

#125

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, March 01, 2018 12:36:05 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, March 01, 2018 1:13:34 PM
Time Spent: 00:37:28
IP Address: 89.206.152.3

Page 2: Local Development in the Cairngorms National Park

Q1 We propose to use the vision and long term outcomes set out in the Cairngorms National Park Partnership Plan as the 'vision statement' for the Local Development Plan. Do you agree with this approach? **Yes**

Q2 Please explain your answer

Yes, this vision is good, however, this same vision could be applied to other planning authorities. Cairngorms is a National Park, therefore it needs to have a more ambitious vision when it comes to achieving its purpose. Woodland Trust Scotland believes that the vision should also include the conservation and enhancement of the natural and cultural heritage of the Park.

Q3 Do you agree with our conclusions about the changes that need to be made to policies in the existing Local Development Plan? **Yes**

Q4 Do you think any other changes are needed? **Yes**

Q5 Please explain your answer

Yes, we agree that policies can be reviewed with a view to improve them. We have commented on the policies which are main issue topics in more detail in the MIR questions. Below we provide our comments on the policies which are not MIR topics.

Policy 4 - Natural heritage: we agree with the recommendation to strengthen the policy protection for ancient woodland and protected species. This is the time to significantly raise the profile and importance of ancient woodland by placing it at the heart of conservation policies. From our site allocation reviews we have noted that there is a high number of sites which would impact on ancient and native woodland sites. We are concerned with this high number and feel that this would be inappropriate for site allocations in any planning authority. We think that development in areas of ancient woodland is completely inappropriate and should not be allowed. The current policies in the Cairngorms LDP leave too much room for interpretation and are not strong enough when it comes to ensuring adequate protection for ancient woodland. We expect the planning authority to take a bold and ambitious stance and word unambiguous policies which prevent any development on areas of ancient woodland, and request for appropriate buffers for developments proposed in proximity to ancient woodlands.

Policy 5 - Landscape: currently this policy is worded to say: 'there is a strong presumption against any development that does not conserve and enhance [etc.]'. However, to be in line with our proposed changes for Policy 4, Policy 5 could state that 'development which does not conserve and enhance the landscape character will not be permitted.'

Page 3: Main Policy Issues and Settlements

Q6 Which section would you like to give your views on first? **Main Policy Issues**

Page 4: Main policy issues for the new Local Development Plan

Q7 Please select a main policy issue: **Flood risk and climate change resilience**

Q8 Or, **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 5: Settlement-based Issues

Q9 Please choose a settlement **Inverdrue and Colyumbridge**

Q10 Or, **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 6: Main Policy Issue 1: Over-arching development strategy

Q11 Do you agree that the overall development strategy of the current Local Development Plan remains appropriate, and that we should use this as the basis for the next Local Development Plan? **Yes**

Q12 Please explain your answer here:

Yes, we agree with the overall development strategy and think that this is appropriate given it has been identified that further development is needed to support the local population and tourism. While Woodland Trust Scotland fully understands this, we would like to see concepts of sustainable development fully embedded in both policy and practice. We agree that it is best to develop in the areas which have existing infrastructure 'whilst protecting and enhancing the National Park's unique natural environment.' In this respect, we would like to see strong policy which asks for buffer zones to be established around protected and sensitive sites. All development allowed near such sensitive and protected areas must have site specific developer requirements to manage and mitigate any disturbance due to indirect impact of development. It is vital that use of land in Park is for conservation purposes.

From our site assessments if the current Development Plan aims to build on existing infrastructure while protecting the environment, then this is not reflected in practice on the ground. Some examples we have identified of this gap between policy and practice are the proposed site allocations at Inverdrue & Coylumbridge, and the ones at Carr-Bridge. Further site specific comments are discussed in our site assessments.

The developmet strategy should aims to guide development towards existing settlements.

