

All maintained Objections to the Local Plan

Objector	Name	Agent
425a	Rona Main Scottish Enterprise Grampian 27 Albyn Place Aberdeen AB10 IDB	Steve Crawford Halliday Fraser Munro 8 Victoria Street Aberdeen AB10 IXB

Company Scottish Enterprise Grampian

Policy/site General

Representation to Deposit Plan

General Observations

It is important to note that the Local Plan, regardless of the comments in this report, has been well written and that the policies are generally framed very well. Overall, however SE Grampian believe that The Local Plan has a heavy concentration of economic development towards the west of the Park and does not consider the future of the eastern settlements and areas in enough detail to enable their viable future as thriving communities or as tourist destinations. It is light on specific proposals for important park 'gateway sites' such as Dinnet and Glenshee, and other settlements in Aberdeenshire.

Recognition in the Local Plan that economic development is a key driver within the Park is welcomed but the Local Plan is missing an explicit economic development strategy. We would wish to see this developed as part of the Plan.

SE Grampian would also suggest that the Local Plan's vision of 'The Cairngorms National Park as an exemplar of sustainable development where people and place thrive together' (section 2.12) is too narrow a vision and does not reflect the key aims of the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000. It suggests a conservationist approach rather than the controlled growth approach set out by the National Parks Act. If this vision is to direct planning policy then we believe that it should clearly intimate that growth in settlements and some bespoke tourism investment opportunities outside of settlements are necessary to enable the Park to provide the level of quality and recognition that it strives for.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Modifications will endeavour to clarify terminology and phrasing used. A review of the Introduction and Context sections are necessary to clarify the context for the Local Plan and its relationship with other documents, including local, regional and national, and also to expand on the thinking behind the policies as drafted.

Response to 1st modifications

We are pleased to note that the Local Plan has been amended to reflect some of the Economic Development and Tourism objectives raised by Scottish Enterprise, and that these modifications have had to be balanced with the conservation aims of the Park. However, we do not believe the modifications go far enough and in some circumstances the policies are unclear.

Notwithstanding, this or the following comments, we believe the Local Plan, has been well written and that most of the policies are generally well framed. We also appreciate the Park have to balance economic development objectives within a sustainable policy framework and with respect to the conservation and protectionist objectives.

We believe The Local Plan First Modifications continues to have a heavy concentration of economic development towards the West of the Park and does not consider the future of the Eastern settlements and areas in enough detail to enable their viable future as thriving communities or as global tourist destinations.

We acknowledge modifications have been carried out under Policy 26 to acknowledge Economic Development, however the Local Plan is still missing an explicit and clear economic development strategy.

We acknowledge the Local Plan has been modified in various sections to account for conservation needs balanced with economic development needs however, we believe a conservationist approach rather than the controlled growth approach set out by the National Parks Act prevails in the Local Plan. We fully appreciate why

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

this is the emphasis, but the merits of controlled sustainable growth and development, particularly within the Tourism sector, should be strengthened. The general comments are noted. The specific objections will be considered through the subsequent formal objections to the plan. No further modifications are

We strongly support the modifications made under Section 6 (pages 55 & 56) regarding sustainable Tourism and the need to provide a high quality experience in an proposed as a result of this part of the objection.

increasingly global market. We would however wish to see stronger policy support in favour of improved visitor accommodation and opportunities for developing a sustainable high quality small-mid scale resort to the East of the Cairngorms. On this note, we are pleased with the amended references under Policy 27 Business

response to 2nd modifications

Development section c) 'other business opportunities' to promote diversification within existing businesses or to create new small scale development which supports the local economy.

Although there is general support under Policy 27 for Business diversification there appears to be no specific reference to support diversification within the Glenshee or Lecht Ski Resorts.

There is still a very low allocation of new housing to settlements on the East of the Park, however the Local Plan is improved by reference to housing tenure mix and the development of key worker and affordable housing.

