to an element of environmentally sensitive area, but do not specify where. Then detailed environmental studies would form part of a submission and the correct site would be identified through this process.

- Alternatively, amend the housing areas to that shown on the accurate Muir Homes draft layout, informed by the land studies done so far.
- Request for an extension of the park to build 10 Chalets on triangle of land North of park up to the dismantled railway
- Request for extension to park on square of land to east of park

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- The high profile area by Grantown East Station should be rezoned as tourism to make the most of the passing traffic and allow development of a new tourist facility.
- The west end of the area opposite the caravan site should be rezoned as tourist rather than environmental to allow the option of a station for the Strathspey Steam Railway.
- The last paragraph on page 81 should be amended by replacing the word '*continuation*' for the word restoration.
- Concern that community facilities out with the boundary will be lost if not zoned properly or included in the boundary. These include:
 - a) **C2** should be extended to include the school playing fields, new sports facility, Grantown show ground and golf practice ground (Heathfield Park area)
 - b) The area around the Skating Pond/Kylintra Park needs to be zoned for community use and incorporated into the town boundary
 - c) The area around the curling pond by the golf course needs to be zoned for community use and incorporated into the town boundary.
- Confused over whether the Community Woodlands of Anagch Woods is zoned under **General Policy 1** or **General Policy 2**.
- Concern that this means some of the woods are deemed less in need of protection from development than others.
- Auchnagolin Industrial Estate (**B2**) effort needs to be made to make the units more attractive to businesses by lower rents and encouraging use.
- The area zoned for a new housing development (**H1**) is deemed as adequate for the town.
- Concern that development needs to be in scale with the town and its facilities and that it will benefit the community, not swamp it.

INDIVIDUALS

- Objection to develop the wooded land **H1** on the Mossie as it would affect the adjoining land which is to be a protected area.
- Surprised that half of the area of natural woodland from the caravan park end of Spey Avenue up to the Ian Charles Hospital, behind Mossie Road, is designated for housing development, while retaining the other half as a conservation area
- Surely the valuable habitat does not just exist in one half of the woodland.
- Concern that the development will have adverse effects on the habitat in the protected portion.
- If the development is to go ahead it should be ensured that the houses are to be built in stages as is stated in the plan.
- Surprised that part of the area of **H1** is designated for housing development. While the remaining part of the natural woodland has been zoned for protection from development.

- This is part of an area of considerable natural beauty and constitutes between a quarter and a third of the tree covered part of the area referred to in the LP as valuable habitat to be maintained.
- Concerned that the removal of such a large number of trees and the consequent disturbance of plant life and soil in one part of the woodland could have an adverse effect on the wildlife and plant life in the protected area.
- Concern that development on this area would necessitate draining of the peat, which would disturb the water table of the entire moss and destroy the valuable habitat to be maintained.
- Since all the remaining areas marked **H1** are on open land, it would appear unnecessary to destroy a large part of valuable habitat.
- The areas referred to as **H2**, should be designated as housing and should be accessed from Seafield Road.
- The housing zoning should extend into parts of the area **E1** between the **H2** zones and Seafield Road.
- The proposals for this area in the HC LP Aug 1996 are a better alternative.
- Future housing provision should develop slowly; consistent with the growth rate over the last 10 year period and local firms should have the opportunity to participate in this growth.

Kincraig

PUBLIC BODIES

- The natural buffer which separates Kincraig from the A9 should not be breached.
- **H2 & H3** – parts of these are on Ancient Woodlands Inventory.
- Title of statement and map should match.
- Suggest the moving of some boundaries between **C2, H4 and E3**
- **H5** – contains a small area of an AWI site.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- The *statement "Sites for affordable housing may also be available via agreements with the forestry Commission"* is welcomed, however land in an existing community (Forestry Compartment 4090) which was formerly zoned for housing has now been reallocated to Policy **E1**.
- This represents a reduction in the area made available for housing in this small community. Request that at least part of this land remains zoned for housing; the land to the south more suitable. The existing shelter-belt of trees and the wetter ground to the north could provide the environmental protection required within the village.
- **T1** – Inshriach forest should also be listed as a tourist destination in this area. The Speyside Way extension should also be considered in this respect, rather than just a reference to Sustrans link.
- Safety issues regarding access onto the A9.
- Feel that the village benefits from being integrated into its rural surroundings and feel that this should be the way to continue development.
- Consider housing in small groups outside the settlement boundary.

- Concern that infilling in **H1** may compromise the woodland character of the village.
- Affordable housing should be integrated into the community and not form down market ghettos as may result from **H4 & H5**.
- Issues regarding the designations of some of the woodlands.
- Suggest zoning whole areas in an indicative rather than prescriptive manner to be looked at in more detail as to the suitability of the whole site by developers.
- Important that new business opportunities are encouraged within and out with the settlement boundaries in order to maintain the local economy.
- Feel that the areas zoned under C1 and C2 are too restrictive.
- Have to take into account that as the community changes, preferred locations for community facilities will inevitably change, therefore policies for this should not be overly restrictive.
- Would not be practical for the bottom part of the field E3 to be retained as grazing if the top part was developed for housing.
- Recommend that Kincaig Bridge be strengthened and supplemented with a pedestrian walkway.
- **Proposed New Housing in and Surrounding Kincaig** - None of the proposed sites identified for housing would lead to "a loss or disturbance of locally valuable wetland" the water problems in the Field identified for **C2, E3, and H4** is caused by an accumulation of blocked field drains.
- Kincaig has spare sewerage capacity, suggest extending housing into woodlands north east of **H4 & H5**, integrated with good design and landscaping.
- Suggest consulting more and integrating with the local community/residents/landowners.
- Additional areas to be included
- Areas shown on enclosed map in Brown – potential new housing development
- Areas shown on enclosed map in Green – amenity planting to act as development boundary definition.
- Area to the south of Suie Hotel is felt to be suitable for housing development
- **Housing** - increase areas zoned for housing (**H2 & H3**) with buffer zone **E2** being decreased.
- Extend **H2** towards south west boundary to allow harmonisation with current development area.
- **Community** - The location of community facilities should be decided in discussion with the community.
- The protection of existing community facilities from non-community use seems rather prescriptive.
- **Environment** - consider decreasing **E2** as in point above regarding housing.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Change the south block of **H2** to an extended **C2** (used for Kincaig Fair)
- Adjust the environmental boundary to follow the fence lines below the Suie Hotel to Dunachton Road
- Extend **H1** to the Brae
- Retract **B2** to north of the Station House garden

- Extend the property line for Tom-na-Criagie
- Add an environmental strip on either side of the Baldow Burn
- Re-draw the bog margin at **H4**
- Show **B4** at Insh
- Land for houses in the strip between the A9 and the B9252 is increasingly shown to be building up resistance. **H2** Should perhaps be shown as an area for later development if at all – different shade of colour for this area maybe.
- Reference to previous planning determination for Squirrels Leap (Ref 05/002287/REMBS) Paragraph 5 in particular. The CC is anxious to see the old FE buildings scheduled for 'Start-Up' Sites.
- The HSCHT are concerned that their proposed Affordable Housing Project in Milehouse Wood above the Loch Insh Watersports Centre should not be omitted from the LP.

INDIVIDUALS

- **Site B1** – the phrase “*high environmental sensitivity*” requires to be quantified.
- **Site B2** – both existing vehicular accesses are poor and are incapable of improvement to a reasonable standard. Only satisfactory vehicular access route to the site would be through land to the west, possibly uneconomic. The proposal should be deleted.
- **Site E4** – the only original features of Kincaig Bridge are the piers and abutments. No longer merits listing.
- The impeded drainage of the land between the railway line and smithy is significant and required to be recognised on the map.
- The easterly boundary of **E1** does not reflect any feature of importance. The green area should be extended to include the entire TPO area except for those areas within curtilages.
- The TPO should be shown on the map.
- The existing S.75 Agreement on the land to the west of the housing estate between the railway and the old A9 should be shown on the map.
- The school house and its garden should be included in the “school” allocation.
- Appear to be some odd black lines on the map that should be described or deleted.
- Far too much land is allocated for residential development. There should be no housing allocations in the strip between the two main roads.
- Include a statement of principle (SoP) about protecting the landscape and views around the Speyside Way. In particular:
- Where the proposed route passes to the south of Insh along edge **H6** and **E1** and past areas designated for housing, an SoP that the actual buildings should be set back from the line of the path, to maintain views over Insh and the Monaliadhths.
- Struans route 7 should not be referred to as a path as is a public road
- The Badenoch Way should be included under “Paths” as should a number of recognised RoWs in the area
- Suggest a Statement of firm principle that in general in rural areas new houses should be no higher than 1 ½ storeys and in keeping with other styles

- Suggest a presumption against approval for houses outside settlements located by roadsides.
- Insh Map – request to remove the environmental designation from an agricultural field along the B970 within the registered Greenfield Croft. Need this field to stay as it is, for the croft to stay viable.

Kingussie

PUBLIC BODIES

- SAC runs through an unmarked environmental area.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Support Highland Councils view that there is a need to identify more land for business and industrial use in both Kingussie and Newtonmore.
- An area of former sidings adjacent to Kingussie Station has not been included within the settlement boundary; this might hinder Network Rail from using it for operational purposes or making best use of its assets. As Brownfield land adjacent to the settlement it would be appropriate to include it within the boundary.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Suggest that Lynchat, outside Kingussie should be a recognised settlement, with a boundary and settlement statement.
- Suggest consideration of proposed settlement boundary and statement for Lynchat.
- Area of land shown on attached map has been previously zoned for housing in the Badenoch and Strathspey LP. Suggest this area remains ideal for development and should be zoned in this LP.
- Suggest a broad zoning of the entire housing development site of Kingussie (as shown on attached map) as opposed to discrete pockets
- Suggest producing a masterplan for Kingussie.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Concern that the land set to housing; **H1** to **H4** will be accessed via road through the existing Dunbarry settlement. This access route will not safely or practically support the construction traffic or the increased transport needs. This will pose safety issues to the large proportion of young families with children living there.
- Suggest new access via Kerrow, which can also service the proposed future developments at **FH1 and 2**.
- Welcomes and agrees with the general comments identified under Business/Employment, Community, Environment and Tourism. **Policy T1** and **Proposal E1** broadly agreed with.

INDIVIDUALS

- Proposed site for a local electricity generator at the River Gynack would be a good opportunity to reinstate the gravel traps which were previously along the river.
- The plot of ground allocated for housing at the east end of Kingussie is coloured red in error.

- A woodland corridor could be established off Dunbarry Terrace as squirrels use this area.
- Area west of the former Ruthven farm buildings to be allocated for affordable housing as it is in the current Local Plan.
- Concern over how areas **H1** and **H2** will achieve appropriate road access. At present none of the existing public roads west or south of these areas could accommodate additional traffic.
- Objection to the exclusion of area of white land to the north of Ardvonie Road and land shown as General Policy 2 area (green) from within the settlement.
- This LP fails to meet housing objectives in Kingussie, as the areas zoned have been partly built on, very little further land available in short/medium term to meet housing needs.
- Need to consider housing in woodland settings.
- Housing completion figures in the LP are inaccurate and do not reflect realistic housing demand.
- Concern regarding road safety & traffic issues regarding **H2**.
- The existing amenity space in area **H2** and **H1** should be preserved.
- The environmental space in **H1** seems too narrow.

Laggan

PUBLIC BODIES

- **H1** – contrary to landscape capacity study. Within RSBP study area

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Disagree with the policy of encouraging exclusive development of village centres (alien to historic settlement patterns of a village such as Laggan) Small clusters the norm historically.
- Scattered development is the most socially inclusive form of population expansion.
- Where the village centre is to grow it should be outwith the existing curtilage. The committee does not want to see ribbon development branch out from the centre with attendant invasive infrastructure such as light pollution from new street lighting etc.
- On the above principle the area between the shop and the village hall (serviced by street light and gritters) is a better for a new build than any area west of the hall. The lower part of the football field could therefore be released for development, with the upper part remaining zoned for community.

INDIVIDUALS

- Opposed to proposed affordable housing site at Catlodge for following reasons:
 - Existing drinking water and waste pipes cross the site
 - The existing septic tank has no further capacity
 - The close proximity to a Listed Building Curtilage
 - Road Safety issues.
 - Concern over proposed residential building at Catlodge
 - Concern that offering affordable housing sites may be used as a tactic for further commercial gain.

- Feel that the level of need for affordable housing in this area does not warrant the obliteration of beautiful and historic countryside.
- Feel that if development were to take place at this site it would totally destroy a piece of heritage that we should be trying to salvage within the National Park.
- The proposed development would increase the amount of dwellings at Catlodge by approx 60%
- Sporadic building within Catlodge is unsuitable.

Balgowan Settlement Boundary

- 0 as marked on attached map – triangle of ground fenced off from the grazing, must have been part of the curtilage of Cluny Croft (now Swallow Cottage) is excluded – Why?
- 1 as marked on attached map – is dwelling house that should be part of Balgowan.
- 2 on attached map - The Cabin is historically the tied cottage of the Balgowan Shepherd. It is emphatically an inherent part of Balgowan.
- Strip of Ground above the road is not suitable to be built on; it only comes into Balgowan if the Cabin brings it in.
- 3 on attached map - There are several buildings below the road but further construction is not a good idea. Why is the bit of crofters in bye land included whereas other similar ground is not?
- 4 on attached map – this area would have historically had dwellings on it. With a bit of drainage work this area would probably take two houses.
- 5 & 6 on attached map – area 5 should be outside the boundary like area 6 is.
- 7 on attached map – this is a steep slope and unsuitable for development. Why this is within the boundary when 6 is out?
- 8 on attached map – Ivy Bank, now called Drumlaggan is an inherent part of Balgowan – it was the School – it should be within the boundary.
- The nature of Balgowan is a crofting community, 2 of the six crofts have recently been split whereby the senior crofter stays in the house while a relative gets the land. One of the relative requires to build a dwelling on the plot, but this is out with the settlement boundary. This must be included within the boundary in order to facilitate a young crofting family building, settling and rebalancing the community. This is in line with the Parks 4th Aim.

General Policy 4

- It is essential that well-defined and sensible boundaries are selected.
- Objection regarding Balnagowan Boundary.

Landscape

- Much greater attention should be given to the protection of designed landscapes. This policy may be too broad to ensure correct management of some features.

Archaeology

- Policy 5 is not adequate in meeting the statutory requirements set out in section 1(a) of the National Park Scotland Act. Policy 9 is helpful but does not offer the necessary provisions.
- Suggest inclusion of a number of policies/proposals to assist in achieving aims.
- New Policy – regarding archaeology

- New Proposal – regarding the establishment of a Historic Environment Record
- New Policy/Proposal – use of conservation area designation to protect areas of known archaeological interest

Listed Buildings

- A new Policy regarding that Historic Scotland carries out a resurvey of the National Park.
- Support policies 6, 7 & 8.

Water

- Welcome Policy 11. Helpful to include a statement regarding the possibility of a hydrological survey being required in respect of any planning application in this area.

Housing

- Support comments on Section 75 Agreements
- Given recent history of development in Balnagowan, there is no justified housing need.
- Proposals in Policies 39 & 40 are welcomed, however Concerns with Policy 41. A 50% threshold is too large a percentage increase of an existing building footprint. A 25% increase might be wiser, due to the differences in building size.

Housing Design

- Major criticism of lack of clear commitment of improving the architectural input of new development despite Soc Exec having a number of policy initiatives on this.

Settlement Statements

- Support recommendations R2 & R3.
- Serious Objection regarding proposed settlement boundary for Balnagowan.
- Need to consider the case involving the Scottish Land Court and the Balnagowan Grazings
- Therefore the northern settlement boundary as discussed in the above case should be taken as the formal boundary line.
- Boundary as it is does not take account of the land regarding the crofting or agricultural workings. The line as drawn does not follow any logical land pattern. (Details and alternative in letter)
- The boundary where it follows the line of recently granted planning consent also would allow space for some other small scale development.
- The community has always been dispersed through small clusters.
- Within the LP only Gergask is considered for expansion.
- To allow this largest centre within the cluster to further expand with no development to the others would change the character of the area.

Housing

- Support the principal of extension of the Laggan Bridge and Gergask settlement boundary and further support the site **H1** as suitable for affordable/local needs housing.
- Suggest that site **H1** may be extended east to the Gergask burn, south to maximise the elevated ground above the flood plain and west along the south site of the Corrieyairack road.
- This site will shortly be served by access of an adoptable standard, has grid power and is adjacent to the new public water supply.
- Suggest sites for sensitive, well designed, energy efficient housing:

- a) Land north of Am Bothan and the former Gergask School House and west of the Gergask Burn, accessing through the Gergask plantation.
- b) Land north of Laggan Stores and Corriebuie Cottage.