Q13 What would you like to do next? **Answer questions on another main policy issue**

Page 7: Main Policy Issue 2: Designing great places

Q14 Do you agree that the new Local Development Plan should include a new policy requiring development proposals to show how they meet the six qualities of successful places? **Yes**

Q15 Do you agree that we should include a clearer policy in the new Local Development Plan to set out when tools such as master plans and development briefs will be used? **Yes**

Q16 Please explain your answers here:

Yes, we agree with this. Any new development should be sustainable (energy efficient homes built with sustainable materials, such as responsibly sourced wood) and should aim to meet the six qualities of successful places. However, in addition to this and to help with development constraints within the Park, the planning authority should consider bringing existing empty homes, dilapidated and ruined spaces back into the housing market. This would be a successful and sustainable use of space which aims to build upon existing resources and infrastructure, while conserving the landscape.

Q17 What would you like to do next? **Answer questions on another main policy issue**

Page 8: Main Policy Issue 3: Impacts and opportunities from the A9 and Highland Main Line upgrades

Q18 Do you agree with our proposals to allocate new employment land to take advantage of the opportunities for inward investment associated with the A9 and rail upgrades? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q19 Do you agree that we should seek to support those communities that are at risk of being by-passed by the A9 dualling project? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q20 Please explain your answers here: **Respondent skipped this question**

Q21 What would you like to do next? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 9: Main Policy Issue 4: Housing

Q22 A) How much new housing do we need and where should it be built? Do you agree with our proposed Housing Supply Targets for the next Local Development Plan? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q23 Do you agree that the proposed Housing Land Requirements are sufficiently generous?

Respondent skipped this question

Q24 Do you agree with our overall conclusions about the need for additional new housing sites in the new Local Development Plan? **No**

Q25 Please explain your answers here:

Housing and any development should be built away from ancient woodland.

In order to help with the nature conservation and enhancement aims of the Park, the planning authority could also address other underlying issues such as regulating the purchase of holiday homes within the Park, and consider bringing existing empty homes, dilapidated and ruined spaces back into the housing market. Addressing these underlying issues may result in less need for new developments and therefore help protect the natural environment of the Park.

Such an approach would make sense from a sustainability point of view and it can contribute to preventing a need for further physical expansion into sensitive and protected areas, such as ancient woodland, which have identified as a constraint in further development outside some current settlement boundaries.

Therefore, the new LDP must identify existing built spaces which can be adapted to meet current housing needs, alongside identifying other appropriate sites.

Q26 B) Housing growth in Aviemore Do you agree that we should include long-term development land in the Local Development Plan which could be released for development in the event that An Camas Mòr does not progress as envisaged?

Respondent skipped this question

Q27 Please explain your answer here:

An Camas Mòr would impact on an area of ancient woodland which covers 30% of the site; there are also concerns about capercaillie habitats being affected, and SSSI and local nature reserve nearby, as expressed by RSPB Scotland and Scottish Wildlife Trust objections. This development has been in the plan for 10 years and has not delivered due to constraints. We object to An Camas Mòr as allocated at the moment, and would advise that if the development is to go ahead and appropriate buffer area (at least 100m) should be designed around the area of ancient woodland.

Any long-term development land allocated if this project does not progress as envisaged, should be allocated on appropriate development sites and away from high-value woodlands, such as ancient woodland.

Q28 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on another main policy issue

Q29 Do you agree that we should increase the affordable housing requirement to 35% in Ballater and Braemar, and to 45% in Aviemore and Blair Atholl? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q30 Do you agree that we should include policies to require a greater mix of house types and sizes, including more smaller homes? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q31 Please explain your answers here: **Respondent skipped this question**

Q32 What would you like to do next? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 11: Main Policy Issue 6: Economic Development

Q33 Do you agree that the new Local Development Plan should identify a limited number of new economic development sites? **Yes**

Q34 Please explain your answer here:

We have identified that some of the sites allocated for economic development would impact on ancient woodland, our assessment can be found in the site allocation comments section. Therefore, we would not agree with some of the allocated sites to be taken forward for economic development and ask that these are reviewed to ensure they are allocated away from sensitive and protected areas such as ancient woodland.