There are no specific new employment land allocations to settlements on the East of the Park at Deeside or Strathdon.

The development plan policies still remain restrictive in parts, for encouraging business growth and improvement in business and accommodation premises, in an area where development has the potential to be unviable. Again, the need for conservational balance is appreciated, however property owners and developers may be discouraged by the protectionist approach and the additional policy requirements.

The Plan should be promoting infrastructure provision and improvements in a co-ordinated fashion, based on an agreed strategy that covers public transport, roads infrastructure, utility infrastructure as well as softer infrastructure such as streetscape and public realm improvements. It is important that Local Authorities are pro-active in ensuring that infrastructure is programmed via other agencies (especially Scottish Water) to meet the aims and vision, in this instance, for the National Park.

The modifications go some way to addressing these issues – especially Transport and Water, however the Transport provisions are vague and the Plan is silent on softer infrastructure improvements such as streetscape and public realm improvements.

As per our previous representations, there are no new employment land use allocations in the Deeside or Strathdon settlements and we believe this may impede rural economic development and growth.

We acknowledge and welcome that Dinnet as one of the gateway settlements to the Park has been referred to in the modifications with an emphasis on improving tourism and recreational facilities in this settlement.

Our previous representations of 27 September 2008 still stand, however we acknowledge some of our concerns have been thoughtfully addressed. For the avoidance of doubt, and at your request, we wish our original observations to be maintained and they are highlighted below for ease of reference.

HEARING

Objector 390a	Name Roy Turnbull Torniscar Nethy Bridge Inverness-shire PH25 3ED	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site General

Representation to Deposit Plan

In general I found the Deposit Local Plan represents a profound retreat from the high hopes that accompanied the establishment of the national park. The CNPA appears to have capitulated to the demands of developers and large landowners and abandoned any real commitment to the first aim of the park.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Modifications will endeavour to ensure a balance is struck between development opportunities and the protection of the special qualities of the area as identified as a National Park.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The local plan has the aims of the Park at its heart. Policy I is a direct link to these. No modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

The policies will exacerbate an increasing gap between subsidised 'affordable' homes and homes sold on the open market. Few economically active residents within the Park will be able to move up the housing ladder as their circumstances improve due to the large gap in value between subsidised and open market homes.

The policies do not encourage "... good quality private rented sector accommodation available at affordable rents to meet local demand."

We believe the policies as stated will further damage our cultural heritage and the rural character of our settlements.

We believe there should be more emphasis and encouragement on building additional houses to rent rather than buy.

We believe the Local Plan should concentrate more on meeting the needs of those resident and economically active within the Park and less on meeting the aspirations of those living or working elsewhere. The Local Plan should meet the needs and aspirations of local communities and residents, not those outside the Park who seek to utilise the Park for their recreation or life style changes. We are concerned that reducing the value of houses within the Park through "affordable" housing schemes relative to properties elsewhere in the UK will make owning a home within the Park even more attractive, thereby further fuelling demand.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Modifications will endeavour to clarify terminology and phrasing used and will endeavour to ensure a balance is struck between development opportunities and the protection of the special qualities of the area as identified as a National Park. A review of the Introduction section is necessary to clarify the context for the Local Plan and its relationship with other documents, including local, regional and national. Clarification is needed on how the Local Plan relates to the aims of the National Park. The comments made regarding housing will be assessed through the representations made specifically on the Housing section of the Plan.

Response to 1st modifications

We object to many of the policies as stated in the Cairngorms National Park Deposit Local Plan First Modifications. The policies as proposed will not meet the aims of the National Park as set out in the National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000, it will not meet the aspirations and needs of communities and businesses within the Park and it will not achieve the vision to make housing more affordable and sustainable as stated in the Park Plan.

The Cairngorms National Park Deposit Local Plan gives undue weight to the natural heritage at the expense of the cultural heritage of the Park. It will not 'conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area' which is the first aim of the Park.