Environment

- Support the village Elm Tree being protected.
- Feel that this area behind the hall would be enhanced by creating grass parkland around it and forming a pedestrian access linking the village hall, doctor's surgery, Albyn housing scheme, Gergask Avenue and the picnic area and playpark.
- Some potential developments:
 - a) Extension to the hall to the north
 - b) Extension to garden and new access to Gergask Cottage to the north west
 - c) Extension to the Garden of New house on Gergask Avenue to the south west.
- Feel that these three small developments could take place alongside the enhancement of this area as a whole.

Infrastructure

- Strongly support **Recommendation R1**
- Support **Recommendation R3** – Suggest:
 - a) A circular footpath around the village for dog walking/amenity and could link areas within the village.
 - b) A loop footpath/route from the Corrieyairack road bridge over Gergask Burn following the bank of the burn north and returning south to the same point by the opposite of the burn.
 - c) Plant the sides of this deep gully with a native trees mix.
- Suggest that the upper reaches of the Gergask Burn be suitable for a well designed micro hydro development. Could be achieved with very little visual, environmental or water flow impact.

Nethy Bridge

PUBLIC BODIES

- Concerns that development of **LA2** may cause adverse impacts.
- A dwelling has been included under the adjacent designation – east of Tulloch Road.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

Possible sites for new appliance garage for Highland Fire Brigade

- Vacant House site at the corner of Lynstock Cres & Mackenzie Cres
- Undeveloped forestry site, Proposed low cost housing site
- Disused Builders Storage site, Proposed house sites

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Suggest rezoning areas currently zoned for housing.
- Extend site at Duack Bridge to include the bottom half of the field adjacent to the road.

Braes of Balnagowan

- Recommend the eastern part of **LA1** suitable for housing
- Western parts of **LA1** identified as protected open space or landscaping.

- No need to identify affordable housing as part of the overall housing on the site.

Reasons for recommending housing on Balnagowan Site

- Only remaining New Development site identified in the 1997 LP still to be granted PP
- The only one of the Long Term Development sites in 1997 LP that is not identified as housing within this draft LP
- This site is centrally located within the village
- The allocation of housing to this site would meet the objectives set out in the Nethy Bridge part of the draft LP
- The plan states that future housing development should be focused on in Nethy Bridge, this site would be developed as soon as PP granted and so this objective could be met.
- Specifically allocate this site to match the boundary of the current planning application and current LP zoning and to identify the north and north west part of the site as open space or landscaping to avoid consideration of the site as infill.
- Housing on this site would comply with **General Policies 4 & 5** and **Policy 38**

Land as Shown on attached Map

- Suggest using symbols on the maps to represent the criteria applicable to each of the **General Policy 2** sites.
- This land provides good amenity woodland for the village so should form part of the settlement boundary along with the golf course. Also to encompass the school and housing lying to the north east already included. The above sites all provide important functions for the village.
- Suggest therefore that the land shown on attached map be identified as a potential long term option for a low density development and/or high quality affordable housing within a strong landscaped setting. This would be consistent with **H2** and **H3**
- Propose tourist accommodation on land 600 metres from the north east extremity of the settlement boundary
- There are no suitable sites for tourism development within the defined boundary, s those allocated in the previous LP have been developed.
- There are no allocations for tourist development within the draft LP therefore the LP is unable to satisfy its aims in relation to Nethybridge without allocating sites outside the boundary.
- Suggest modifications to the policy approach to support tourist development outside settlements as long as it complies with other policies in the LP. This would then meet a defined need for tourist accommodation in the area.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Should be no development be allowed which would materially alter the village.
- No wholesale suburban sub division type development should ever be entertained for Nethybridge.
- The Local Plan must maintain the ambiance of the village.
- No Development to take place in these areas:
 1. Field below Nethybridge Hotel and Mountview Hotel

2. Field adjacent to the playing field on the B970 bounded by the Duack Burn and the woodland surrounding it.
 3. the fields adjacent to Craigmore Wood
 4. The Castle Roy/Milton area and surrounding woods
 5. The area known as the Nursery along Dell Road. if development must take place here then it must be kept to a minimum.
 6. The open fields bordering the River Nethy.
- The above was so strongly felt by the community that they wished to protect them under Section 75 Agreements, and to ensure that no holiday homes would be allowed.
 - Development to take place should be only allowed if well spaced out, minimum tree felling sanctioned, no more than 4 houses to be built in any one area at a given time.
 - Should be included in the Plan that the sheltered housing project be guaranteed.
 - Boundaries roughly: Castle Roy in the north, Mondhuie to the south, Culna, Kyle to the west and Craigmore/Lettoch to the east.
 - Possible addition of footbridges over the Duack Burn for safety reasons
 - Provision to be made for affordable housing
 - Suggest reverting to the Local Plan that has an allocation for 10 houses at Braes of Balnagowan
 - Suggest the sloping area at the Braes of Balnagowan be maintained under Section 75.
 - No access that would cause the destruction of a path to be tolerated.
 - Retain field at Craigmore, overlooked by Craigmore House and Craigmore Mill as undeveloped.
 - Woodland area near Castle Roy and the Golf Course included within the village boundary.
 - Include area from Willow Cottage to Duack Side beside the football field within the boundary.
 - Extend village boundaries to include Balnagowan Wood, the area from the Football Field to Culvardie and area from the bridge over the Aultmore at the Golf Course up to Castle Roy.
 - The Pollyannas site development must be exclusively for the elderly. Either sheltered housing, amenity housing for the elderly or disabled. The development should be built on one level and should remain as housing for elderly or disabled in perpetuity.
 - Pollyanna site to be used to build houses for elderly and for no other purpose.

INDIVIDUALS

- Infilling development in the villages should be of a sensitive nature respecting existing densities and favouring low cost affordable housing.
- The site **H2** is large and out of character with the design of the village and in a woodland area adjoining popular walks.
- Modern housing on this scale would detract from the tourism appeal.
- **LA1** is similarly of an over-intensive scale but a more sustainable location.
- Suggest the settlement boundary should encircle the new development north of the Causer and omit **H2**.
- Consideration should be given as above for areas **H2** and **H3**
- **H3** should include a green environmental strip along the roadside.

- Oppose the inclusion of the area of the nursery on Dell Road; this area should be a buffer zone between the NNR and any development.
- Suggest need for local awareness of changes in landownership in favour of developers and vigilance against tree felling in preparation for future asset stripping
- Important amenity woodlands potentially at risk:
 - a) Balnagowan Woods/School Wood/Culstank Woods (Eagle Star)
 - b) Hotel field triangle of ancient trees & width behind houses from Causer-Balnagowan (Wilburn)
 - c) Lynstock Woods (Knox-Goldcrest)
- Skyline developments not desirable
- Native species for landscaping garden boundaries
- Traditional road layouts for housing developments in harmony with character of village road system and not creating social sub-communities
- Wants LP to reflect garden
- Feel that the boundary which runs north west behind Lettoch Road and Lynstock Crescent is well placed other than the absence of any opportunity for some affordable housing
- In favour of affordable housing provision with criteria in place to ensure that local people were the beneficiaries.

Comments Regarding the Suitability of Proposed Developments

Ancient Woodlands

- Development proposals fall outside the village boundary and point to areas described as ancient woodland.
- This ancient woodland was largely felled in the 1940's and 50's. Is this being used to influence the configuration of future development proposals?

Access for the Developments

- Proposals indicate access from a new road joined with Lurg Road, this give cause for a number of concerns:
- This is where the oldest Scots Pines in the area are to be located. Even if not felled the shallow nature of the roots would mean risk of damage during the construction process.
- Road Safety issues on Lettoch and Lurg Road

Sewerage

- Concern over possible 'temporary' solutions to sewerage issues

Marshland

- Drainage problems connected to this site.
- Attached map shows area wish to be zoned for a small scale housing development.
- Development of this are would meet criteria and enhance this derelict area.

Objection to new proposed new boundary

- Sewerage issues
- Road safety issues
- Will extend village beyond its heart
- 66% of homes in the village are holiday or second homes
- Need a pre conceived idea of how the village should grow
- Previous meetings have concluded that the footprint of village must not expand

- Development within the forested area of Lettoch Road would destroy valuable wetland
- Wildlife habitat issues
- The community wants and needs housing for the elderly
- Does not need any more amenity housing
- Pollyanna's site ideal for elderly housing
- Area designated H1 was meant to be specifically scheduled for housing for the elderly. Suggest re-designating for this purpose.
- Few if any other sites suitable for this purpose within the community.
- With regard to LA2 which is not proceeding, strongly support retention of "environmental"
- LA1 would completely change the character of the village destroying an historic open hillside. This land should be protected and retained in its present form.
- Pollyanna's site to be used for housing for the elderly as an ideal site for this type of development.
- Not another location in village that may be used for this purpose
- Support aim to keep woodland character of the area
- Support delineation of village boundary, existing zoning for housing allow for ample development of the community
- Nethybridge to be saved from unlimited sprawl
- Further development at a distance from the two shops and recently approved business development at the Old Station will not be in the interests of the community
- Agree the need for a well designed pedestrian bridge
- Support environmental protection measures within and out with the village boundary
- Agree with support for development of appropriate tourism business, but would also welcome equal support for non-tourism business also.
- Feel that path planning should be left the core path planning exercise however the word Foot should be removed to be compliant with the Land Reform Act and a clear statement about access by horse and bike should be made.
- Area marked **H1** should be zoned for sheltered housing for the elderly as supported by the local survey

Land Adjacent to B970 in Nethybridge

- A clear need has been identified for elderly accommodation in the village
- The village already has a stock of affordable family housing
- No suitable housing for elderly in the village at all
- This area is perfect with flat ground and close to services
- As the elderly in the village would vacate their current properties to take up accommodation on this site, their own properties would become available to families etc.

Land Adjacent to B970 in Nethybridge

- Use as sheltered housing would be perfect.

Land Adjacent to B970 in Nethybridge

- Site ideal for elderly housing as close to services.
- Current elderly accommodation not ideal as build adjacent to a steep hill.
- No other provision in Nethybridge for elderly housing.
- This site to be retained for sheltered housing in perpetuity.

- Wish the area outlined on red on enclosed map to be considered for designation as housing. Feel that this would not be out of character and would continue to reflect the street layout of houses on either side of the road.
- Community desire to see provision for housing for the elderly and sheltered development on the Pollyannas site. Ideal location as close to all services.
- Important that the footprint of the village should be adhered to and not extended or altered.
- Opposed to any movement of the boundary line to include land east of Lynstock Park within the village envelope.
- Planning proposal by Goldcrest Lettoch/Lurg Road – if these were approved then this would legitimise the zoning of the other side of the road – southeast of Lynstock Park, for further and sizable development.
- If the above proposal takes place access proposals would suggest a new road joined with Lurg Road. Objection due to Caledonian Pines, increased traffic.
- Sewerage facilities unfit to cope with additional development here.
- Development unsuitable on the east side of Lettoch/Lurg Road due to the terrain being boggy.
- Opposed to any more chalet type or holiday homes in the village.
- Support Proposals for Nethybridge
- Pleased to see Balnagowan Field is no longer zoned for housing.
- Identification and recognition of the planning position on the site of the refused application at Fasgagh, Blair Ghorm, Nethybridge
- Agree with view that any further large scale housing development should not be permitted and development restricted to infill.
- Care must be taken however to avoid obliteration of all open spaces – a 'pack them in' policy would not enhance the village.
- Every effort must be made to ensure that the detailed layout/design is to a high standard.
- As much woodland as possible must be retained within the village, any new developments should incorporate planting where possible.
- The existing derelict curling pond does not feature in the LP. Its site should be safeguarded so that it is available for future use as a valuable village recreational facility.
- Provision should be made for future pedestrian bridges across the River Nethy. Replace the structure at Lyngarrie, provide one at the ford (2km south of Forest Lodge)
- Land for future growth of Nethybridge is not sufficient for its needs.
- Wish land at Lynstock owned by Donald Black to be included in the new LP.

Newtonmore

PUBLIC BODIES

- **H1 & H2** – Concern over prominent position and that they will affect the appearance and setting of the settlement.

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Support Highland Councils view that there is a need to identify more land for business and industrial use in both Kingussie and Newtonmore.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Why is it proposed to move the village envelope to the east in respect of land between the Perth and Laggan roads when this land is currently zoned for long term housing?

COMMUNITY GROUPS

Errors within Plan

- Land north of Laggan Road to the east of Lodge Hotel, and two small parcels of land immediately north of Lodge Hotel have already been developed and should be shown uncoloured

Road Planning

- Wish a new road line marked on map, extending along western edge of boundary, south west across the Perth road by a roundabout, along the periphery of the area zoned for housing towards the railway line, turning south east to skirt northern edge of Jack Richmond Woodland Trail, to meet with access road to the industrial estate
- This would address and/or solve a multitude of current problems and safely issues in and around the village.

Zoning for Housing between Perth Road and Railway Line

- Wish a planned scheme of developing in smaller sections buffered by green space and tree planting
- Need an indication of acceptable maximum housing density for whole area and any one part of it.
- Scope for a schema for road accesses to be indicated from the new road and for an indication of areas where tree planting ought to be carried out and to indicate that this should occur well before the developments actually take place.
- Feel that in context of the road layout suggested above, that the parcel of land to the south of the road once it runs parallel to the railway line, up to the Jack Richmond Trail, should not be zoned for housing but for Community Space.

Zoning for Housing Between Laggan Road and Perth Road

- Same comments as above area.

Both Primary Zoned areas for Development

- Should be a clear commitment accompanying the LP to planning authorities to consider the developments as a whole, to comprehensively consult with the residents who will be affected by any application and to insist that developers have a defined landscape plan put in place well in advance of the development.
- Do not wish to see the village's strengths and integrity sacrificed by ill-considered and/or piecemeal development

Areas outside the village boundary

- Land out from Spey Bridge towards the Ralia former information centre has been developed in the past, with scope for a limited number of houses to be built and feel that this area should not be ignored and wish to see a definitive plan for this area. Do not wish for presumption against development though.
- Area along Strone Road, possibility of release of some unproductive land from Crofting Tenure for use as affordable housing. Possibility of recognising this in some way in order to take planning proposals forward.

Do not wish this area to be included within village boundary or given a separate zoning map.

Land south of Community space at Clune Terrace – White Space

- Wish this area to have a more definitive designation for this space, preferably housing (if access difficulties resolved) or community open space.

Changes from Previous Plan

- Now wish the environmental designation of the two fields between Station Road and Golf Course Road to be re-instated

Public Footpaths

- Would be useful to highlight known and recognised paths. See no reason why the LP should not make reference to the work being done to define footpaths and allow for the inclusion of the results as a form of codicil to the LP once they are known.
- Support the decision to preserve the environmental amenity status of the fields between Station Road and Golf Course Road.
- Provide good views
- This is particularly important in view of the plan to fill the field on the other side of the road opposite the Chef's Grill, with up to 90 houses

INDIVIDUALS

- The LP shows new housing allocation for only 1 of the 2 areas previously allocated. It only shows area previously zoned for new development, but not area Perth Road/Laggan Road previously zoned as long term.

