



CNPA Consultation

21 February 2018 at 22:49

Please accept my comments as requested

Response to the CNPA Consultation

Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan 2020

INSH Village

I do not understand much of the meaning behind the words throughout this massive document and am rather bemused by the references to Insh. I am a long term resident of Insh, having moved here from Aviemore in 1973, and have been perplexed by successive plans from Inverness County Council, Highland Regional Council, Highland Council, and now the Cairngorms National Park.

However, in direct response to issues raised on page 107 I submit the following thoughts.

A. Do I agree with the proposed settlement objectives?

Is the economy of INSH really based on tourism & outdoor leisure? If it is because nearly 50% of the houses do not have permanent residents i.e holiday homes, then the answer must be yes. Exactly what are the outdoor leisure facilities to be found in Insh Village? I do not refer here to the wonderful countryside around Insh, or the wider Parish, as the focus of the document seems to be on the settlement of Insh Village.

Economic growth in the village has grown more in the last 6 months than in the previous 30 years with the advent of superfast broadband enabling more folk to run businesses from home. This has happened with minimal (and at times, negative) support from the KVCC. The village has its own contact list for ALL residents, including an email list of all those with internet connection. (There are a couple of people who choose not to be on this list or do not subscribe to the internet.) To further enhance the sense of a shared community, the village also has its own closed Facebook group.

What exactly does 'organic development' mean. I don't know.

B. Do I agree with the protected open spaces?

From what is the land protected? I agree wholeheartedly with the idea of protected space and with the areas proposed. However, the area immediately behind Skara Brae and Cluanach is a bog and not really accessible to the residents. What threatens that area? Should not the land immediately to the south of that not also be protected? Is protection not proposed because someone might wish to build on it in the future? There is a footpath crossing the field so it is used by the community.

Why are those two pieces of land at the eastern end protected and not other areas throughout the village?

Why is none of the land on the north side protected? Does all of it already have special designations such as SSSI or is it registered crofting land and hopefully protected by the Crofters Commission? That is not clear to me on this plan. Who owns this land?

C. Do I agree with the proposed settlement boundary?

Has the Insh site THC001 already been allocated? Is it in Insh at all? This is relevant to the question about the proposed settlement boundary.

What is the purpose of the settlement boundary? Who decided, when, and how, this line was drawn on the map? The boundary along the north side of the B970 is a very squiggly line that seems to have changed over the years, defying my understanding. For example, the last house on the north side going east is now included, the settlement boundary going round the property boundary. I have no objection to either the house or the boundary but it was not there until the house was built. Does that mean that the boundary can change at any time? Would, in the fullness of time, the site THC001 be incorporated into the boundary, including that strip of land between the boundary and THC001. In that case, why not Singita or Waney Edge? I have no objection to either, either way, but do not understand how the boundary is decided or, as stated, what the purpose of the boundary is. Did anyone from the National Park actually look at the natural lines on the ground? Why does the boundary not extend down to old road (now rarely used) below the village or even down to the 'canal'?

At least the southern and western boundaries are straight and nearly follow clear fence lines. But does it not in some places cut through private gardens? The map scale and line thickness does not clearly show the line. Why does it extend so far from the housing line unlike the northern boundary?

These are just my thoughts.

Raymond Green