Q35 What would you like to do next? **Answer questions on another main policy issue**

Page 12: Main Policy Issue 7: Impacts on Natura designations

Q36 Do you agree that the new Local Development Plan should include a more co-ordinated approach towards delivering wider packages of capercaillie mitigation and conservation measures? **Yes**

Local Development Plan 2017: Main Policy Issues and Settlements

Q37 Please explain your answer here:

We agree with this idea in principle, however, we note that in practice this is still an issue. We agree that conservation measures should be taken at landscape scale and that the Local Development Plan can put in place the right policies which can translate into better practice on the ground. However, an example where this is not happening in practice is the proposed development at An Camas Mòr to which both RSPB Scotland and Scottish Wildlife Trust are objecting to, because of concerns around precious capercaillie habitat. As a landscape scale conservation measure, Woodland Trust Scotland suggests that the planning authority could include good habitat creation for capercaillie in the next LDP. For example, developing native woodland habitats suitable for capercaillie. Woodland Trust Scotland would be delighted to work with the planning authority and local landowners towards creating these woodlands on appropriate sites.

The Fresh Water Pearl Mussel (FWPM) is also mentioned in the Preferred Option. Woodland Trust Scotland understand that FWPM habitats have been degraded due to rising water temperatures in rivers. As a solution to this, the project 'Pearls in Peril' has identified that planting small pockets of woodland upstream to create future conditions (shading) which can regulate river temperatures. The planning authority should recognise the importance of new woodland creation in preventing further degradation of FWPM habitats.

New woodland creation is also included in the National Planning Framework, so it would help deliver the national ambition for increased woodland planting: '4.23 We aim to increase the rate of woodland creation to deliver 100,000 hectares of new woodland over the next 10 years, and have pledged to plant 100 million trees by 2015. Future reviews will assess what further woodland expansion is required in the 2020s to ensure that we meet emissions reduction targets and wider land use objectives.' Native woodland creation would be the best type of woodland to complement the existing woodlands and the landscape in the Park.

Q38 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on another main policy issue

Page 13: Main Policy Issue 8: Planning obligations

Q39 Do you agree that the new Local Development Plan should include a revised and more rigorously justified policy on planning obligations?

Respondent skipped this question

Q40 Do you agree that this should be supported by more specific guidance in the plan about what planning obligations will be required in different settlements/locations?

Respondent skipped this question

Q41 Please explain your answers here:

Respondent skipped this question

Q42 What would you like to do next?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 14: Main Policy Issue 9: Flood risk and climate change resilience

Q43 Do you agree that the new Local Development Plan should include a stronger policy requirement for Sustainable Drainage Schemes (SUDS) to be considered in all new development proposals? **Yes**

Q44 Please explain your answer here:

Yes, we agree with this, and in particular with the implementation of natural flood management measures such as increased woodland planting. Woodland Trust Scotland would like to see in the new strengthened policy on flood risk and climate change resilience, a specific requirement for native woodland planting and a landscape scale approach to this. Increased native woodland creation can maximise the benefits of woodland for water quality, soil erosion and a range of other ecosystem services.

Q45 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on settlement-based issues

Page 15: Main Policy Issue 10: Land management in upland areas

Q46 Do you agree that the new Local Development Plan should include an amended policy to reflect the National Park Partnership Plan's presumption against new hill tracks in open moorland areas?

Respondent skipped this question

Q47 Please explain your answer here:

Respondent skipped this question

Q48 What would you like to do next?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 16: An Camas Mòr

Q49 Do you agree with the proposed objectives?

Yes

Q50 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

No

Q51 Explain your answers here:

Part of this allocated site is covered in ancient woodland (long established of plantation origin) Woodland Trust Scotland would object to this development as it is allocated at the moment. We understand from objections raised by RSPB Scotland and Scottish Wildlife Trust that there are significant concerns regarding nature and wildlife conservation in the area. If the development does go ahead, we recommend that the site is planned around the area of ancient woodland, leaving an appropriate buffer of at least 100m between the development and the area of woodland. The allocated land can become a combination of the preferred site allocation and the alternative site allocation, essentially avoiding the ancient woodland area and leaving enough buffer between the development area and the woodland so as to protect the woodland from negative edge effects. We understand the need for housing in the area, however, this need should not damage woodland unnecessarily. On the other hand this development would meet the housing requirement for the Highland Council area of the National Park for many years to come so it would be a development which would take off the housing pressure in the area but it must be done in such a way so that it is in line with the aims of the Park.