Arguments against new zoning for housing & business

- Area zoned for business adjacent to the railway line is prone to flooding
- One of the 4 blocks allocated for housing (immediately adjacent to the Perth Road) has been bought by a developer and will inevitably be developed
- The 3 remaining blocks skirt a pine-clad glacial deposit which is a landmark feature on entering Newtonmore from the south. There are landscape character and settlement pattern arguments against the siting of new developments at the base of this glacial deposit on the flat open land adjoining Newtonmore

Alternative land for housing, business and tourism

- The area previously allocated for long term housing development suitable for reasons below
 - a) Well drained, no flood risk
 - b) Ample space to accommodate 100+ houses
 - c) Mature trees make a natural screen
 - d) Well serviced on both sides by the Laggan Road and the Perth Road
 - e) Recent settlement expansion
 - f) Well suited to accommodate a business park due to proximity of Chef's Grill on Perth Road
- Further area which might be considered is area 3.3 of previous LP. Open space between Station Road and Golf Course Road, zoned for agriculture/community space 2 separate houses have been developed, therefore its value as open space is questionable.
- Continue Cycle paths and extend them safely at north end of village
- Proper path alongside the river Spey between Newtonmore & Kingussie

- For safety reasons suggest blocking off one end of Station Road or making it one-way and also traffic calming on main roads in village.
- Consider banning HGVs from travelling north through village
- Suggest relocating petrol station and Chef's Grill to Ralia, removing the need for HGVs in the village
- Suggest signs to alert drivers to lack of pavements in places
- Build new road from the Laggan Road across near to the shinty field to take traffic across to old A9
- Pedestrianise main shopping areas
- Cycle lanes through village
- Build more council houses
- A need for community services
- Concern over re-zoning of the fields to the south of Alvey House Hotel.
- Concern over area of green land below Alvey House now shown as white land.
- This area is important because it gives a vista from the southern entrance to the village to give a feeling of spaciousness.
- Object to creating large housing developments and ruining the aspects to the southwest when there are other areas available for infill
- Increase in traffic justifies a new road, but the area should not be bordered by this road.
- Should be screening of the industrial site at the Little Chef
- Should be linked proposals to ensure that the required infrastructure development will occur within the village; water, sewerage, dog walking areas, parking, pavements and encouragement of local families within the village centre.
- Logic behind use of land for housing between Perth Road and main railway line and the Perth Road and the A86.
- Arable land important in preserving the culture and natural heritage of an area and in light of global warming
- Can this area sustain more people?
- Support the decision to preserve the environmental amenity status of the fields between Station Road and Golf Course Road.
- Beneficial from a scenic point of view
- Concern that the fields between Golf Course road and Station Road will be rezoned to the status of white belt and will not remain as green belt.
- Wish the two fields between Station Road and Golf Course Road to remain a designated environmental area.
- Support the decision to preserve the environmental amenity status of the fields between Station Road and Golf Course Road.
- Maintain a sense of village
- Provide splendid view to the Cairngorms
- Often grazed by ponies providing pleasure for locals and tourists
- This is particularly important in view of the plan to fill the field on the other side of the road opposite the Chef's Grill, with up to 90 houses.
- Wish the two fields between Station Road and Golf Course Road to remain a designated environmental area.
- Scenic reasons
- Need to retain green space

Rothiemurchus

PUBLIC BODIES

- **H2** – incongruous to the existing settlement, may have impact on Ancient Woodland Inventory site. Suggest quarry and burrow pit adjacent to **LA1** more suitable
- **FH1** – Concern over prominent position, possible effects on NSA, contradictory to landscape capacity study. Recommend the site be reduced in size and number of houses.
- Title of statement and map should match.
- Suggest having a settlement boundary for Glenmore

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- **Rothiemurchus** – **H2** needs more investigation.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- Glenmore Forest Park is not mentioned in the character of the area, despite it being a major tourist destination.
- **H5** – support the development of the two affordable housing units on the old campsite shower block.
- **FH1** – generally supportive of further affordable housing sites at Glenmore, but would question whether this is the only or best site. Sewerage issues and traffic implications.
- Tourism – Would welcome a statement similar to the one regarding Coylumbridge caravan site, for the larger Glenmore camping and caravan site.
- Access – would like to see a specific statement of support for completion of the Aviemore-Glenmore Cycle Route.
- **Rothiemurchus and Glenmore, Sawmill site – Proposal Site H2 (Aviemore Settlement Statement)** Support the development of low cost (not affordable) housing on this site.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- Need a more accurate description of where these communities are located.
- Loch Morlich comes under General policy 3, which discourages development, however Policy 28 encourages diversification/enhancement of large outdoor recreation centres.
- Glenmore lodge and the Centre at Badaguish faces similar ambiguity as above.
- Therefore it is not clear if the activities and infrastructure provided by these facilities are encouraged or discouraged by the CNPA.
- At time the general policies appear unclear and difficult to read.
- General Policy 3 feels like a “catch all” policy.
- General policy overview map should be clearer and easier to read, perhaps split into sections and a larger scale.

INDIVIDUALS

- Oppose the inclusion of the area **H2**.
- Object to proposed housing development on south side of Ski Road opposite Dellmhor at Inverdrue for reasons of safety, changing the rural outlook, other alternative sites available.

Tomintoul

PUBLIC BODIES

- **H1 & H4** – Concern over prominent position and would be contrary to the characteristic surroundings. Consider the Cairngorms Landscape Study.
- Consider **T2** most appropriate site for formal campsite facilities.
- **H1** - No house building until road widened to 5.5m with a 1.8m footway on the side of the development.
- Road to be finished to base course prior to house building commencement, unless a Road Bond is provided. Road to be constructed to an adoptable standard.
- A SUDS Scheme should be designed and agreed with the Director of Planning.
- Developer must give attention to a safe route to school.
- New roads and road works will require an application to be made for Road Construction Consent within and outwith the site, designed to TMC specifications.
- **H2,3,4** - Type of road to be agreed with the Transportation Manager

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Need more associations of the eastern gateway linking to Cockbridge/Strathdon and Ballater.
- Should consider opportunities to develop the Lecht and Tomintoul as a tourism draw.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

- **Chapelton/Knockandu/Minmore/Castleton** - Consider additional areas to be included in the boundary – shown on attached map.
- **Tomnavoulin** – could form useful infill sites.
- **Tomintoul** – the location of a campsite at **T1** is queried as this would be an appropriate site for further business uses. Suggest redrawing the boundary as shown on attached map.

Workshop results

Community Council Area		Angus Glens
Meeting & Date		27 September 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Norman Brockie
Attendance:		23 (Esk 5, Clova 14, Isla 4)
Issue	Comments	Similar
Housing	Many people are on short-term tenancies via private landlords. Need for more choice in 'affordable-rented housing to keep people in the Glens.	
Tourism	There's a need to develop tourism and recreation (facilities and amenities) in harmony with the estates.	
	Glen Esk: need for a formalised campsite; develop one next to Tarfside toilets	
	Glen Esk Retreat: museum and café will be fully operational by summer 2006 and a great attraction/facility for tourists.	
	Car park at InverMark needs to be enlarged and more facilities added for visitors	
	Clova: need for a campsite but not at Acharn, where it was un-supervised.	
Signage	All the Glens need better signage, incorporating the National Park status (including signs on the A90)	
Park Boundary	Why does the boundary only take in the heads of the Glens? ~ should take in the communities further down, too arbitrary at present	4
Access	Need to clarify the network of paths around the Glens	
	Road to Glen Doll inadequate and in poor condition for the no. of visitors	
Heritage	Runtaleave in Glen Prosen, interesting collection of stone-built sheep pens and associated structures; in danger of decay and needs restoration/preservation.	
New Clova/Doll ranger/visitor centre	Questions regarding the justification for this and the lack of community consultation	3
Comments collated by:	Norman Brockie	

Community Council Area		Aviemore
Meeting & Date		4 October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Don McKee, Anna Barton, Ian Malcolm, Henderson Pollock
Attendance:		117
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing		
Affordable	Please define affordable housing – affordable to whom?	
Building	No more building approved until infrastructure catches up with the needs of the community and stock of what is required is considered.	1
	Enough is enough – let's have a breathing space before we become the Milton Keynes of the north.	
Cambusmore	Object to this development. More development on land used by wildlife!	4
	Must be a self-contained 'village' – shops, school, community facilities, pub, etc, etc, with adequate road infrastructure.	1

	Creation of a whole new village and community would be much more beneficial than extending or filling in any more areas in Aviemore. Aviemore is fast becoming a housing ghetto without any amenities.	1
	Should be developed to spread village in alternative direction and create feature with river and possibly open parkland.	3
	Undeveloped area used by the local aeromodel club for last 25 years.	
	Why not build Cambusmore and stop constantly building and covering the whole of the north of Aviemore?	2
	How big is Aviemore going to be? This is a village with a good community spirit. This will be lost if Aviemore expands any more. Wildlife will also be affected and pushed further and further out. We may be top of the species in the natural world, but surely it is our responsibility to protect our wildlife and ensure that they too have a home (natural habitat).	2
Cambusmore	Development at Cambusmore would take the pressure off Aviemore.	1
	Thought this had already been agreed – we've said we want it to happen	12
	Much better to have future development at Cambusmore and retain the remaining green spaces in Aviemore	2
	Rethink the village shape with river as central focus – build on Rothiemurchus proposed site.	3
CNP	Why are continued developments of housing going ahead without a stated and guaranteed input of services – new school, village hall, indoor sports facilities? Also 2 and 3 storey building seems to be going ahead – spoiling other people's views and light. The quality of build in general is poorer than other national parks anywhere in UK and abroad! Many visitors state that the outlook as they enter Aviemore from the north is extremely ugly – is this how the Park Authority want the main village in the Park to be viewed?	6
Development	Consideration should be given to curtailing development in Aviemore.	
H1 and H2	Where is the infrastructure to go with all this housing – eg bus stops, shops	1
	What percentage is affordable housing?	1
H2	Provides valuable flood defence.	
	No further plans, other than those in place should be allowed. The southern part of this should be for community use. This is a nice area for walking. Another consideration is that this area floods in winter even with drainage – where will this water go?	2
	H2 seems a more sensible housing site than LA1, which is pretty restricted	3
H2, H3, H4	Should be an element of affordable housing which cannot be bought as holiday homes	
H3	Should be used for community use, picnic spaces, play areas, etc.	
	Too many houses on flood plain	6
	The old golf course was the finest open space in Aviemore, but money talks and now it will go under bricks and mortar.	
H4	Local residents campaigned for Milton Wood and adjoining land (now marked red for housing) to be kept safe for the benefit of the local community for recreational use. It is a	18

	disgrace that it is still shown as potential housing.	
	This area is integral to Milton Wood and would be better used for community purposes.	12
	This part of Milton wood and should be kept for community use.	15
	This area proposed for housing was discussed in conjunction with Milton Wood. The majority of people objected to housing on both sites. I would prefer to see a play area of swings and other equipment on H4 and Milton Wood left for natural woodland for recreation.	8
	Was originally included in Milton Wood local opposition and should remain so. It was requested that the field be used for community use. Building in the most westerly part of H4 would result in loss of trees and pond. The field would be better used as a picnic area with the path extended along the burn.	2
	Don't see why Milton Wood is dezoned and H4 is for housing. Best to dezone H4 as well. Seems crazy to have a road for a few houses. Road at present not suitable.	5
	The planning authority refused permission originally for this area as they felt it should be treated as a whole with Milton Wood – why should this be overturned? It's part of the same local amenity – there's little enough of it left.	4
	Strenuous opposition to this. There are already large amounts of houses being built to the north. There are no jobs for local people as it stands. This small piece of land could be left for community amenity land, the same as Milton Wood. Building on this area would severely inconvenience the residents of Grampian View.	1
	Access from Grampian View inadequate; no green spaces – site of old mill could be one.	4
H4 and H2	Risk to human life as housing would be right next to extremely busy road.	
H4 and H3	Should be left as was, we have no green area as such left in the village. Where do our children play and play safely? With all this building is infrastructure (e.g. sewerage, shops, etc) going to be extended as they can't cope at the moment?	6
Housing	This present plan continues to favour incremental development with no thought to the long term needs of an ever expanding town. The single road with cul de sacs is no longer acceptable. There is no evidence that there is a land bank for housing or communal development in the next phase of development beyond 5 years. The present land available is now being all used. Cambusmore must be zoned and the access and bridging must be a priority in this plan. Housing need for Aviemore for the last 40 years has always been underestimated by a factor of 50%.	
	Can CNPA look at housing development needs for next 10 years, if not 20 – not just 5. How long has it taken to get any houses built in Aviemore? 5 – 15 years minimum.	
LA1	This area should not be used for housing, but as an environmental area for the community with paths, similar to Wild Cat Trail at Newtonmore.	2
	Ensure adequate separation from existing houses by means of tree belt.	
	Object to this development as one of the only remaining	26

	green sites in Aviemore.	
	Further housing on this site would be surplus to requirements.	4
	Object strongly to the proposed development – loss of woodland.	19
	Should be designated amenity area.	9
	This area is the only open space area left in Dalfaber for amenity use and also the railway crossing is not able to carry the additional road traffic which will be generated.	8
	Need to keep green areas and protect what we have.	13
	A recent survey by locals indicated a large percentage use by visitors.	4
	A very small number of affordable houses proposed. Lots of presumably expensive houses. Housing market for expensive homes is stagnant. Why destroy this area of woodland, used by lots of people for walking, for more holiday homes? Locals will not be able to afford them.	
	Original Dalfaber North Phase 1 – 4 – Robertson's – no green areas or play parks. Flanked by railways and main road north. Children playing in the street in Aviemore North.	
Live application	Fox area behind Corrou Road and near 18 hole golf course – why build houses which are too expensive for practically all locals? What need is there for these?	3
	Provides valuable sound and pollution barrier against A9	
	No to Cambusmore. All live applications should be used for conservation and amenity areas.	1
Business		
AHR	Dislike intensely the practices used by AHR with their employees, i.e. hours worked at basic rate.	6
B1, B2, B3	Seems a bit counterproductive to have business centres which are inaccessible unless industrial, which leaves no space for walk in.	1
B4	Strongly object to the extension of the business area into the woodlands, as this is one of the last areas for woodland and wildlife within walking distance of the village.	5
	Strongly object to northern extension of business park into conservation and amenity woodland.	2
Congestion	Should have shops in outer areas of village to stop people having to come into middle of village and causing traffic chaos!	5
Employment	Real jobs for people who want to stay / settle long term.	1
Local businesses	Would like to see more small local businesses in the area and not be reliant on the tourist trade which because of the weather can be extremely fickle.	3
Retail	Need shops at Dalfaber.	
Supermarket	When will we see a proposal for a new supermarket? – nothing on the map.	2
	LA1 or LA2 for a second supermarket – either site needs to be looked at carefully for access and parking, etc. I would also like to see a possible site within the developments to the north, east of the main road. If a second supermarket does arrive, it should be a different company to the one already in the village. This would benefit villagers due to the healthy competition.	1
Tourism		
Employment	Tourism should not be built on immigrant labour who have no	2

	employment (and very few human) rights.	
Environment		
Everywhere	The environment has been tossed aside in favour of indiscriminate housing developments.	
!	Environment/species protection must not be a PR 'spin'/leaflet distribution exercise. Desktop administration guesswork does not protect anything. Too many PR and media exercises distract from the factual assessment of any environmental impact report and/or assessment.	1
Green areas	These should be extended, not squeezed out.	2
H2	The underpass to Craigellachie should be preserved.	1
H3	Is home to a fine group of marsh orchids.	
H4	This should be preserved.	2
	Burn has altered course and eroded land, including residents' properties.	3
LA1	Loss of woodland used by visitors.	4
	It is essential to preserve historical artefacts within this area.	11
	If this goes ahead, we need significant environmental areas within the development.	8
	Should be preserved, not developed.	8
	We need to protect the wild animals and wild flowers in this area.	12
	If the application for housing is rejected, the area should be retained as natural woodland.	9
Milton Wood	Needs to be conserve – hardly any amenity woodland left.	6
Paths	Tourist are looking for, but cannot find, scenic footpaths around Aviemore for short walks, i.e. without use of car.	7
Wildlife protection	Attention to detail. Facts not PR spin.	
Community		
All developments	Open spaces should be included – kick pitch and play areas – in any new housing	1
C1	Site of current school is totally unsuitable for any future building – bog.	2
C3	Possibility of community ice rink.	11
	Must be retained for community use.	9
	This piece of land is so disconnected from the community that it would benefit more from some sort of compensation/alternative use granted by McDonalds.	5
	An area of community ground should have some corridors of community access.	1
Cambusmore	We need the Cambusmore development to get a sizeable new school and community facilities.	5
Community land	Land between E1 and C4 should return to community recreational/open space.	3
	The land between E1 and C4 has been downgraded and has not been given a proposed use. This land should be included in C4 as community/environmental.	3
	We need significant areas of amenity land for the community, e.g. Milton Wood.	
E1 and E2	Should be for community use only	3
Facilities	Why should the community have to share with the school? Our existing facilities are well used and this justifies having stand-alone facilities.	
Fence	McDonald's fence is still a blot on the Aviemore landscape. The path from Laurel Bank is a right of way.	

