

# CNP Local Development Plan 2020

## COMMENTS

S. Macdonald  
Carrbridge Resident  
Feb 2018

### Carrbridge Section

#### General

1. The plan initially appears confusing with 'not preferred – Alternative Site Options' identified on the plans.  
It would greatly assist understanding of the 'Local Development Plan 2020' if these 'not preferred' sites were not identified on the overall map, but they should be left in the background information as discussion points.
2. THC067 – Curling Pond.  
This is not a 'Former' nor 'Disused' Curling pond.  
Please amend your documentation.

#### Site Ref./Comments

##### **THC033 or H1** – Carr Road.

With the amended boundary, the area is considerably smaller than when the planning applications were initially made which went to appeal.

I understand that the Reporter recommended 36 houses, so why do you go against this with a 72 house proposal?

I cannot support the 72 houses with the amended boundary.

Even with 36 houses, Carr Road itself is presently congested at busy times, so with the increased traffic from the additional houses will become a nightmare to negotiate.

##### **THC034 or H2** – Crannich Park.

I would support this area for housing if it remained as 22 houses.

##### **THC057** – To the east of B9153, adjacent to H2.

I agree that this area is not suitable for development, as per the background information.

##### **THC066** – Land at Inverness Road.

I accept that this area is not suitable for development, as per the background information.

##### **THC067** - Curling Pond.

I accept that this area is not suitable for development, as per the background information.

Neither is it available, as it is the Curling Pond.

##### **THC068** – (land at Railway Station)

I agree that this area is not suitable for development, as per the background information.

# CNP Local Development Plan 2020

## COMMENTS

**THC030** – Station Road (Former Sawmill) &

**THC069** – Former Wood Yard

It is difficult to determine which area is which, the former sawmill was also a woodyard, whereas the area nearer the road was used as a construction yard during the present A9 construction.

Although these are identified for future economic development, should these areas or part of these areas not be considered for housing development?

The access road i.e. Station Road would lend itself to heavier traffic as it has in the past at various times. It has a recognised metalled pavement most of the way, to the station turn off.

It has nearby or on the site, an appropriate power supply.

One drawback may be contaminated land, but this should be minimal as it was in the main a wood storage yard, and remediation techniques are readily available.

## Consultation Questions

- *Have we identified the right issues for Carr-Bridge?*  
As long as these issues are not in any particular order.
- *Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives?*  
Apart from the small business units, are there not plenty of these around in other parts of the Park, and not all units used.
- *Do you agree with the preferred site options?*  
See comments above.
- *Do you agree with the protected open spaces?*  
As far as this goes, I would agree, but there are other areas that in my view should also be protected. E.g. Golf Course, Curling Pond, the field bounded by Mannfield Place.
- *Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary?*  
I do not agree, the boundary should represent the village, and its amenities, there are a number of areas that are part of the village but appear outside the boundary.  
On the attached map:  
Green: These are some of the areas that should be within the settlement boundary.  
Red: These are some other sites that may be considered for Site Options.