Q52 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on settlement-based issues

Page 17: Aviemore

Q53 Have we identified the right issues for Aviemore? **Yes**

Q54 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **Yes**

Q55 Do you agree with the preferred site options? **No**

Q56 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Yes**

Q57 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Yes**

Q58 Explain your answers here:

ED2 South of Dalfaber Industrial Estate: Woodland Trust Scotland recommend that development on this site is considerate of the native woodland present. This development should be designed to minimise the impact on this important habitat, as well as aim to ensure that much of the trees on site are retained - we will be able to offer more detailed recommendations when detailed development plans are submitted for this site.

THC045 and 059: We understand that there is a need to have a supply of land for housing for future long term development, however, we would like to ask that the site boundaries are reviewed so that the surrounding precious woodland is not damaged by development. For example a buffer zone can be allocated between the woodland and the development, particularly for the northern part of the site boundary which has the area of ancient woodland.

Q59 What would you like to do next? **Answer questions on settlement-based issues**

Page 18: Ballater

Q60 Have we identified the right issues for Ballater? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q61 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q62 Do you agree with the preferred site options? **Yes**

Q63 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Yes**

Local Development Plan 2017: Main Policy Issues and Settlements

Q64 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Yes**

Q65 Explain your answers here:

This settlement is surrounded by large areas of woodland, particularly to the north-west and south-east. There is an area of ancient semi-natural woodland (ASNW) north of Ballater and we would like to recommend to the planning authority that the settlement boundaries of Ballater are retained as they are at the moment, allowing for development in the south-west and north-east of the settlement boundaries, away from the ancient woodland.

Q66 What would you like to do next? **Answer questions on settlement-based issues**

Page 19: Grantown-on-Spey

Q67 Have we identified the right issues for Grantown-on-Spey? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q68 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **Yes**

Q69 Do you agree with the preferred site options? **No**

Q70 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Yes**

Q71 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Yes**

Q72 Explain your answers here:

This settlement is also surrounded by areas of ancient woodland, both ASNW and long-established of plantation origin (LEPO), as well as native woodland. We recommend that the council allocates development on areas which do not contain any high-value woodland habitats.

EDI Woodland Industrial Estate: We recommend that the site boundary is reviewed to avoid this development boundary being directly adjacent to the area of ASNW to the east.

H1 with extension THC039 Castle Road: Revise the site boundaries in order to allow for an appropriate buffer area between the woodland area and the site allocation. We can comment further on these impacts when we see a detailed planning application, however, we are concerned that a housing site so close to an area of LEPO can have both direct and indirect impacts which at this stage in the planning process can be mitigated through the establishment of an appropriate buffer.

THC038: This development is listed as an alternative site option and it is not preferred. The site has restrictions in that it is proposing to build on an area of native woodland and the western boundary of the site is adjacent or it is proposing to build on part of an area of ASNW and LEPO. As there is a strong presumption against developing on high-value habitats such as these, we recommend that this site is not taken forward to the next LDP.

Q73 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on settlement-based issues

Page 20: Kingussie

Q74 Have we identified the right issues for Kingussie?

Yes

Q75 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives?

No

Q76 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

Respondent skipped this question

Q77 Do you agree with the protected open spaces?

Yes

Q78 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary?

Yes

Q79 Explain your answers here:

There is an area of LEPO at north and west of the settlement boundaries for Kingussie, therefore further development north of the current allocated boundary would be unacceptable. A settlement objective should be to protect and enhance the natural environment around this settlement.

EP1 Land between Arbroilach Road and Craig an Darach: We understand that one of the objectives of the settlement is the delivery of housing and that this is a preferred site allocation, however, Woodland Trust would like to ask for a buffer area of at least 50m to be established between the development and the area of LEPO to the north to ensure minimal impact on the woodland. Therefore we would like the site boundary to be reviewed for this allocation so that it is not adjacent to the area of ancient woodland.