Fence	Why is the right of way still closed?	6
H1	Does not have a sports pitch. It has a very small kickabout area	
	Community land is inadequate. Can all future permissions include bigger sites?	1
H4	This is community land – not for housing of any sort. We need it for our children.	7
	This should be community land to keep children safe and take them off the streets.	
LA1	This land should be left alone. It is the only place where you can walk with your dog. It is not everyone who has a car!	2
	If this goes ahead there need to be significant amenity/ community areas within this development.	1
Local bus service	Often unable to keep to time due to congestion – how are locals to keep appointments?	1
Play areas	No parks in the National Park? We need areas for children.	4
Other Issues		
Cambusmore	It should definitely be considered, but must be properly integrated with at least two access roads, one north and one south end of proposed site. It needs to be able to be accessed speedily by emergency service vehicles – if you only have one point of access you increase response times, endangering both the population and emergency service personnel.	
Development	It's shocking that we have to fight for our village!	
	The village is not being allowed to evolve as a normal village largely caused by large companies building huge numbers of houses, causing local people unable to buy a home in their own village.	5
General	The general feeling in the village is that the infrastructure is at 'exploding point' and the quality of life is suffering in many ways.	
Infrastructure	LA1 – infrastructure not sufficient for existing community, let alone this development.	7
	No more development without increased services	1
Level crossing	Can it cope with increased development?	1
Master Plan	Why does Aviemore need a 'Master Plan'? Won't everything be delivered via the Local Plan?	
Orbital path	H5/E2 orbital path needs to be finished and the existing area of the path used be re-structured and repaired.	6
Paths	There are no proposed paths on the plan – why?	2
	The Orbital Path used to be like walking in the countryside – now it's becoming like walking past people's back gardens. How big is Aviemore going to get?	2
	Can all paths be shown on final draft of the plan?	1
	There is a sad lack of footpaths around Aviemore. Other villages are able to promote their area with booklets on footpaths.	9
Roads	Definite need for a roundabout at the junction of Dalfaber Drive and Grampian Road.	2
Zoning	Dalfaber should be white.	
Comments collated by: Anna Barton		

Community Council Area		Ballater
Meeting & Date		14 th October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Jean Henretty, Gavin Miles, Andrew, Eric Baird, Bell MacAulay.
Attendance:		167
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing	Move zones FH1 further east to allow larger community area C2. An enlarged Ballater will require a large park.	
	There need to be a very strict limit on the number of second homes and retirement homes.	
	Object to FH1 & FH2 being used for housing.	
	Who regulates 3.101 which is to be added to policy 37.	
	FH1 for houses not trees.	
	FH1 should not have any housing.	
	H3 - nature conservancy own the land. It is prone to flooding.	
	Housing , curtailing of second homes – some areas in UK bar people who do not already live in a village from purchasing property. They need to have resided in the village for a number of years.	
	There should be no further development N&E of E2, FE1 and E3.	
	Let us have affordable houses on the site of the old school.	
	Any new developments should be in keeping with the traditional Ballater – and not the new suburban type houses built over the last few years.	
	There needs to be strict capping of second homes and retirement homes.	
	In building should be in keeping with the present density of housing.	
	Affordable housing could be housing for sale not for rent – for local people.	
	Have affordable housing required for mature couples who at present are only offered one bedroom council properties i.e. to rent. Therefore making entertaining at home very difficult due to lack of space. Council property should no longer be available to purchase.	
	A figure of 25% affordable housing will mean death to the village it needs to be more like 90%.	
	Any new housing should be affordable preferably for sale to occupants rather than renting.	
	Housing on H1 & H2 must be similar in style and density to adjacent development to maintain appearance on entrance to village.	
	Planners and developers should be made to bring low energy/eco friendly building technology into the main stream – it has been proven in Aberdeen that this type of housing does not cost anymore to construct.	
	There is a great need for affordable accommodation in the village. Houses for rent which cannot be bought and then sold at great profit would be really helpful for young people.	
	For the good of local community please implement housing item 3.101. we need housing, affordable housing not more holiday homes.	
	I am against any housing on FH1.	
	I would like to see a limit to the number of homes available to second home owners, and affordable housing set at a price that locals could buy over the long term rather than rent – unless this is local authority housing only and not privately owned.	
	There are not enough houses for working people. There are too many "holiday homes" in my street, I am surrounded by homes lived in a few times in a year.	

	As a young woman with a husband and child all of Ballater it is of great concern that we cannot afford to buy property here. Wanting to live here and contribute to the village is not enough, affordable housing and facilities promoting young families must be made available, please!	
	There is a great need in Ballater for this but if these houses are then sold on they will no longer be affordable. Could we not devise a scheme whereby houses are built for rent, or resale be controlled so that they remain available.	
	How do they intend to access housing sites FH1?	
Local Economy	Use local skills and companies on new developments to give local people jobs.	
Tourism	In this plan no allowance has been made for the 1000 people at Craigendarroch who require services and car parking in the village.	
Other topics	No provision has been made for recycling of green waste. It has been rumoured that the council site over the bridge is to be used for this purpose. If green waste was composted on site it could be sold to residents providing funding for the project.	
	Is there not enough trees in Ballater after the hideous way they were planted on the eastern fringe last time.	
	Ample car parking for the Ballater highland games is of paramount importance	
	Why ring fence the village with trees?	
	What period does proposal cover ie when is the next local plan due?	
Comments collated by: Jean Henretty		

Community Council Area		Boat of Garten
Meeting & Date		26 September 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Anna Barton, Willie Cruickshank, Lorraine MacPherson, Norman Brockie
Attendance:		43
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing		
Affordable	Housing allocation of affordable houses should be fair and transparent giving a high tariff to those in village/area who need to rehouse	5
	Essential that affordable housing should be phased over a number of years so that it answers local need in the long term	8
All sites	The CNP local plan allows for 3 zones for housing. I like this and object strongly to the current proposal in the woods. Existing pathways should be protected.	1
	There is no accommodation planned for disabled people	
	More houses = more families = better chance for school	5
	More houses means possibility of more business for local shops, etc	4
	To assimilate the new families into the village, the development must be at a controlled rate. How many a year? How many overall?	
	I would say that 10 houses/year is about right.	
	No more developers – use HSCHT to landbank for self build	2
H1	This should go ahead	7
	This is an area rich in ground nesting birds, to the extent that dog owners are requested to keep their dogs on leads from March to August	3
H1, H2, H3	Housing on these sites directly affects the amenity of far more existing houses than the development on SW of village which CNPA opposes	6
H2	This should not go ahead	9
	This development should go ahead, instead of in our precious woodland	1

	Should become available to build the new hall and the hall site released for housing.	
	This would be the most logical area for housing development as services could easily be connected from Grampian Crescent	3
H3	This should go ahead	9
	Please show Strathspey Park road and its expected extension on next presentation.	2
	The existing access in Strathspey Park development would be inadequate. Is there room to widen this access?	2
	What route will the road extension from Strathspey Park take?	
	More houses in this area	4
LA1	This should not go ahead	8
	If this goes ahead, there should be no more housing zoned in the next local plan	4
	Should be scrapped/moved to H1, H2 and H3 in line with new local plan	6
	Too many houses in proportion to size of village. Stick to small developments	9
	Affordable housing should only go to persons in employment	4
	AWFUL	6
	The proposed clear felling of this area of woodland would be criminally irresponsible and a negation of all the work carried out by conservation groups and individuals. This is a famous wildlife area, attracting visitors from great distances who hope to catch a glimpse of Scottish wildlife which can be seen nowhere else. The need for affordable housing for local people could be met in area H1	2
	This may be too many houses at once, but if it goes ahead we can ask for phasing and we get a free site for a new school and access to the new hall.	4
Old hall	Am not keen that it might be a railway museum – keep that to the railway station. A more social use for hall would be good, e.g. sheltered flats.	7
Business		
B1	Any business development planned at the entrance to the village must be effectively screened and accessed separately to preserve amenity of entrance to village.	1
	This should not go ahead at the suggested location. Any such business site should be near the sawmill	6
	Business zoning should remain at B1	3
Pub	How about a village pub?	2
Tourism		
Old hall	To be turned into a focal point for tourism	1
T1	This should not be allowed unless there is absolute agreement that a new school will be built and housing for young local families will be a priority.	1
Environment		
C1 – C5, E1	No further buildings or developments in these areas	3
LA1	Do not allow any development in this special amenity	1
Paths	Paths and Rights of Way – presumably they will all be established and maintained. How wide will they be?	1
Woodland	Woodland around Street of Kincardine – current shading for Category 2 isn't accurate.	
	Protect all woodland sites	5
Community		
Community Hall	If land on left coming into village is allocated for housing, it could be swapped so hall could be built there!	
	Don't agree with above comment. New hall incorporates changing facilities for playing field.	5
Fire station	We need a site for the new fire vehicle	2
Public Hall	The statement should allow for any disposal or development of this that the community agrees once new community hall is built.	8

	Could old hall not be turned into a restaurant pub? i.e. community enterprise	4
	The community has to decide on a future use for the old hall, not CNPA	6
Other Issues		
Infrastructure	How soon do we know if there will be sufficient water supply and a sewage system that will cope – something that it frequently doesn't at the moment.	
LA1	Rights of way, or commonly used tracks, should be kept – the latest plan seems to ignore them	7
Comments collated by: Anna Barton		

Community Council Area		Braemar
Meeting & Date		5th October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Jean Henretty, Gavin Miles, Sue Walker
Attendance:		58
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing	Houses must be rented accommodation so that there is always house stock.	
	Consider housing south of Ballellan – new bridge & footpath from Golf Course Road to A93.	
	H3 – this will need a new access road – Castleton Place, as this is only a single track road and will not take traffic, mirrors needed at each junction.	2
	Houses for key workers and locals.	
	Reduce number of holiday homes.	4
	Rezone immediately south of H1 up to ditch & towards river. This ground is useless for anything else.	
	H3 – as a local resident, concern at development going as far as the smiddy/firestation. I will have lost privacy and views, shadow will increase noise. Also concerned that affordable housing is used for locals and not for people from outside braemar. I have recently opened a new business and although I am catering for visitors in a wet weather environment CNPA don't want to help me.	
	Strongly in favour of affordable housing under certain conditions. Only for people of Braemar or who are going to make this their only residence. That they must in time be returned to the community. If purchase is allowed there must be provision for resale to the community at a reasonable price or only to someone making it their only residence.	
	Housing development perhaps south of Blanellan, east of the river.	
	Any new housing must be designated for local needs and affordable. There are already far too many second holiday homes in the village.	
	I would support H4 site for local needs units. I disagree with site H5 proposal as this has always been an open space for childrens sledging in winter, as general through path to Linn of Dee Road and I believe should remain so.	
	Possible housing site beside H4 – site of old school.	
Economy	Zone present clinic as business – it will hopefully move soon to C3 and present site for an office.	2
	Develop proposals for commercial development both retail/office and industrial.	
	Designated medical centre and police station as business use.	
	Provide opportunities for small businesses e.g. as part of H3	

	Need small industrial/business units as no opportunity for all these people who are coming to these low cost houses to start businesses.	
	Regarding business policy site B2, the road and access up Chapel Brae and the access road would need upgrading before developments. Also consideration to control lorry traffic which could develop with business use.	
	Business zones B1 & B2 both suffer from problem of access. The roads are not up to allowing increased traffic, especially around C1, children will be at risk. Roads are not wide enough for safe lorry/large van access.	
Community uses	Village hall should be classed as community area.	
	Bowling green – should this not be part of the community facility?	
	E2 communal area is privately owned.	
Other topics	T1 people wild camping won't want to camp in formal campsite.	
	Consider redrawing of conservation area to include all traditional houses.	
	Zone area between caravan park and A93 as environmental open space.	
	No extension to water works for business or industry.	
	Conservation area should include all housing areas.	
	Recycling to protect the environment.	
	No infill on Chapel Brae	
	Up grade local shops.	
Comments collated by:		Jean Henretty

Community Council Area		Carr-Bridge
Meeting & Date		27 September 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Norman Brockie, Anna Barton, Kate Adamson, Mary Grant
Attendance:		40 Adults, 13 Young People
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing		
Duthil	Not to double size of village in one go – listen to locals' objections	2
Housing	Good that no further housing complexes are proposed for next 5 years	8
	Scale of proposed development could swamp the village	
Density	Density of housing in big development – village but not be overwhelmed	5
H1, H2, H3	Affordable housing must be phased over next 4-5 years or longer	
	Affordable and open market housing would be better integrated	
	Would prefer to integrate housing. Separation at start, particularly at H2 smarts of a 'ghetto' type area!	
H1, H2, H3 & E2	Strong support for proposal that at Reserved Matters stage, Carr-Bridge Community would like to join discussions on development of these areas.	8
H2	To include houses for single people	1
	Affordable housing must be phased. Some every 2 years	2
	All affordable houses Village wanted it to be integrated throughout site. Affordable could be partly on H2 and partly on H1 by Carr Road	9
H2 & General policy sustainable development	The area marked out for the 28 affordable houses is bogland. Will it have adequate drainage and where would the excess water flow to?	
H4	It could become crowded	6
	Flats should not be built on this site	6
H6	The community could be overdeveloped and lose its character if	1

	multiple single house developments on the same site are allowed. Infrastructure (roads, water, waste) will not support extensive development	
	Before more development occurs in Duthil, a speed limit is needed on the main road to make it safer. Too many houses in Duthil will spoil good agricultural land.	1
	Existing agricultural land should not be released for infill developments in Duthil, but maintained for agricultural use	2
C2	Behind village hall is undesignated – could be housing	
Carr-Bridge	Any future developments should be less dense than recent new developments	1
Infill	Boundary should include some of the land between Lilac Cottage and golf course as this seems an ideal infill area	9
Business		
B1	This area could be used for a lot of different things, e.g. lorry park, new business	5
B1/B2	Access to these areas off A9 for lorries would reduce heavy traffic in the village	
Tourism		
T1	The Landmark extension car park is missing from the present map – this could be used as a focus for new footpath development behind Landmark	2
T1	As above – or for abike park, skateboards, scooters, etc	
Blackmount	Scenic picnic area between old and new A9. Information on CNP	
Environment		3
Protect	Protect ancient woodland around Duthil to Carr-Bridge birch woods	8
Area between The Spinney & Lilac Cottage	This area should be designated as a water collection area (hence the name Bogroy!)	1
Fields adjoining village	Consideration on zoning these as green areas	2
H1 – H3	The Reporter's decision also required the developers to show they would protect against flooding – very important	2
Flooding	Groundwater/flood protection will be very important for any future housing development or infill	3
Fields behind Carr Place & by football field	Bring within village boundary and designate as green areas	
E1, E2, E3	Very happy that these are protected	3
General policy 1	Area behind village hall also has a substantial area of natural woodland. Would be desirable to see this looked after on an environmental/community basis.	1
Community		
Facilities	Skate board park possibly as planning gain in H1	8
Play park	A bigger park – more swings, etc	8
Activities	Low ropes assault course in woods	5
Activities	Dirt jump in woods	7
Facilities	A toilet store	5
C4	The Curling Rink could be used in the summer time for e.g. basketball, tennis	3
School	School will need to be enlarged if planned expansion of village goes ahead. Need to be diligent as regards funding, etc before it all happens	
Youth facilities	Need a useable area for teenagers to meet and socialise/ exercise	
Other Issues		
Duthil	Valuable arable ground being lost to large scale developments	4
Main road	Cannot cope with further development	2
Carr-Bridge	Developments should not be allowed to fill the pockets of speculators	7
Duthil	Developments should not be allowed to fill the pockets of speculators	7
Water table	Serious concerns that water table would be adversely affected by developments	2

Road Safety	How is safety to be developed on boundary of H1 and Carr Road	1
Water supply	Can it sustain the future housing developments already in the pipeline – let alone any additional developments	1
R1	Increased capacity should be done well in advance of housing development and access road should be capable of dealing with increased traffic, including construction vehicles	
Comments collated by:	Anna Barton	

Community Council Area		Cromdale
Meeting & Date		29 September 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Gavin Miles, Anna Barton, Yvonne Nugent
Attendance:		32
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing		
Balmenach	There is an opportunity to enlarge the settlement area to allow a reasonable number of new houses, both at north and south ends.	
Balmenach	Ground proposed (by Mr Strathdee) is unsuitable for building.	
Balmenach	Mr Strathdee stated that if he did get permission to build houses it would be affordable housing. £50,000 - £250,000 a plot is certainly not that in this area.	16
Balmenach	This is not a suitable location for affordable housing and should not be used for expensive second homes at the expense of wildlife.	18
Balmenach	Absolutely no housing around Balmenach. This is prime wader territory and also swifts, swallows, bats and owls. Infrastructure is being put in to try to get housing which has already caused tawny and barn owls to leave their territory.	
Open countryside	Shouldn't allow any houses in the middle of nowhere, whoever is going to live there	8
Farm land	Don't build on all our farm land	
Aesthetics	The quality of the environment should be protected for those that like living in the countryside with open views and little traffic.	16
Business	Distillery and bonded warehouse at Balmenach should be zoned for business	
Tourism	Haugh Hotel Should be zoned for tourism – now operating very successfully	3
Environment	Any further development will be detrimental to the unique environment	18
	Noise, pollution and deterioration of the atmosphere will ensue from development.	5
Community	Good to see a community open space in Balmenach	8
Infrastructure	Further development will increase the problems in the area of water and sewerage.	
Traffic	Tractors and bogies that are travelling up and down at the moment go too fast!	21
Boundary	Boundary at S end of Balmenach where new house is being built is not accurate – plot shown is too big.	
Water supply	Water pipes have been laid all along Feith Bhuidhe Road – why?	
Infrastructure	Work that has already been carried out (on unzoned land) is substandard (lay-bys are no more than disguised access roads in preparation for future building.	8
Comments collated by:		Anna Barton

Community Council Area		Dalwhinnie
Meeting & Date		26 October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Norman Brockie, Anna Barton, Bill Carr
Attendance:		16
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	similar comments
Housing		
H1	Don't build here – vital for agricultural use.	2