T1 Caravan park: From the issues identified for Kingussie we note the need to encourage tourism, however, we would be concerned that this site could have impacts on the adjacent woodland habitats. In the first instance we recommend that the site boundaries are reviewed and allocated to allow for an appropriate buffer zone. Woodland Trust would be happy to offer further advice on this if a planning application plan becomes available.

Q80 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on settlement-based issues

Page 21: Newtonmore

Q81 Have we identified the right issues for Newtonmore? **Yes**

Q82 Do you agree with the preferred site options? **No**

Q83 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **Yes**

Q84 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Yes**

Q85 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Yes**

Q86 Explain your answers here:

T1 Caravan park: If there is a need for this tourism development to go ahead and it is needed by the local community then this is something that we understand and would advise that this site is developed with high regard for the native woodland present on site. We are happy to advise further if development plans become available. However, if this site is not needed for tourism development then we would like to see the area of native woodland here protected, in line with the Forestry Strategy for the Cairngorms: according to this. 63% of native woodland is in good health for biodiversity therefore existing native woodlands should be protected and enhanced.

Q87 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on settlement-based issues

Page 22: Blair Atholl

Q88 Have we identified the right issues for Blair Atholl?

Yes

Q89 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives?

Yes

Q90 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

No

Q91 Do you agree with the protected open spaces?

Yes

Q92 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary?

Yes

Q93 Explain your answers here:

T1 Existing caravan park with proposed woodland lodges developed at North: This site is already a caravan park, surrounded by strips of LEPO and a larger area of LEPO to the north where it is proposed that woodland lodges can be built. Woodland Trust believes that this type of development in ancient woodland is not acceptable and we object to allocating this site for development in the next LDP.

C1 Caravan park: There is a strip of LEPO on part of this site. We would have to see more detailed development plans in order to have a position on this development but we are concerned of the potential damage to the woodland and would recommend that if the site is allocated for development, an appropriate buffer zone between the caravan park site and the area of woodland is requested as site specific developer requirement.

Q94 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on settlement-based issues

Page 23: Boat of Garten

Q95 Have we identified the right issues for Boat of Garten?

Yes

Q96 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives?

No

Q97 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

Yes

Q98 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Yes**

Q99 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Yes**

Q100 Explain your answers here:

A proposed settlement objective should also be to protect and enhance the natural environment and adjacent area of ancient and native woodland to the south-west. This ancient woodland area would also be a constraint for future development to the south-west so future development should focus expansion to the north of the settlement boundary

THC043, THC044, THC074: These sites are listed as alternative site options which are not preferred. We would also object to allocating these sites for development and recommend that they are not taken forward to the next LDP.

Q101 What would you like to do next? **Answer questions on settlement-based issues**

Page 24: Braemar

Q102 Have we identified the right issues for Braemar? **Yes**

Q103 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **No**

Q104 Do you agree with the preferred site options? **No**

Q105 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Yes**

Q106 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundaries? **Yes**

Q107 Explain your answers here:

A proposed settlement objective should also be to protect and enhance the natural environment - Braemar is surrounded by large areas of ASNW and a proposed objective should be to protect and enhance these areas.

T1 Caravan park: We would advise a review the site boundaries to leave an appropriate buffer between this site allocation and the area of ancient woodland at the northern boundary of the site.

AB002: We strongly object to allocating this site for development and support that this is not a preferred site allocation for the next LDP.

Q108 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on settlement-based issues

Page 25: Carr-Bridge

Q109 Have we identified the right issues for Carr-Bridge?

Respondent skipped this question

Q110 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives?

No

Q111 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

No

Q112 Do you agree with the protected open spaces?

Respondent skipped this question

Q113 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary?

Respondent skipped this question

Q114 Explain your answers here:

Proposed settlement objective should be to protect and enhance the natural environment, particularly given that there is a large area (1182 ha) of ASNW south of the site boundary and also 100ha of native woodland south-west of the site boundary. The area of ASNW would be a constraint so future development should be directed well away from this area, and area of ancient woodland. Due to the nature of woodland at Carr-Bridge we have found many of the site allocations inappropriate and in need of revision. Woodland Trust Scotland would be delighted to work with the planning authority in order to help better protect these areas of ancient woodland.