	Not a suitable site or location for houses.	
H2	Part of essential field for agricultural use, very wet.	
	Very boggy land for housing!	
H5	Road needs to be adopted.	
Environment		
E1	Important that this area is only used for community approved purposes.	
	Should include a zoned area for a sports field close to the school.	
Community		
C3	Now apparently included in the planning application for housing under H7. Will be trees planted!	2
E1	There is a need for a sports field in this area.	
Other Issues	Land west of the railway id not included in the CC boundary.	
Comments collated by: Anna Barton		

Community Council Area		Mid Deeside & Cromar
Meeting & Date		27 September 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Jean Henretty, Mary, Eric Baird, Anneke Stolte, Claire Fraser
Attendance:		25
Issue	Comments	Similar
	If more houses with young children are proposed in Dinnet would the area require a new school?	
	How is a "cluster" defined?	
	What is the definition of affordable housing?	
	What could be defined as an infill site?	
	How many houses would be in sites H1, H2 and H3?	
	Would prefer not to have any new expensive homes in Dinnet.	
	How could CNPA ensure new houses are allocated to local people?	
	Is there a need for homes for local people?	
	Would welcome new younger people and their families to the village.	
	Smaller homes for sale may suit the existing elderly residents who could sell their large homes to new families.	
	Housing in the area marked H1, H2 & H3 may contravene Policy 37a and policy 3 of the draft local plan. This area is birch woodland which is an LBAP habitat, removal of which may result in an adverse significant impact. Housing should be, if possible, be located on land of low ecological value e.g. intensive farmed fields. If all the houses were low cost housing there may be a case for social benefit overriding ecological impact.	
	Ordie is an historic Clachan, one of the few remaining in Aberdeenshire, and should not be infilled, otherwise the structure will be lost.	
	Although upgrading the caravan site behind the hotel would result in an improvement in visual amenity, and possibly bring in more money, it would on the other hand mean that folk who currently come from Aberdeen to enjoy the countryside will lose the facility.	
Comments collated by: Jean Henretty		

Community Council Area		Donside
Meeting & Date		6th October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Jean Henretty, Gavin Miles, Eleanor McIntosh

Attendance:	29	
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
	Provision of service should balance any interest in local population.	
	Having looked at the draft plan I believe the general policy zones are appropriate. I am please to be able to view the plans and discuss the matters.	
	Why is Waterside not zoned as settlement or indicative of new housing.	
	Settlement boundary too restrictive. Insufficient scope for new building.	
	Lobby Central Government on our behalf to provide fuel as we live such a long way from any petrol, this is a basic need.	
	I would like to see more affordable housing built in the Bellabeg/Strathdon area that could accommodate young families.	
Comments collated by:	Jean Henretty	

Community Council Area	Dulnain Bridge	
Meeting & Date	28 September 2005	
Staff/Facilitators present	Norman Brockie, Anna Barton, Mary McCafferty and 5 other Community Councillors.	
Attendance:	40 Adults, 2 Young People	
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing	Holiday homes contribute nothing to the local economy.	
	Is there planning permission on a site adjacent to Church Place where the settlement boundary juts out beyond the wall?	
	25 houses in 5 years? Not enough for local businesses.	
	Dulnain Bridge needs more housing for people living permanently in the area at affordable cost.	
	Affordable housing needed.	
	The two areas designated for housing on the draft Local Plan should be reserved for affordable housing.	
Business		
B1	This site next to garage could provide small café, public toilets, bus shelter and pull-in for cars. There is presently nowhere to stop at the shop. There are no public toilets. A building which was placed well back on the site could house a small café and public toilets. The café could sell crafts, local paintings, photographs, etc, to generate enough to finance the project and create employment, possibly several part-time positions.	3
Shop	It is essential to support the local shop and expand opportunities for business generally.	
	A local shop is essential to the community – need to find a way to bring tourists into the village to help sustain this business ventre and to expand to enable the shop to increase its lines. Is there any funding available for this.	
Tourism		
Tea shop	A tea shop in the centre of the village would attract visitors. The old filling station area would be a suitable site. We desperately need something to attract people to stop in the area.	
Crafts	A teashop could attract craft makers to exhibit.	
Artists	(Added to above) and local artists of whom there are many.	2
Tea shop	The site at Granite House is to become a licensed restaurant/tea shop aimed at the local trade as well as visitors, i.e. reasonable prices.	
Visitors	We need more people to stop, stay and come back again.	

Environment		
	No comments.	
Community		
Bus shelter	A bus shelter in front of B1 would be beneficial to the community as a whole. This is a very exposed area in a cold area of the National Park.	3
Toilets	We need public toilets.	
	We desperately need public toilets – too many visitors use the Roches Moutonnees site for this purpose – shameful!	
Other Issues		
Previous comments	Please note all comments previously submitted by the Community Council. Thank you.	
CC Boundary	What's shown on the map doesn't tally with HC map of CC areas. Can you check, please?	
	Tullochgribbain High to the west and Gaich Farm to the east are both in DBCC area. Map is incorrect.	
Comments collated by:	Anna Barton	

Community Council Area		Glenlivet
Meeting & Date		12th October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Jean Henretty, Gavin Miles, Eleanor McIntosh, Fiona Toovey
Attendance:		48
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
	Zone Tomnivoulin heritage centre as Tourism	
	Important sites for ground nesting waders, peewees, snipe, curlew, oyster catchers, black grouse etc – Glenlivet	2
	Important site for curlew, snipe, lapwing, merlin, black grouse in Corries Glen	
	Red Start, Woodcock, Tree creeper, Bullfinch, song thrush etc in Clash Wood.	
	Houses should be in keeping with surrounding buildings	
	Not necessarily single storey	
	Houses to be in the design of local houses – single storey.	
	Knockandhu water supply may not support more housing.	
	“The Park” to be protected. No development.	
	Heather Fold viewing area – tourist amenity.	
	Water plant not included in Chapeltown?	
Comments collated by:		Jean Henretty

Community Council Area		Grantown
Meeting & Date		5 October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Norman Brockie, Anna Barton
Attendance:		16
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing		
The Mossie	This area is not suitable for housing – subject to flooding. Better on land to the east of Grantown close to the railway track.	
H1	Strongly resist an explosion of houses over a short period – preference for slow natural growth, preferably using local services.	1
H1	Areas designated for houses have reduced since last local plan. Would prefer certain designated E1 areas being reinstated for housing.	1
H1	Strongly opposed to large development Mossie area by national builders. Considerable areas of H1 zones are in fact very wet and boggy and therefore the whole Mossie area would lend itself much more to small developments by local builders with local knowledge.	
Housing	Rapid expansion of housing would spoil the character of Grantown and the necessary enlargement of the present infrastructure would destroy the very thing which appeals to visitors and presently attracts tourism.	
Business		
B1	Includes land required for Strathspey Railway terminus and approach.	
Achnagonalin	Business	
Supermarket	An out of town supermarket would destroy the main shopping area, as has been proved time and again in other areas.	
Tourism		
Caravan site	Redraw boundary at T1 to reflect statement.	1
Environment		

Parkland	Parkland and lochan opposite Craiglynne Hotel must be within the boundary.	
Community		
Grantown Show field	Field should be within boundary and zoned for community.	1
Other Issues		
Roads	Recommend early implementation of A95 improvement at Gaich.	
Paths	Create all abilities path beside Kilyntra Burn from opposite Craiglynne to bypass.	1
Comments collated by: Anna Barton		

Community Council Area		Kincraig
Meeting & Date		6 October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Norman Brockie, Anna Barton, John Anderson, Nic Bullivant
Attendance:		55
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing		
Affordable	Housing for young people should be a priority, but there should be a mechanism to prevent so-called 'affordable' housing being sold on for profit/holiday/second homes and taken away from the locals' needs.	2
General	There should not be a presumption against single housing developments.	2
	There should be more houses in the countryside.	1
	Housing should be permitted in the countryside for people who belong there.	
H2	If poor winters are to come again, they are in line with snow drifts!	
H2 and H3	Hope they will not materialise, but better there than other options.	1
	Can these be held back until the next plan?	
	Housing should not spoil views to the hills.	
H4	Happy for it to be affordable, but not otherwise	4
H4 and H5	These should be less prescriptive and penetrate into the adjoining woodland utilising the trees to screen houses and break up the woodland edge.	
H4, E3	Should be housing in forest to create a balance to both sides of the village.	
H5	Agree.	1
H6	Development should be in a manner sensitive to the rural nature of Insh.	
	There is an existing planning permission in the E7 area to the west of H6. Need to keep new housing well clear of Badenoch/Speyside Way. Right of way out east side of H6 to be protected.	
	Should be as unobtrusive as possible. Definitely no street lights.	
Retirement homes	The area is not providing homes for older people to retire to. No shepherd, gamekeeper of the like will want to live in a scheme. For these, do not consider 1 bedroomed houses – minimum 2 bedrooms.	
Business		
General	Not sufficient land earmarked for local business opportunities. Suggest area east of school on other side of road.	
B2	Invasion of privacy of properties in Sepybank Walk – noise and light pollution, loss of woodland area, affecting those immediately by the railway.	1
Environment		
Noise pollution	To be avoided by all business developments	2
E1, E2, E3	Strongly agree	
FC land	Why is the section of FC land (part of Inshriach) at the SW end not included in the NSA. It should be.	
E3	Too much environment zoning in wrong place.	1

E3/C2/H4	The split of this field shows no knowledge of the type of ground. Top half of H4 is OK for houses and C2 possible. However, with regard to the wet ground in the middle, best create a nature pond! Why not include part of area north of H4?	2
E3	This should reflect the character of the ground and include area unsuitable for housing that is wet, rather than ground suitable for housing. Too prescriptive.	1
E7	Existing planning consent for two houses here (Insh).	
Community	No comments	
Other Issues		
Boundary	Houses within boundary should be white, not General Policy 2. To include garden of Tom na Creige (formerly 'Carrington')	1
Drumguish	Should be a development plan for Drumguish.	
Footpaths	No mention of Speyside Way	
Full local plan	Not enough copies of full plan to include housing policies.	2
Policies 21 & 22	Fully supported – most other aims also well thought out.	1
Policy 22	No charging for car parking which gives access to the countryside.	
Policy 27	Why will there be 'no extension to ski areas'? What about an artificial ski area for use in adverse weather conditions? Old habits still persisting. Time to break out of the box!	
language	Please use plain English – no jargon. There are far too many AMCSs, SACs and SPAs. I cannot see all the links between any of these.	3
Comments collated by:		Anna Barton

Community Council Area		Kingussie
Meeting & Date		3 October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Gavin Miles, Anna Barton, Alan Hunt, Tom Wade, Donny Grant
Attendance:		28
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing		
Affordable	Local need should take priority with transparency in allocation process.	
West Terrace	Why has the area previously zoned for housing been removed from the plan? Do the planners have any reasons other than 6 objections in the previous survey?	3
H1 – H4	The road is inadequate already – could not cope with another 80 houses, which could mean 160 extra cars!	2
FH2	This should be developed first.	
FH1 and FH2	No further housing until new road out onto old A9.	2
Business		
	Does current use of the cattle/sheep holding zone by the Market Stance justify retaining it as it is? It would seem to be more appropriate for small workshop units.	
Tourism		
Highland Folk Museum	If this is closed and the collection moved away from Kingussie, it will be a disaster for the community - a great cultural loss and will have serious adverse effect on many local businesses, not just hotels, guest houses and retail, but also small tradespeople. The buildings should be refurbished and then the Museum facilities enhanced without losing attractive character.	
Iona Gallery	This needs money spent on it to enhance its availability. Better signage needed too.	
Environment		
Green zones	Who manages/maintains these areas?	
Protected sites	Why is the area behind West Terrace not suitable for building development? Were the comments relating to this made by incomers and holiday home owners?	
Community		

Court House	This listed building should not be allowed to deteriorate further – it must be refurbished and then open to the public.	
Other Issues		
Footpaths	No mention of Kingussie footpaths, many of which are in need of maintenance – should be included.	
Footpaths	Extend network to link up and plan maintenance of paths.	
Water/sewerage	Do we have to wait for Scottish Water to invest before there is any more development?	
Water/sewerage	Essential, surely, before further building.	
Policy 41	Temporary permission for caravans should be 9 months for self-built houses.	
Comments collated by:		Anna Barton

Community Council Area		Laggan
Meeting & Date		27 September 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Gavin Miles, Anna Barton, Sheena Slimon
Attendance:		34
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing		
	Reinforcing character of hamlets – only Laggan Bridge and Balgowan are zoned areas - would be helpful to zone other hamlets also.	
Affordable housing	Visually adverse to have this density of housing. Should follow the existing line of houses.	
	Local need should come first.	2
H1	Not suitable – find alternative smaller sites.	1
	Other side of the road more suitable – higher ground and doesn't obstruct view.	
	This is a large site – if 10 affordable homes are built, will they go to local people?	4
	Too large – we don't want speculative development	2
	Will spoil the view for the many visitors and residents who walk here.	1
	Not suitable – single track road – do not want street lighting on Glen Road. Better, if needed, to extend Albyn Housing into top of picnic site area – footpath to shop and extend doctor's surgery road to link into western end of Albyn houses.	2
	10 in a row very ugly = ribbon development. Much better in small groups.	1
	A totally non-aesthetic site. It is not of the Highland design of clachans or settlements. If houses are needed, the sites around the surgery and Albyn housing would be more suitable. The all-round view would be blocked to tourists and photographers.	3
	This site has so many things against it. The village water supply goes through the site and there are 3 septic tanks and soak aways in the area. Access would be very difficult, single track road. One of the few lapwing nesting areas. Visual impact for visitors and walkers up the Glen Road would be spoilt. It was rejected in 1975 and should be again.	
	Concern that this is not the most cost effective site to build on for affordable housing and that the visual impact would be significant in a very small village.	3
	This proposal would do nothing add to Laggan/Gergask. It would completely alter the balance, line and demographics of the village. The upper area of Glen Road, the wooded area, is much more obvious as a site for houses in the Highlands! No need for lights and a 'street', please.	
	Would these houses (affordable or otherwise) be occupied by	

	people working outwith Laggan?	
	Affordable housing – in 1975 this area of land was not granted planning permission as it was not thought suitable for village development as it would spoil the view up the glen and sewage and water supplies were in the field. Nothing appears to have changed!	
More sites	Current housing zones far too restrictive. More houses will be good for Laggan whatever their use.	
Glentruim Road	There used to be housing right along Glentruim Road, should be once again. Would help to liven the place up a bit. Current housing zone far too restrictive – regulations should loosen up a bit, nothing to lose by having more scattered development.	1
Above	The consequences of 'livening the place up a bit' would be the utter devastation of an unspoilt, respected and popular beauty spot.	5
Policies 1 – 5	With reference to the above two comments, Policies 1 -5 would apply and these are to be applauded and sensible – i.e. Glentruim Road/Catlodge is outwith these policies and totally unacceptable.	4
Proximity – why so close to existing houses?	Why not do a hamlet further away with potential for 10-20 houses that doesn't have to be on top of each other or on top of existing houses and yet have safe accessibility to village facilities.	1
Privacy	The Local Plan should protect existing residents' privacy and favour existing residents rather than potential new ones.	1
Present houses	Gargask/Laggan Bridge – 28; Glen – 15; Blagowan – 24; Catlodge – 21; Cluny – 13; Strathmashie - 15	
R2	The same applies to A889.	
R3	The same applies between Catlodge and Laggan.	3
More sites	For self-catering – current housing zones far too restrictive – more houses can only benefit Laggan	
	Each application should be on its own merit.	2
Response to above	No thanks!	
	There are hundreds of thousand of acres of nothing around Laggan – what's wrong with a few more houses in it? The community needs more people to give it life and to keep the shop and the school and the pub going and more taxpayers for the upkeep of services. Far too many numbies writing here.	
Business		
	Laggan is wider than Laggan Bridge. To apply an urban view to the community of Laggan is quite unfair. All our businesses are of importance – whether it is the pub (as important as the shop to many), coffee shop, hotels, farms, estates and BandBs. We do have Broadband and at least 3 home based national businesses.	
Home working	Encourage home working through subsidising Broadband	1
Wolfrax	Beneficial to the area – increased business opportunity	3
Small businesses	Need storage sheds for forestry and fencing equipment – other than in FC land close to Laggan Bridge.	4
Small businesses	These should be sited within the community – avoid centralisation on FC land away from village.	5
Business	How can any one business have more priority than another in a community? The Laggan Stones are only 1 business, there are 3 other businesses of long standing who are part of our infrastructure and good employees. It is important to consider how to maintain their accessibility.	9
	No more development of retail or catering facilities just like supermarkets on the outskirts of town centres. Business is not spread inwards. Tourist numbers are falling – this has been the worst year for 20 years – fuel costs too high – home market goes abroad.	3
Broadband	Fully functional Broadband a high priority.	
Economy	The future has to be other than 'land based' and 'tourism'. 'Home working' devalues those of us who run businesses from home!	1
Tourism		
Lochan Uvie	Strongly support improved car parking for climbers	1
More tourists	Mean more work – extend the Wolfrax Mountain Bike facility	6

Environment		
Flooding	Gergask Burn where it enters Spey – trees increase likelihood of flooding.	1
SSSI – Spey C2	Trees now so thick that inhibiting flow of Spey. Village Elm needs a TPO.	3
Farms	Local Plan should not make it easy for farmers to develop house sites – why should the environment suffer to supplement the farmers' incomes?	
Farms	Farmers look after the environment and are penalised if they do not!	
	Any development should include a wide strip of woodland or hedge.	
Community		
	To say Laggan's community facilities are 'limited' to the Village Hall, etc is another example of an urban view – for a community of 200 people, we have a well used community hall, shop, church, doctor's surgery, primary school and sports field – this is much more than many larger communities.	
Other Issues		
Transport	Train/bus transport needed	3
Anonymity	Your last consultation reports published the names of authors of written comments – it should not.	
Paths	Footpath from Catlodge - Laggan Bridge; Cluny - Laggan; Strathmashie - Laggan	11
Farms	Local Plan should allow farmers to develop house sites as easily as possible. Supplementing farm income keeping farmers in Laggan is best way to help environment.	
Farms	This is nonsense and would go totally against the CNPA's policies for the environment for this outstanding nationally scenic area.	2
Farms	There are 8 farms and 4 crofts in the Laggan area.	
Farmers	Farmers get far too much subsidy. Non-farmers should be protected and favoured, too.	
Balance	There has to be a balance – we need farming community, but we also need tourism and so need to keep our scenic value.	
	Scenic value is helped by keeping livestock to keep scrub birch at bay as recognised by Highland Council.	
Paths	The idea of a path along the A86 linking Balgowan and the Monaliadh Hotel and Strathmashie would open so many social and healthy opportunities and would encourage people to walk and to use local services in so doing.	12
Cycling	Safe cycling for ordinary cyclists, children, families) in a car-free zone would be a bonus.	4
Speyside Way	It is planned to extend it to Newtonmore and perhaps this could further be extended to its source in Laggan, thus bringing more folk to the community.	4
Marketing	Tourist not here this year – need better CNP advertising/ marketing	2
Safe routes	Extend off-road all abilities route planned for Strathmashie – Garstean all the way to the village and up to Catlodge.	6
Road	Improve road layout at Wolfrax to give safer access/exit.	5
Pylons	It is proposed to build pylons across the Correyarrack Pass which is in direct contravention of Policy 5 in Local Plan.	
A889	Road has more traffic than A86 – need for R2 first.	4
Comments collated by:	Anna Barton	

Community Council Area		Nethy Bridge
Meeting & Date		7 September 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Norman Brockie, Anna Barton, Richard Renton
Attendance:		65
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Housing		
	Small scale development within village boundary keeping character	3
Affordable	Local needs building plots in woodland at Lynstock	2
	Local needs housing in woodland at Lynstock	2
Housing	Draft policy H3 My appreciation is that a Section 75 agreement would be unenforceable in the European Court. An option for sale by the developer to the Park if the restriction on occupation was not observed might be enforceable as a private contract. Otherwise change land law.	
Housing policies	General policies for development nos. 1 – 3 are too woolly. They give no more guidance for consistency in decision making than with the previous local plan. Park board planners have been seen to make their own political self-interested decisions, often with total disregard to Park planners' recommendations and planning guidance. Woolly general policy will not help to change this.	1
Chalets	Chalet developments are not appropriate in a village where many local people depend on small scale holiday letting. Nethybridge could become a 'chalet park experience' for visitors.	7
Brian Rothnie proposal	Local low cost amenity housing is already proving difficult to let by Albyn Housing. Other identified sites within the village would fulfil the need for extra housing without going outwith the village boundary.	1
Affordable	How much affordable housing is required in the village/further to Broomhill and the new development and Eagle Star's proposals for School Wood? Small scale – 4-6 houses may be suitable to stay in sympathy with revised village thinking which is to avoid schemes for any kind of housing.	
Chalets	Plans for area of chalet holiday accommodation not a good idea. Nethybridge already has a far too high percentage of holiday accommodation.	4
Affordable	Concern about Goldcrest affordable housing site. Very wet and will revert to bog when trees are felled.	2
Housing	Housing should be encouraged in open countryside	
Chalets	Surely just another lot of second homes – already identified as being of no value to the community.	
Business	Business area on village edge on Lurg Road inappropriate and unnecessary	
Tourism		
Chalets	Chalet development within woodland at Lynstock	
	20 chalets are too many for village and may destroy existing businesses in self-catering sector	6
	No chalet development required, the village maintains enough good accommodation already.	2
	Goldcrest chalet park should not be considered as an option, based on the current holiday house population statistics.	1
	Would destroy B&Bs and letting of established housing	2
Hotels/hostels	Can these be coloured purple for tourism on the map?	2
Environment		
Protect	Field between Craigmere Mill and Craigmere House to be free of development to retain character of the locality	
	No large scale development between Nethybridge hotel and Mount View	7

Goldcrest	Their Option 3 suggests we need more open market/executive housing instead of existing woodland – this must be in doubt following the experience of the Eagle Star developments going through before CNP was up and running.	
Trees	Maximum number of trees should be retained in any developments, especially for screening purposes.	1
	There should be some control of species of trees planted for screening – fast growing hedging not suitable.	
Green areas	Imperative that green areas within the village are maintained, e.g. area between Mount View and Nethybridge hotel, football field and field adjacent in order to maintain character of village.	
Protect skyline	We must not lose the large field on the crest of the hill behind the Nethybridge Hotel to 'proud skyline' development	3
Community Facilities		
Paths	To be developed through Explore Abernethy Initiative	
Other Issues		
Boundary	Proposed settlement boundary should encompass the woodland at Lynstock	6 1 disagree
	The tight boundaries on the draft plan are a useful way to contain development	
	Village can expand out SE up Lettoch Road (Lynstock Field)	
Road Safety	Urgent need for pavement/footpath from the bridge to Broomhill court	1
	Clear need for footbridge alongside or near to the Nethy Bridge and extension to Broomhill Court.	
	Speed limit in centre of village should be 15 or 20 mph.	4
	Suggest speed limit restricted along the road by the school	1
	Footbridge required adjacent to Duack Bridge and footpath extended to village boundary south	2
	Road junction at top of Balnagowan would be unsafe	1
Chalet	The idea that a chalet park could help to free up houses for 'local purchase' may be flawed because the market may well not be a finite one.	
Boundary	Balnagowan Woods and the Golf Course should be included within the village boundary and protected.	
	The proposed settlement boundary should be the 'footprint' of the village, with no prospect of development, housing or otherwise, outwith the boundary for the lifetime of this plan.	5
Road Safety	All roads in CNP badly need trees cut back at least 12ft from side of road – this applies to the whole of Scotland	
Boundary	Why does the boundary at Dell Road exclude the two cottages between Talisker and the church?	
Comments collated by: Anna Barton		

Community Council Area		Newtonmore
Meeting & Date		Proposed Local Plan, 7.30, 14.06.05
Staff/Facilitators present		Norman Brockie, Anna Barton
Attendees		10
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Community	Agreed with all the yellow areas	
Environmental	See comment re landscaping under Housing above	

	Agreed with all the green areas	
Housing	Can landscaping and screening be erected before housing developments begin to protect views for tourist-led businesses?	
	How early can we get an idea of housing density and guarantees of planning reassurances that new developments will reflect traditional housing character?	
	Can developments be smaller, i.e. 3 or 4 houses?	
	No big housing estates	
Other	Will extra housing lend weight to regular appeals for serious traffic-calming measures on A86 especially – there is no footpath provision?	
	Reroute A86 and detrunk road through village	
	Footpath needed to Calder Bridge	
	Cycle path leads onto main road – can an off-road route be created?	
	Long term provision of water / sewage infrastructure to be clarified	
	Can the LP be shown on a fully up-to-date map?	
Comments compiled by:		Anna Barton

Community Council Area		Rothiemurchus & Glenmore
Meeting & Date		3 November 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Gavin Miles, Anna Barton, Bob Grant, Mary Ferguson
Attendance:		37
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Similar
Cambusmore	This would be OK, but needs a road bridge too.	
	Don't want Cambusmore – absolutely no need for any more houses.	1
	Cambusmore development is much bigger than envisaged. Feel the area proposed is too big, especially when compared to residential area of Aviemore.	2
	Does the Aviemore community have priority over that of Rothiemurchus and Glenmore when Cambusmore is being considered? If ACC wants it, perhaps they will push for a vehicular bridge to really integrate the new town as an extension to Aviemore town.	
	If we have a vehicular bridge, it will just be a suburb of Aviemore and we will lose the opportunity to have a planned community.	
H2	Housing here.	
H2	Sawmill site far better for residents than to be buried in a quarry. Sawmill is not a designated area.	2
Housing need	When the assessment of required housing for B&S was carried out, were the 100+ houses in Boat and Carr-bridge included?	
Tourism		
Cambusmore	How would the visual impact of a new town sprawled over the foothills of the Cairngorms affect the tourism industry on which this area largely depends?	
Environment		
Cambusmore	If developed, it would be a great area for outdoor pursuits, walks, biking, football pitches, cycle tracks, running tracks, etc.	2
Zoning	There is a paucity of environmental zoning around Inverdrue.	
Trees	Please protect the old trees which add to the visual amenity even if they are not truly native species.	1
Community		
St John's Hall	Should be encouraged and built.	1
	Should be built as it will provide a community centre which is lacking in this area.	
	R&G is geographically part of the Aviemore CC area, but is separate	

	and has its own independent community association.	
Cambusmore	To which settlement would Cambusmore be attached?	
Community Council map	R&G is part of the Aviemore CC area – the map doesn't show this clearly.	
Other Issues		
Infrastructure	Where does the water supply for such a large development come from?	1
New town	What socio-economic/educational impact would a new town in Badenoch and Strathspey have on the other settlements, which probably rightly expect the CNPA to secure the sustainability of all of these issues?	
Cycle track	Great idea, but who built it? Not a biker – who wants to stop every 25 m? Gravel infill a disaster.	2
	Gravel infill between cycle path and road is dangerous – needs a kerb instead.	7
	Bump in middle of road unnecessary – ridges on either side to slow cars would be better.	2
Light pollution	Unnecessary street lights in Inverdrue.	6
Map & Statement	Numbering of housing zones does not tally.	
Map	Track marked on map opposite Cambusmore (house) does not exist.	
Comments collated by:	Anna Barton	

Community Council Area		Tomintoul
Meeting & Date		7th October 2005
Staff/Facilitators present		Jean Henretty, Norman Brockie, Eleanor McIntosh, Sheila Thomson
Attendance:		23
Issue	Comments (and location, if applicable)	Ssimilar
	A small centre in Tomintoul would encourage visitor/business; while promoting the aims of the Park	
	Why do the Crown Estate not have to apply for planning consent for whatever purpose over a popular right of way, the Green Lane?	
	No development on agricultural land	
	What provision in the housing blocks has been made for affordable housing?	
	The square E1. it is very difficult to get any improvements made in the square because the Council says it is the Crown and vice versa.	
	Agree with policy of protecting commercial sites from being used as housing. Idea of a small retail/countryside centre outside Tomintoul since commercial sites on the main street are now housing except the school and filling station.	
	Camping/caravan site on site adjacent to Speyside way car park north of the village.	
	E5 could be a possible housing site - alleviate use of farm land	
	R2 – this should include sewage pipe work within village – existing too small.	
	The forest at the Lecht end of the village looks neglected, can it not be cleaned up and proper walks set up for tourists, locals etc.	
	Site on Lecht side of E5 road would be a better site for housing to also improve the entry to the village and would save farming land being used up all the time.	
	T1 chalets with caravans at the rear would be a good impression as well.	
	Consistency of building design within the settlement without making all buildings identical.	
	Concern about community use of C1 being against use and if same facilities C8 would no longer be required. All facilities for community in C8.	
	New housing plots should follow pattern and size of existing plots.	
	New development should be focused in one area at the back of B2 to reduce the visual impact and use of land. There is no demand for a new campsite. The site could be better used for houses. The water and sewage of this area has to be upgraded to ensure this view of the development can meet all the controls for today and the future. No extra doctors/fire services/police. No development on farm land. Road around the village needs to be upgraded for extra vehicles.	
Comments collated by:		Jean Henretty

COMMENTS ON THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (SEA)

PUBLIC BODIES

- Comments separate from initial Local Plan responses

GENERAL ORGANISATIONS

- Feel that the SEA is inadequate in that it has not detected potentially serious deleterious effects on the aims of the Park due to deficiencies in policy drafting.
- Design statement should be used as part of the assessment of the potentially harmful effects of the developments highlighted in paragraph 1.10 of the SEA Non-technical Summary.

ESTATES, LANDOWNERS & DEVELOPERS

The Process

- Believe that environmental problems be considered in balance with other issues including economic, social and cultural considerations.
- To say that developments must fit in with all policies is unreasonably restrictive.

Baseline Information

- Concern over the State of the Park Report being used as the environmental baseline for the SEA.

Baseline Facts and Trends

- Concern at the absence of any economic key baseline facts.
- Consider land use changes to be the dominant trend which in turn dictate changes in biodiversity, population structure and landscape.

Objectives, Indicators and Targets

- Concern over potential conflicts between objectives at different levels of jurisdiction over the land.
- Absence of an economic objective in the SEA, without an economic objective the SEA cannot assess the 4th aim of the Park.
- There is also an absence of a cultural objective, question therefore whether the SEA can competently assess the 1st aim of the Park.
- The SEA criteria as stated in **6.2** are largely irrelevant to conserving and enhancing the diversity of species and diversity of habitats, should be more than just "priority".
- It must be considered that to maintain catchment processes and hydrological systems it is inevitable that there will be "interference with natural fluvial processes".
- Consider **Figure 6.3** to be flawed.

Housing

- Each proposal for housing should be considered on its own merits.

Assessment of Plan Proposals

Semi Natural Habitats

- PAWS are not ancient woodland therefore consider it unreasonably restrictive to restrict housing development of these sites.

Identifying Sites for New Housing

- Sites should have been identified with reference to land owners and residents.
- Suggest lifting the presumption against new housing in the countryside
A Scottish Water providing water and sewerage facility is only one option.
- Little or no reference to woodland
- Paragraph 2.8 does not accord with paragraph 29 of SPP15.
- Paragraph 3.4 – the clear legal relationship between the draft Local Plan and the Structure Plan needs to be explained.
- Paragraph 4.1 and 4.3 – it is important that the guidance used is actually referenced.
- It is clear from paragraph 4.3 that Circular 2/04 and Schedule 2 to Regulation 16 has not been complied with.
- Paragraph 4.3 does not include identify any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan as is required by Schedule 2.
- Table 5.2 seems to equate issues to problems without any explanation.
- Paragraph 5.5 to 5.7 makes an unsupported assertion about existing planning policy and explains nothing so the reader has no way of knowing if the new policies are any different

in environmental effect from the existing policies.

- It is impossible to know whether Tables 6.1 and 6.2 intend to follow what is required in Schedule 2 para 5.
- The terms 'Positive and negative' effects should be used instead of terms like 'harmful' as set out in the Regulations.
- Para 4.15 is wrong according to the Regulations with confusion over impacts and effects.
- Use of the term 'issues' in the Local Plan deviates from the way this term is used in the Regulations.
- Paragraph 4.15 does not define the 5 categories as is required by good practice.
- It is essential that the categorisation and equation to significant is transparent otherwise the assessment conclusions in terms of significance are cast into doubt, as it is in this assessment.
- The explanations in **4.14, 4.15, 8.6** and **8.7** are completely insufficient in terms of good practice.
- The standard methods of assessing the significance of effects does not seem to have been followed, therefore seriously calling into question the results of the assessment.

In Conclusion

- The SEA does not comply with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (Scotland) Regs 2004 or with Planning Circular 2/04 on good practise
- The SEA lacks a suitable methodological basis and is difficult to follow. The basis is not transparent and makes a number of unsupported assertions.
- As a result no reliance can be placed on Chapter 7, 8 or 9.
- Disappointing that more account was not taken to the studies supporting the Cambusmore development.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

- **9.21** – Fails to indicate where the wetland it refers to is situated.
- **9.22** – This area should be zoned for later development (5 – 10 years out) if at all. Concern regarding the validity of the area designated as ancient woodland (see comment in relation to general policies) as this could affect the zoning outcome.
- Comments on Appendix 2 Policies 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Aviemore Housing Proposals

- 1 - Should also look at North Dalfaber, which was going to remove a lot of trees – Negative
- 5 – Hydrological systems should be negative
- 7 – Is not correct because **H3** will result in a total loss of informal access opportunities and is currently well used. – Negative
- 8 – Most of the developments in **H2** in Aviemore have already got planning permission. **H3** designation with number 8 should be a negative. Air quality is flawed as coal fires and oil CH can only exacerbate the problem especially during winter. Should be negative not neutral.
- 9 – used as a local amenity – negative not neutral.
- 11 – it will not sustain a healthy population, as in the case of H2, the infrastructure required increases the price of housing taking it outwith the scheme for locals – neutral rather than negative.