THC068 Glencarnoch Woodland - Woodland Trust Site: We strongly object to this site being allocated for development - this is a Woodland Trust site and no permission will be given for housing development here. Furthermore, this site is an area of ASNW and development on this type of woodland is unacceptable. We support the view that this site is not preferred for development.

H1 Carr Road: It is proposed that this site is allocated with an amended boundary which would see a large area of native woodland removed. Woodland Trust would object to such a development which would damage an area of native woodland. The Scottish Government has ambitious targets for woodland planting and it seems counterintuitive to remove woodland like this for the purpose of development. We would like to ask the planning authority looks at alternative sites which would be more appropriate for an area of housing in the Cairngorms.

EDI Land at railway station: We would like to ask the planning authority that when allocating this site it reviews the boundary so that an appropriate buffer area is established between the area of ancient woodland at east and Woodland Trust site and the railway station development. We can comment with a more specific recommendation if a detailed planning application becomes available.

THC030 and THC069: As it is at the moment, the site allocation would remove an area of ASNW. Development in this type of woodland is unacceptable and the site boundary should be reviewed in order to leave an appropriate buffer area between the proposed development and the woodland.

Local Development Plan 2017: Main Policy Issues and Settlements

Q115 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on settlement-based issues

Page 26: Cromdale

Q116 Have we identified the right issues for Cromdale?

Respondent skipped this question

Q117 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives?

Respondent skipped this question

Q118 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

Respondent skipped this question

Q119 Do you agree with the protected open space?

Respondent skipped this question

Q120 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary?

Respondent skipped this question

Q121 Explain your answers here:

Respondent skipped this question

Q122 What would you like to do next?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 27: Dulnain Bridge

Q123 Have we identified the right issues of Dulnain Bridge?

Respondent skipped this question

Q124 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives?

Respondent skipped this question

Q125 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

No

Q126 Do you agree with the protected open spaces?

Respondent skipped this question

Q127 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary?

Respondent skipped this question

Local Development Plan 2017: Main Policy Issues and Settlements

Q128 Explain your answers here:

H1: This site could be allocated with the reviewed boundary to exclude woodland - we support this boundary revision to avoid inappropriate development on areas of ASNW and native woodland.

THC032, THC041, THC042, THC070: Alternative site options (not preferred) for Dulnain Bridge We agree not to take forward all alternative site options for this settlement. The areas which are allocated at the moment are all areas with ancient woodland and development on these sites is inappropriate. We are delighted to see the planning authority has identified these areas on the Ancient Woodland Inventory and would prefer not to allocate these sites for development.

Q129 What would you like to do next?

Answer questions on settlement-based issues

Page 28: Kincaig

Q130 Have we identified the right issues for Kincaig?

Respondent skipped this question

Q131 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives?

Respondent skipped this question

Q132 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

Respondent skipped this question

Q133 Do you agree with the protected open spaces?

Respondent skipped this question

Q134 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary?

Respondent skipped this question

Q135 Explain your answers here:

Respondent skipped this question

Q136 What would you like to do next?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 29: Nethy Bridge

Q137 Have we identified the right main issues for Nethy Bridge?

Respondent skipped this question

Q138 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

No

Q139 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives?

Respondent skipped this question

Q140 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q141 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q142 Explain your answers here:

H1: Proposed for deletion - we support this site for deletion due to ancient woodland present on site which makes this site completely inappropriate for development.

THC002, THC036, THC037: We agree not to allocate these sites for development and not to take them forward to the next LDP. We have identified ancient woodland on these site allocations as a constraint for development.