Aviemore, Business, Tourism, Community & Environmental Proposals

- B2 & B4 should be negative.
- Objective 2 - B2 & B4 should be negative, cannot be both.
- Ecosystems should be negative.
- 6 – should be negative
- 7 – should be negative
- 8 – should be 'not known'
- 9 – should be neutral
- 11 – should be positive
- 12 – should be positive
- 13 & 14 – should be question marks

Cambusmore

- 8 – same as air quality, should be negative
- 10 – should be question mark
- 12 - should be a question mark only

- 13 & 14 – should be positive because it is to be done to support this objective to comply with the policies in the Local Plan

Rothiemurchus and Glenmore H2

- 7 – Should be negative because they are taking something away. Removing access opportunity is negative.
- 9 – Should be negative because it is taking something away.
- 10 – should be positive
- 11 – should be positive
- 12 – should be positive
- 13 – should be positive
- Been very difficult project and expresses appreciation for work done.
- Conflict of Aims make it impossible to come to mutually agreeable policy conclusions.
- Policy 2 – Protected wild species is n/a – what about common ones?
- Deer Culling and white-tails – says does not actively improve conditions.
- Policy 3 – Landscape character – need to read recent Geomorphology? technical term? Enhance historic environment? Does this mean mown grass and notices?
- 3a – Soils – a wake up call but survey not a full one
- Policy 4 – Concentrate developments in towns and villages
- Policy 5 – objectives and alternatives Sustainable Design Guide – scoring? is this objective?
- Policy 6 – Natura 2000 and Ramsar Sites – why so many n/a?

INDIVIDUALS

- Feel that the word “responsible” should be dropped when talking about access.
- The first aim of the park should take priority over the other aims.
- Paragraph 1.9 of the non-technical summary – if this is the case and such harmful effects cannot be avoided then there should be other actions created which have a positive environmental effect to offset them. This might be by creating 2nd tier conservation sites, such as Local Nature Reserves and footpath networks.
- The 1st and 2nd objectives of the draft SEA – This should be the first consideration in the Local Plan, and in this case applied to proposed zone **H2** in the Boat of Garten Local Plan. **Mitigation measures 9.34** should be applied and **H2** removed from the Local Plan for housing.
- A major omission is zoning for developments or activities other than buildings, e.g. sensitivity of different areas to developments such as tree plantations, vehicle tracks and others, it is fundamental to most National Parks.

Suggest the following:

- Rewording on para 1.8 page ii
- Rewording on para 1.9, 1.10 page iii
- Grammar para 3.4 page 5
- Rewording & grammar para 4, 4.4, 4.5 page 11
- Rewording and grammar para 4.6, 4.9 page 12
- Rewording para 4.25 page 15
- Rewording Figure 5.1 page 17 & 18
- Discrepancy Map 5.7 Page 22
- Rewording Figure 5.2 page 23
- Rewording and grammar para 5.4 page 24
- Grammar Para 5.7 page 25
- Rewording Figure 6.1 page 27
- Grammar and rewording figure 6.2 page 28 & 29
- Clarification and word insertion figure 6.3 page 30
- Rewording para 7.6 page 35
- Grammar and rewording para 9.7, 9.9, 9.10 page 44
- Points to consider , rewording & grammar table 9.1, para 9.12, 9.15, 9.17 page 46
- Grammar para 9.18 page 47
- Word order para 9.363 page 48
- Clarification para 9.35 page 49
- Use of term para 9.37 page 49
- Word substitution and order para 9.38 page 49
- Use of words para 9.46 page 50

- Rewording para 10.2 & 10.4 page 53
 - Grammar, word clarification appendix 1 page 1
 - Points to consider, grammar appendix 1 page 2
 - Rewording appendix 1 page 7
 - Points to consider appendix 1 page 8
 - Grammar appendix 1 page 11
 - Nothing on advertisement signs within Appendix 1.
 - Points to consider appendix 2 page 5 – General Policy 1
 - Points to consider appendix 2 page 8 – General Policy 2
 - Rewording & grammar appendix 2 page 12 – General Policy 4
 - Clarification and word use appendix 2 page 13 – General Policy 5
 - Word use appendix 2 page 14 – General Policy 5
 - Word use appendix 2 page 15 – Policy 1
 - Points to consider appendix 2 page 19 – Policy 3
 - Points to consider & rewording appendix 2 page 21 – Policy 3a (RM9)
 - Rewording appendix 2 page 22 - Policy 3a (RM9)
 - Grammar wording appendix 2 page 43 – Policy 14
 - Grammar appendix 2 page 49 – Policy 17
 - Points to consider & grammar – appendix 2 page 50 – Policy 17
 - Clarification & points to consider appendix 2 page 63 – Policy 23
 - Points to consider and word use appendix 2 page 65 – Policy 24
 - Points to consider appendix 2 Policy 24
 - Word use appendix 2 page 73 – Policy 28
 - Clarification & point to consider appendix 2 page 75 – Policy 29
 - Points to consider, grammar appendix 2 page 106 – Proposal 1
 - Grammar appendix 2 page 113 – 1a
 - Points to consider & word use/order appendix 2 page 119 – 1c
 - Word use appendix 2 page 120 – 1c
 - Word order appendix 2 page 121 – 1c
 - Word use & grammar appendix 2 page 122 – Boat of Garten
 - Grammar appendix 2 page 123 – Boat of Garten
 - Grammar & points to consider appendix 2 page 125 – Carrbridge
 - Word use & points to consider appendix 2 page 126 – Carrbridge
 - Grammar & word use appendix 2 page 131 – Dulnain Bridge
 - Word use and repetition appendix 2 page 133 – Grantown
 - Word use appendix 2 page 134 – Dulnain Bridge
 - Word use appendix 2 page 144 – Nethybridge
- Rewording appendix 2 page 161 - 18a

Summary of additional specific comments on the SEA Report.

Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)

- **Section 1** – non tech summary is clear and useful
- **3.16 – 4.32** – clear explanation of approaches and methods used and difficulties encountered is helpful.
- **Section 4** – Practical interactions between SEA and Natura should be explained in this section. Noting should SEA identify any likely significant effects on Natura or European Protected Species an appropriate assessment will be required at Local Plan stage.
- Useful to state explicitly in Sections 8 & 9 whether any such effects have been identified in this assessment and if so, where appropriate assessments can be found. Note that from responses to SEA and Local Plan that SNH consider wording of policies/settlement allocations could lead to significant effects on Natura interests or EPS. May be addressed by altering policies / allocations in line with SNH recommendations to mitigate / avoid likely significant effects.
- **Para 4.16** – Some future sites for housing (FH1 Glenmore) and some sites subject to live applications (LA1 & LA2 Nethy Bridge) do not appear to have been assessed in Section 9 and Appendix 2. Would be useful to assess at this stage. Also useful to state in this paragraph whether or not they have been assessed.
- **Section 5** – Disappointed previous comments on Fig 5.1 and 5.2 have not been incorporated.
- **Figure 6.2** – Welcome incorporation of almost all previous comments into draft SEA objectives and criteria. Note that the need to protect and enhance wild land has not been included. Strongly recommend that wild land is explicitly incorporated within Objective 6.
- **Figure 6.3** – Note the draft indicators and targets and that further work is proposed. Guidance on developing appropriate monitoring arrangements in various sources of best practice guidance on SEA is available.
 - Useful to assess increases/decreases in disturbance to species and damage to habitats in addition to loss of both.
 - More meaningful to assess changes in habitat condition, or possibly area under habitat enhancement works, rather than increased management of habitats.
 - Recommend inclusion of target for no loss or damage to important geological and geomorphological features.
 - Welcome inclusion of wild land in indicators and targets.
- **Section 7** – Approach seems sensible and accept in practice that few strategic alternatives were considered as a result of strong policy context created by NP. Were any alternatives considered to Policy 20A?
- **Para 7.6** – Text could be revised to make clearer that it is not simply the presence or absence of a designation that makes a site suitable/unsuitable for development.
- **Section 8 – General Comments -**
 - a) Assessments are clearly presented and generally well reasoned, although suggest improvements as detailed below.
 - b) Accept general rationale for the judgements of significance. May be reasonable to predict some specific policies, particularly those concerning housing. Useful to consider cumulative effects of housing related policies. Useful to clarify that the definition 'significant' used here for SEA purposes seems to be different to that used for Natura purposes. Advise that any effects on Natura qualifying features or EPS identified through SEA should be considered for 'likely significant effects' that would trigger need for appropriate assessment under Conservation Regulations.
 - c) Assessment of policies do not seem to incorporate the SEA criterion about conserving geodiversity under Objective 6. Policies 3a, 10 & 14 – 17 could have effects on geodiversity which have not been identified. Several policy assessments don't seem to have used the criterion under Objective 6 re: allocating sites for development with the greatest capacity to absorb it. Expected policies 26, 28, 29, 30, 31e, 35d & 39 to be assessed for negative effects against this. Recommend that both these criteria are used in assessments in next version of Environmental Report.
 - d) Strongly recommend that there are clear statements early in the Local Plan about the need for development proposals to comply with all relevant policies and about

which policies take precedence in cases of conflict. Assumed that cross-compliance is required for individual proposals but any likely cumulative effects on SEA criteria from repeated application of policy need to be assessed in the Environmental Report.

- e) There are few policies predicted to have a positive effect on SEA Objective 7 (responsible access for all)– consider rewording some policies to have positive effect on this objective. eg. policies 26, 28, 29, 37 – 39.
- f) The potential for cumulative negative effects on Objectives 1 – 7 from repeated application of the 'enabling' policies such as 26, 28, 29, 39 in parts of the Park covered by General Policy 1 has been under-estimated in the Report.
- **Section 8 – Specific Comments –**
- **General Policy 1** – Policy appears to create presumption in favour of development in the areas it covers and outlines circumstances in which adverse impacts on the Park will be deemed acceptable, countered to some extent by the criteria in Table 2.1. It seems as though the repeated application of the caveated presumption in favour of development could be predicted to result in cumulative negative effects on most SEA objectives and criteria. Negative effects could be reduced by rewording the policy in line with our response to the Local Plan consultation.
- **General Policy 4** – Second paragraph provides a basis for development outwith settlement boundaries, caveated by need to comply with other plan policies and consideration of the overall merit of the proposal. Seems as though repeated application of policy could result in cumulative negative effects on most SEA objectives and criteria. Negative effects could be reduced by rewording the policy in line with our response to the Local Plan consultation.
- **General Policy 5** - As worded policy is unclear about the extent to which different types of developments must comply with which sustainable principles and consequences of non compliance with some of the principles for development control decisions. The assessment is too positive. Policy could be brought in to line with the assessment by following alterations in our response to the Local Plan consultation.
- **Policy 4 & Para 8.26** – Strongly support draft Local Plan policy as written, and do not support proposal in the Environmental Report for modifying the policy.
- **Policy 12** – Concerned about potential for this policy re: cumulative negative impacts on water quality. No potential negative effects have been identified in the assessment. Negative effects could be mitigated by amending policy to indicate that private sewage treatment facilities will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. Note related comments on settlements Dinnet, Braemar and Para 9.45.
- **Policy 20A** – Policy is worded to not allow for any alternatives to undergrounding. Not clear what solution should be if undergrounding may create more damage to Parks special qualities than overhead lines. Due to lack of clarity there is potential for this policy to have negative effects on several Objectives eg. 1-6.
- **Policy 21** – Unclear why several of natural heritage related objectives scored as '/'. Could be positive effects from presumption against commercial renewables and possible cumulative negative effects if there were a large number of small scale renewables or biomass plants – points to an overall score of '=' or '-/+'. Presumption against commercial renewables has a wider negative effect beyond the Park on criterion to reduce fossil fuel consumption in Objective 9 and should be scored accordingly.
- **Policy 22** – Unclear why several of natural heritage related objectives scored as '/'. Part c of policy could have negative effects on several objectives but part d could have positive effects on objective 6. Negative effects could be tackled by clarifying need for compliance with all relevant policies and need to consider and avoid cumulative negative effects.
- **Policy 23, 26, 28 & 29** – All policies seem to have presumption to certain types of development. Could all have cumulative negative effects on a number of criteria under objectives 1-7. Negative effects could be reduced and positive effects increased if policies reworded in line with our response to LP.
- **Policy 30** – Part c as worded could have negative effect on natural heritage objectives. These effects are not currently identified in the assessment. Could be reduced by modifying policy to have greater controls over location and design so Park qualities are not adversely affected.
- **Policy 31 part e and Policy 35 part d** – appear to have presumption in favour of retail/commercial and business developments outwith settlements that are for specific operation relative to the site. Could lead to negative effects on natural heritage objectives particularly landscape. These negative effects have not been identified in the

assessments. Could be reduced by stating that retail/commercial and business developments outwith settlements will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and outlining criteria with which they must comply, inc. no alternative site available within settlement, no significant adverse impacts on Parks special qualities, adherence to best practice in location design etc.

- **Policy 38** – Likely to have negative effects on open green space (Objective 7) and wildlife corridors within settlements(3) which have not been identified in this assessment.
- **Policy 39** – As written appears to allow anyone who has worked in area for 3 years and inadequately housed to build a house outwith a settlement – Could result in significant number of houses could have cumulative negative effect on a number of natural heritage objectives. These have not been identified in this assessment. Could be reduced by adopting alteration to policy as in our response to LP.
- **Policy 41** – Not clear whether criteria in policy 40 also applies to proposals in policy 41. If they do not, likely to be effect on Bats which will require appropriate assessment. Also likelihood of negative effects on objective 1.
- **Section 9** – Note approach taken to assessment of significance of effects and agree it seems reasonable.
- **Section 9 –Aviemore business.** proposal B4 would have negative effects on ancient woodland and access (objectives 2, 3, 6 and possibly 1). These effects are not mentioned in Assessment appendix 2 – could be avoided by removing allocation.
- **Cromdale & Balmenach** – Allocations H1 & H3 are likely to have negative effect on objective 2 – could be mitigated by following our recommendation to LP.
- **Dalwhinnie** – Allocations H1, H2 & H7 would all have negative effects on obj 6. These have not been identified in the assessment and could be mitigated by following our recommendation to LP.
- **Kincraig** – Agree assessment H2 & 3 will have significant negative effects on objective 6 and note these allocations are contrary to finding in recent 'landscape capacity for housing' study. Recommend these allocations are reconsidered with a view to avoiding these effects. If allocations are retained need a justification of housing need in this area is required.
- **Newtonmore** – Agree with assessment that H1 & 2 will have significant negative effects on objective 6 note these allocations are contrary to finding in recent 'landscape capacity for housing' study. Do not agree that proposed mitigation would significantly reduce the adverse impacts of the loss of substantial and prominent areas of generally flat agricultural land in the Strath – this being a key component of local landscape character. Recommend allocations are significantly reduced/moved to areas located in housing capacity study. If allocations are retained need a justification of housing need in this area is required.
- **Tomintoul** – Allocations H1, H2, H3, H4, T1 & B2 will all have negative effects on objective 6. These are not identified in the assessment. Have included suggestions for mitigation and avoidance in response to LP.
- **Dinnet / Deeside & Cromar** – R1 could have negative effects to objectives 1 – 5. Possibility could have significant effect on River Dee SAC – especially regarding freshwater pearl mussels. Proposal could add to cumulative levels of phosphorus. Recommend CNPA consider whether an appropriate assessment is required at this stage and possible mitigation measures.
- **18 a Braemar** – Significance of negative effects of H2 on objective 6 have been understated in the Environmental Report and do not consider the mitigation proposals would effective or appropriate. Agree with housing capacity study for Braemar. Note part H1 is located on ancient woodland and recommend negative effects are mitigated by protecting area as stated in our response to LP.
- **18 b Braemar** – Consider likely negative effects of T1 on objective 6 have been understated. Effects could be reduced by following recommendation as stated in our response to LP. Allocation could impact on qualifying features within River Dee SAC, particularly any otter. Proposals for site would need to be examined for managing effluent and potential effects on SAC. Recommend CNPA consider whether an appropriate assessment is required at this stage and possible mitigation measures.
- **Para 9.43 – 9.44** – Support comments about potential cumulative effects of housing allocations on water abstraction from Loch Einich. Strategic appraisal of future water supply options for Badenoch & Strathspey would be welcome and could be supported in LP or Env Report.
- **Para 9.45** – as noted in comments on policy 12 concerned about potential for cumulative

negative effects on objectives 4 & 5 and aquatic species and habitats covered by objectives 1, 2 & 3 from an increase in effluent discharge into watercourses as a result of both an additional 1400 homes and the proposed policy of permitting private waste water treatment facilities. Variety of negative effects are possible inc. biodiversity/ecosystems/River Dee & Spey SACs and could be discussed in this paragraph. Concern about even low level phosphorus affecting freshwater pearl mussel populations. Any such possible effects should be explicitly identified in assessments of proposals at Dinnet, Braemar and Ballater. Further research required to understand critical thresholds in phosphorus levels and relative significance of various possible sources, inc. effluent from sewage treatment infrastructure. Better understanding of effectiveness of possible solutions eg. different types of secondary treatment is required. Useful for LP to support secondary sewage treatment for developments close to these River SACs and tributaries. Support for research and incorporation into future Plans would be welcome. Recommend CNPA consider whether an appropriate assessment for cumulative impacts of additional housing and private waste water treatment infrastructure is required at this stage and possible mitigation measures.