Q143 What would you like to do next? **Answer questions on settlement-based issues**

Page 30: Tomintoul

Q144 Have we identified the right main issue for Tomintoul? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q145 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q146 Do you agree with the preferred site options? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q147 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q148 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q149 Explain your answers here: **Respondent skipped this question**

Q150 What would you like to do next? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 31: Angus Glens

Q151 Do you agree with the proposed objectives? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q152 Explain your answers here: **Respondent skipped this question**

Q153 What would you like to do next? Respondent skipped this question

Page 32: Bruar and Pitagowan

Q154 Do you agree with the proposed objectives? Respondent skipped this question

Q155 Explain your answers here: Respondent skipped this question

Q156 What would you like to do next? Respondent skipped this question

Page 33: Calvine

Q157 Do you agree with the proposed objectives? Respondent skipped this question

Q158 Explain your answers here: Respondent skipped this question

Q159 What would you like to do next? Respondent skipped this question

Page 34: Dalwhinnie

Q160 Have we identified the right issues for Dalwhinnie? Respondent skipped this question

Q161 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? Respondent skipped this question

Q162 Do you agree with the preferred site options? Respondent skipped this question

Q163 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? Respondent skipped this question

Q164 Explain your answers here: Respondent skipped this question

Q165 What would you like to do next? Respondent skipped this question

Page 35: Dinnet

Q166 Have we identified the right issues for Dinnet? Respondent skipped this question

Q167 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **No**

Q168 Do you agree with the preferred site options? **No**

Q169 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q170 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q171 Explain your answers here:

This settlement is surrounded by native woodland. According to the Cairngorms Draft Forestry Strategy, 'the Cairngorms National Park boasts 69%, making it the only area in Scotland where native woodland forms the majority of the woodland resource. 'If the Park is to continue to boast such statistics, then areas of native woodland such as the ones around Dinnet must be protected and managed responsibly.

H1: We agree that this site should be deleted from the next LDP due to the native woodland present on site.

H2: In the next LDP we would like to see as site specific developer requirements the retention of native trees as much as possible and the integration of the native trees within the development plans at an early stage in the planning process.

AB015: There is an area of native woodland on the eastern part of this site. We would recommend that as a site specific developer requirement, in the LDP it is requested that damage to the trees is minimised and that the development should aim to retain as many of the trees as possible. We would like to comment in more detail if a planning application becomes available.

H2: This is an area of native woodland, however, given that there is a need for delivery of housing in Dinnet and that the whole of Dinnet is surrounded by native woodland, we would like to ask that in the development plan, the planning authority ensures the retention of as many of the trees as possible, integrating these into the development at an early stage in the planning process.

We agree not to take forward all alternative site options for this settlement.

Q172 What would you like to do next? **Answer questions on settlement-based issues**

Page 36: Glenlivet

Q173 Do you agree with the proposed objectives? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q174 Explain your answers here: **Respondent skipped this question**

Q175 What would you like to do next? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 37: Glenmore

Q176 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **No**

Q177 Do you agree with the preferred site options? **No**

Q178 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q179 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q180 Explain your answers here:

One of the settlement objectives for this area should be to protect and enhance the ASNW and native woodland present. Due to the sensitive nature of the habitat, Woodland Trust Scotland would advise against further expansion here. An ASNW site should not have as settlement objectives further tourism and economic development. We also note that this settlement has not been included in the Site Assessment Report.

T1 Camping site: This site is on ancient woodland and it is unacceptable and inappropriate to allocate this site for tourism development. We strongly object to allocating this site for development in the next LDP.

T2 Glenmore Lodge: This site is already developed, however, it is surrounded by native woodland and has ancient woodland in proximity. We believe that further development here should be mindful of the ASNW in proximity and the surrounding native woodland. Woodland Trust Scotland would advise that the site boundaries do not expand past the already developed site and that full consideration is given to development in this sensitive area.

Q181 What would you like to do next? **Answer questions on settlement-based issues**

Page 38: Glenshee

Q182 Do you agree with the proposed objectives? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q183 Explain your answers here: **Respondent skipped this question**

Q184 What would you like to do next? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 39: Insh

Q185 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q186 Do you agree with protected open spaces? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q187 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q188 Explain your answers here: **Respondent skipped this question**

Q189 What would you like to do next? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 40: Inverdrue and Coylumbridge

Q190 Do you agree with the proposed objectives? **No**

Q191 Do you agree with the preferred site options? **No**

Q192 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q193 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q194 Explain your answers here:

Included in the proposed objectives for this site should be the protection and enhancement of the ancient woodland present around this settlement.

T1 Camping site: This site is allocated on an area of ASNW and we object to taking this site forward to the next LDP as a camping site for tourism.

THC026: The majority of this site is situated on LEPO ancient woodland and we agree that the planning authority should not take this site forward to the next LDP.

Q195 What would you like to do next? **I have finished with the consultation**

Page 41: Killiecrankie

Q196 Do you agree with the proposed settlement objectives? **Respondent skipped this question**

Q197 Do you agree with the protected open spaces? **Respondent skipped this question**

Local Development Plan 2017: Main Policy Issues and Settlements

Q198 Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary?

Respondent skipped this question

Q199 Explain your answers here:

Respondent skipped this question

Q200 What would you like to do next?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 42: Laggan

Q201 Do you agree with the proposed objectives?

Respondent skipped this question

Q202 Do you agree with the preferred site options?

Respondent skipped this question

Q203 Explain your answers here:

Respondent skipped this question

Q204 What would you like to do next?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 43: Strathdon

Q205 Do you agree with the proposed objectives?

Respondent skipped this question

Q206 Explain your answers here:

Respondent skipped this question

Q207 What would you like to do next?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 44: Final Thoughts

Local Development Plan 2017: Main Policy Issues and Settlements

Q208 If you have any other general comments on the topics you think the Local Development Plan 2020 should address, please let us know here:

We are pleased to see that the Ancient Woodland Inventory is used to identify ancient areas of woodland and that all types of ancient woodland are taken into account in the settlement assessments. However, Woodland Trust Scotland is concerned with the high amount of site allocations which could affect ancient woodland habitats directly or indirectly. We have expressed our objection to a number of these sites, and have suggested appropriate buffer zones to be allocated in instances where the site allocation boundary is adjacent to areas of ancient woodland. From our perspective, it is vital to see no further loss of ancient woodland and no development directly adjacent to ancient and native woodlands. In this respect we welcome proposed changes to Policy 4 on Natural Heritage to strengthen protection for ancient woodland. We are available to assist with any advice on ancient woodland protection.

In general we also agree with the preferred options for addressing the main issues identified but have made comments about how policies could be made more ambitious and fitter for a National Park. We would also like to see sites identified for native woodland creation and plans for ancient woodland restoration included as part of the new LDP, and in line with the Cairngorms Forestry Strategy objectives. Native woodland creation can assist with a range of the main issues discussed above such as: sustainable flood management assistance, mitigating the loss of capercaillie through providing good habitats for them, as well as a range of other ecosystem services.

In the Draft Forestry Strategy, now open for consultation, we also note provisions to halt further destruction and fragmentation of ancient woodland. The next Forestry Strategy and the next LDP must not have competing objectives and therefore it is important that no development is permitted on ancient woodland, or adjacent to these sensitive habitats. As stated in the Facts and Figures section of the Cairngorms National Park website (<http://cairngorms.co.uk/discover-explore/facts-figures/>), 'Some of the most important woodlands in Britain grow in the Cairngorms National Park', and Woodland Trust Scotland believes that these are protected and enhanced, not destroyed by inappropriate development. The planning authority for this area must aim to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage in the Cairngorms, through strong policies and bold implementation of these in practice.

Page 45: Your Details

Q209 Please fill in your details here:

Name	Arina Nagy-Vizitiu
Name of organisation if relevant	Woodland Trust Scotland
Postal address	[REDACTED]
Email address	[REDACTED]
Telephone number	[REDACTED]

Q210 Data Protection Your details will only be used for purposes associated with the Main Issues Report consultation and Cairngorms National Park Local Development Plan 2020. You may request to see personal information held by CNPA at any time.

Please tick if you are happy to receive correspondence via email

Please tick to confirm you are happy for us to hold and use your personal data according to fair collection purposes (see the Fair Collection Statement below).As a registered Data Controller, the Cairngorms National Park Authority will collect, store and use your personal data for the purpose of informing the content of the Local Development Plan. We will hold your data securely for a period of no more than 5 years. You have the right at any time to ask that this data be removed. We will not publish any address information but may include your name against any comments, if you have confirmed that you are happy for us to do so in the 'Your Details' section.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]