- **Section 9** – understand overall scale of allocations for housing will be subject to review before deposit LP following receipt of housing needs analysis. Additional review is welcome as concerned about large scale allocations in current draft LP and potential for significant cumulative impacts on natural heritage especially landscapes and habitats after 2 or 3 decades if this scale of housing growth was to be repeated over successive 5 year LP periods. At deposit stage would be useful to explain scale of allocations with respect to housing need analysis and identify longer term trends and start to map out longer term strategy to cater for these needs.
- **Appendix 1** – This assessment of the extent to which the LP incorporates and reflects national and regional policy and legislation is useful. Also worth describing the outcome of this assessment within the main body of the report, indicating it will result in some changes to next draft of LP.

Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)

- Consider that specific linkages could be made to the National Waste Strategy, the National Waste plan and relevant Local Authority Waste Plans or Strategies.

Baseline information

- Feel that the summary could be further improved by including information such as the current trends showing the situation to be getting better or worse.
- Table 5.1 could be refined with relevant data used to support the assertion of "relatively low atmospheric pollution".
- Datasets have not been used to inform the assessment, (including groundwater issues, flooding, contaminated land, waste management etc) that these have not been incorporated into the Key Baseline Facts section.

SEA Criteria

- Consider that there is scope for further improvements particularly to targets and indicators set. E.g. Objective 4 – linked targets and indicators could be more specific in order to be more effective.
- Consider that the target of "all developments consented with SUDS" is not the only way for waterbody status to be maintained or improved, and reference could also be made to the need to minimise impacts from foul drainage systems and engineering works in or around waterbodies.
- Any targets or indicators incorporated into the Sustainable Design Guide should be precise and measurable and have clear linkages to relevant plans or programmes.
- Objective 8 would benefit from criteria which relate to sustainable waste management particularly if there area nor criteria or targets currently set relating to waste management.
- Further clarification is needed relating to how many targets will be achieved.

Assessment of Policies

- Policy 11 – does not consider that the policy as it stands provides folly for protection of the water environment and catchment and hydrological processes. The policy does not include any criteria with regard to the environmental impact of abstractions. Therefore as it stands the policy will at best have an unknown (?) effect or even a negative (-) effect on the water environment and hydrological systems.
- Policy 18 – regarding the potential effects of contaminated land on the water environment in terms of potential pollution of ground or surface waters, consider that this policy would have an unknown (?) or negative(-) effect on the water environment. In terms of Objective 4
- Policy 19 – regarding that the waste management hierarchy promotes the sustainable use of resources by reducing use of materials, reusing and recycling, consider that the assessment should be amended to reflect this interaction. Consider that this policy should have an uncertain (?) or positive (+) effect on the sustainable use of objective 9.

Policy Issues Not Addressed in the Plan

- No policy on air quality – the SEA is the most appropriate forum for consideration of this issue.
- There is minimum recognition of air quality in the wider context of policies considered in the SEA.

Assessment of Allocations

- There appear to be a few sites that are at risk of flooding that have not ben picked up in the SEA as having potential impact on catchment and hydrological systems, these are:
- Ballater – H1 & H2
- Rothiemurchus & Glenmore – H3
- Dalwhinnie – H5, H6, H7
- The recognition in section 9.43 -9.45 regarding uncertainty associated with the effect of housing allocations on water supply in terms of catchment processes and waterbody status, does not appear to be reflected in the detailed assessment matrices for the allocations.

Monitoring of the Environmental Effects of the Local Plan

Consider that there is scope for the indicators to be made more specific to be more effective.

Historic Scotland

- **Non Technical Summary** – language used in NTS provides clear description of purpose of SEA and the steps undertaken throughout environmental assessment.
- **Methodology** – Noted the data limitations and difficulties encountered.
- **Predicted Baseline & Issues** – Content with baseline data for historic environment shown in Table 5.1 and maps 5.5, 5.6 & 5.7.
- **Table 5.2** – pleased to note some of the issues raised in HS response to scoping report have been incorporated. Content with trends and key issues identified for historic environment.
- **Table 5.1** – includes data for listed buildings however trend information in Table 5.2 describes decay of listed buildings as a trend for there built environment parameter. Table 5.1 data for Conservation Areas appears in both historic environmental and built heritage topics. Understand there will be some overlap however, would be helpful to give clearer explanation of the features that are considered for these parameters.
- **SEA Objectives, indicators and targets** –
- **Figure 6.2** – Assume 'archaeological sites' includes sites of national, regional and local importance. Also assumed effects on listed buildings are considered by the SEA objective for the built environment from the 'maintain character of settlements' and 'prevent loss of locally distinctive architecture' criteria, but would welcome clarification.
- **Figure 6.3** – 'archaeological sites of interest' could be further defined.
- **Figure 6.3** – an indicator that considers effects on listed buildings could be included (also maybe consider monitoring developments that have positive effects on listed buildings and their settings) A target for listed buildings could then be included.
- **Local Plan Strategic Alternatives** – Note that strategic options for housing and locations of housing will be in next draft LP as projection data for population is not yet available. Note this will be included in environmental assessment.
- **Assessment of Plan Policies** –
- Assessment matrix is thorough.
- **Policy 20A** – Impacts on archaeological sites can be mitigated through the careful planning and routing of underground cabling.
- **Policy 24** – Not clear if assessment has considered potential effects from the use and upgrade of existing tracks, as policy seems to focus on new tracks.
- **Policy 26** – Agree policy is unlikely to have significant effects on historic environment. However, may be links between agricultural diversification and potential to re-use redundant traditional farm buildings. This may have positive effects on the historic environment if their character is protected and this could be noted in the assessment.
- **Appendix 2** – Understanding from detailed assessment is that the application of all relevant LP policies to a development decision will mitigate any significant environmental effects that may arise from some Plan policies eg. 20A, 37, 38 & 39. Would be helpful to explain this assumption of cross-compliance more clearly in the Environmental Report.
- **Assessment of Plan Proposals** –
- Assessment of allocations is easy to follow and well presented. Detailed comments are helpful.
- **Braemar – allocation H3** – agree assessment of impacts on the built heritage is unknown. However as the site includes a Category V listed building (former Bluebird bus/GNER depot) and a non listed traditional row of workshops/cottages, the assessment could highlight the potential for sympathetic re-use of these buildings, which may have positive effects on the built heritage.
- **Braemar – allocation C2** – Assessment could note that this site includes a Category B listed building (Castleton Hall) and recognise the need to protect its character and garden setting.
- **Donside – allocation T1** – Have concerns that any development in this area could significantly alter the setting of the Doune of Invernochty creating a suburban feel to its environs. It is our view that the allocation may have negative effects on the historic environment.
- **Glenlivet Minmore - community allocation** – area immediately adjacent to Blairfindy Castle zoned for community use – LP notes that areas have been identified to be protected from development as they make a positive contribution to the visual and recreational amenity of the village, we presume this applies to the community allocation. Clarification would be welcome on this point.

Where mitigation measures have been suggested it will be important for the CNPA to ensure that these are taken forward at the appropriate stage.

North East Mountain Trust

- **General comments** – think could be improved by CNPA adopting zoning strategy. Would simplify any environmental assessment and easier to understand for lay readers.
- **Page 17** – High proportion of undisturbed soils (only 2% cultivated) – presumably this refers to present use. What about semi-disturbed soils?
- **Page 18** – Suggest more prominence given to the areas status in a UK context.
- **Page 18** – this is quoted as the baseline section. Acid rain pollution now declining should baseline acknowledge this ongoing change? Should it be taken as before extensive acid rain pollution?
- **Page 23** – Key trend at moment is removal of NNR status – unfortunately this trend seems to be gathering momentum.
- **Page 23** – Soil erosion should also refer to impacts of forestry, agricultural and sporting practices. Soil erosion will also have effect on water courses causing increased sediment in the run-off.
- **Page 24 – Section 5.4** – on Limitations Data seems overstated. Data has been collected to different standards in the past, but does this significantly affect our ability to use this data.
- **Page 27** – Need to be careful about setting “enhancing diversity of species and habitats” as objectives. Suggest emphasis given to conserving rather than enhancing.
- **Page 43** – Pleased to see reference to proposed zonings for development.
- **Page 46** – Any proposed new community would have significant consequences on NP as opposed to developments centred on existing communities. Te CNPA needs to work up a start position on this issue before it is proposed.
- **Appendix 1, Page 2** – Should only encourage “mix of tree species” if that mix is appropriate to that part of the NP. Some areas of NP are only suitable for one species.
- **Appendix 1, Page 7** – Should promote natural regeneration of woodland before new planting.
- **Appendix 1, Page 8** – Can’t understand how promoting tourism development could lead to environmental improvement.
- **Appendix 2** – Add a policy on advertising signs.
- **Appendix 2, General Policy 1** – his policy would be enhanced and simplified by adopting some form of zoning.
- **Appendix 2, Policy 3** – Policy needs to be clearer that compensation of lost interests is inferior to preserving interests in the first place.
- **Appendix 2, Policy 24** – Needs to be strengthened in light of current pace of bulldozing footpaths to form new vehicle hill tracks.

Highland Council

- **General –**
- **Local Plan Strategic Alternatives –**
- Report acknowledges fact that key forecast do not yet underpin Local Plan – possibly as a result it's difficult to assimilate the SEA with a *strategic* assessment. The effect is a selective assessment of the land allocated and the impact of development on a site by site basis with little deference to alternative strategies or choices at local level. Therefore does not appear to embrace structural impacts attaching to travel and accessibility for example which bear upon the environmental effects of the plan.
- **Assessment of local Plan Proposals –**
- Concern expressed in report about expansion of existing settlements but reluctance to embrace the necessity and effects of Cambusmore in mitigating the effects identified.
- Impacts identified in Boat of Garten, Carrbridge and Kincaig further emphasis the value of a new community in maintaining their ambience and character as well as the economic prospects.
- In local context SEA represents a critique of commitments made in the Adopted Local Plan; no deference to other land adjoining settlements where subject to physical factors/designations there may be choice for direction of growth.
- Avoiding loss of woodland inventory sites is a desirable objective only.
- In the round must be set against wider sustainability objectives re: Nethy Bridge sites H2 & 3 given permission.

- That the LP proposals have no significant positive effects is untenable.
- Table in 1.10 is founded on prejudiced view of visual impact of development. Effects are overstated and failure to appreciate the dynamics of development and opportunities available to the Planning Authority to control the rate at which land is taken up for building. Such measures are material to perceptions.
- Tenor and weight afforded to development carries a lack of appreciation of opportunities which development has for improving the appearance of settlements, setting and public access.
- Should be recognition of the overriding pattern of settlement; the arrangement of villages and infrastructure on the floor of the strath, below 300m and above the flood plain.
- **Predicted Environmental Baseline and Issues -**
- **Para 5.3 – Fig 5.2: Population** – Key Trends should refer to ‘the loss of young people and the workforce’ and Key Issues as ‘implications for the economy and sustainable communities’. Built Environment should refer to ‘economic growth and services’ in addition to housing and ‘the rate and scale of development and land availability/infrastructure’ as Key Issues. Landscape should refer to flood plain. Access should refer to ‘Trunk Road/other main roads/railway’.
- **Para 5.7** – Would dispute that the Adopted Local Plan is inconsistent with Aims of Park.
- **Policy 1 – Natura and Ramsar Sites** – these sites are protected under general polices 1 & 3. CNPA may wish to consider whether this policy is necessarily required.
- **Policy 2 Protected Species** – As policy 1 - If legal protection is in place CNPA may wish to consider the requirement for this policy. Second last box of this table refers to active promotion of improving the conditions of protected species. It is not in remit of LP, according to SPP1, to actively promote any improvement in the conditions for protected species. LP can conserve the habitat but SPP1 does not suggest active promotion.
- **Policy 4 Landscape** – Landscape policy in objective 11 says ‘it is possible that development proposals that would provide housing or services would not be permitted’ this must result in a negative effect rather than uncertain.
- **Policy 22 & 23: Integrated Transport Network and Roadside Facilities on the A9** – A policy that supports development of facilities must have the potential to have an effect on species, habitats, ecosystems and landscape and cultural character of the Park. CNPA may wish to re-consider the effects these policies may have. Under objective 11 does the policy ‘ensure’ or ‘imply’ that access to services will be considered in planning decisions? Should be made clear.
- **Policy 29 & 30** – Potential to have some effect on the historic environment and the quality of the built environment. Also potential impacts on species, habitats, ecosystems and landscape and cultural character of the park: therefore should be scored = rather than N/A.
- **Policies 37 and 39** – if housing were to be built using local timber products then it could have a positive effect on **Objective 9**.
- **1a Aviemore Housing** – Part of **B2** is Brownfield site, development and landscaping on these areas could have a positive impact on landscape and habitat restoration.
- **1b Aviemore Business etc** – **B4** and its impacts appears to be afforded no assessment as part of the SEA. Deleting the allocation **B2** should be considered in this context.

1c Cambusmore

- Cambusmore should be seen as a balanced sustainable settlement with scope to contribute in strategic terms to the economy and related social needs.
- **Objective 5** – discharge of effluent will have to meet the standards of the Regulatory Authority, also the area identified in the adopted local plan does not carry a flood risk.
- **Objective 6** – a strategic development which accords in strategic terms with the established pattern of settlement.
- **Objective 7** .the association of development with Aviemore will be determined by many other factors including the flood plain and landform. Cambusmore must open up a major public access opportunity.
- **Objective 11** – there can be no doubt that Cambusmore is vital to maintaining a sustainable and healthy population.
- There is no explanation as to why Cambusmore is not subject to an assessment as other land allocations.

Boat of Garten

- There is insufficient land allocated in Boat of Garten if **LA1** and **H2** are deleted.
- The SEA should address the relative merits of alternatives.
- That the allocations are acknowledged as having no capacity is not accepted.

- The impact of a visible community in a middle distance view (**6-14**) can be addressed by design and possibly mitigating measures on intervening land. The capacity to see development in the landscape should not be given a negative rating.
- The admission that land allocated will affect "locally" important habitats needs a strategic reference as does the weight attached to "minor significant negative effects"
- How does this assessment lead to the conclusion that **H2** may need to be deleted?

Carrbridge

- **H1-H3** – it is not appropriate to conclude that a large part of Carrbridge's woodland setting will be lost (**6**). This will continue to frame the community to the South and East.
- **Objective 7** - It is within the capacity of good design to embrace and improve public access and amenities.
- The connectivity of the proposals **H1** and **H2** with the village and their associations with **E2** whilst deferring to the planning permission – should be given further thought.

Kincraig

- The effect of **H4** on the wetland is not explained (**3/4**)
- The conclusion in Objective 6 that no sites have the capacity to absorb development cannot be justified. It is **H2** and **H3** that would cause detriment.

Kingussie

- **Objective 6** - There are inconsistencies in the outcomes for significant expansion of certain settlements. I.e. concern over impact of development at Boat of Garten and Newtonmore but not at Kingussie where building would be more elevated and exposed to view.
- The decision to dispense with land to the west of the village restricts choice and the opportunity to balance the community. The importance of such land as habitats needs a strategic context.

Nethybridge

- It is not accepted that sites **H1-H3** are likely to have significant effects on the local landscape or the settlement character. Both accord with the linear structure of the community and do not breach the woodland setting.

Newtonmore

- The impact of development on the west edge if Newtonmore **H1 & H2** should be differentiated.
- The option in the previous Local Plan of development in the fields north east of **H1** has not been assessed.
- The challenge in Newtonmore should be to design a compatible expansion – integrating trees within a layout enabling a good mix of accommodation and densities and securing early commitments to structural planting – **Objective 14**.

Coylumbridge

The large scale Brownfield site – The Quarry, Inverdrue – is omitted as an option. The adopted Local Plan identifies a strategic visitor role for this location at the gateway to Glenmore/Cairngorm.