The development policies as stated are unreasonably prescriptive and restrictive to the extent that they will stifle further economic development within the Park.

They are a 'top down' approach, government planners dictating objectives, plans and regulations to control and govern the community. We would prefer to see a 'bottom up' approach where the Park Plan provided a less prescriptive strategic framework within which local communities and residents were encouraged to develop their own plans based on their own needs and aspirations.

We do not believe that the further promotion of tourism and nature conservation at the expense of other rural economic activities within the Park is within the best interests of the area.

The policies as stated will not 'reduce the gap between housing need and supply'.

The policies as proposed will provide subsidised poor quality houses and even more expensive and unaffordable open market houses that will be occupied by commuters working elsewhere, households from outside the area seeking lifestyle changes and second homes. We recommend that the Local Plan should concentrate instead on meeting the demand for additional housing from residents and their dependents within the Park, those working in the Park and those seeking to contribute positively to the economy within the Park.

The policies will exacerbate an increasing gap between subsidised 'affordable' homes and homes sold on the open market. Few economically active residents within the Park will be able to move up the housing ladder as their circumstances improve due to the large gap in value between subsidised and open market homes.

The policies do not encourage "... good quality private rented sector accommodation available at affordable rents to meet local demand."

The policies as stated will further damage our cultural heritage and the rural character of our settlements.

There should be more emphasis and encouragement on building additional houses to rent rather than buy.

We believe the Local Plan should concentrate more on meeting the needs of those resident and economically active within the Park and less on meeting the aspirations of those living or working elsewhere.

We are concerned that reducing the value of houses within the Park through "affordable" housing schemes relative to properties elsewhere in the UK will make owning a home within the Park even more attractive, thereby further fuelling demand.

We consider this latest Local Plan, particularly in regard to housing, as an experiment in social engineering that will not achieve its stated objectives. We believe a Local Plan should reflect the needs, views and aspirations of local residents, businesses and land occupiers. It should not be an exercise by government to manipulate society, gain more control and raise more funds for themselves. This Plan appears to have ignored the needs and views of the people it purports to serve.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The overarching comments are noted. The plan as modified has tried to set the proper tone to facilitate appropriate development within the National Park and as such no further modifications are proposed in light of this comment.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
400a	Dr A M Jones Badenoch and Strathspey Fiodhag Nethybridge PH25 3DJ	

Company Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group

Policy/site General

Representation to Deposit Plan

2.4 - Object. The Park Plan provides one overarching context for planning policy. Other contexts should include international commitments and international standards for Protected Areas.

2.5 - Object. We are concerned at the lack of direct reference to compliance with the NP Act.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. The context sections endeavours to set out all the context documents and obligations and should therefore be read in total.

Response to 1st modifications

We are disappointed that in many respects the CNPA in the mDLP has gone no further than could be expected of any rural planning authority.

We object to the absence of any indication of the scale of recent development (e.g. at Aviemore and Kincaig). This omission is highly unsatisfactory as it impairs the ability of the public to provide properly informed comments on the proposals.

We object that developments proposed in the mDLP do not appear to conform to the definition of sustainable development provided in 5.2.

We object to the scale of proposed housing and the degree to which the mDLP promotes unsustainable housing growth. This conflicts with all 4 aims of the Park and does not support the Park Plan's vision for the Park.

We welcome the statement in the Park Plan that recognises that the CNPA's data sets are inadequate (final para of Park Plan quoted in mDLP). We are very concerned at the level of data held by the CNPA on sites they are proposing for development.

In view of this we consider the precautionary principle should be robustly applied.

Object to all statements on how policies will be monitored in so far as all policies should be monitored in terms of the impact they are having on the natural and cultural heritage (in addition to the aspects the mDLP already states will be monitored)

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The general comments are noted. The specific issues are addressed through the objections relating to the various policies and proposals of the plan. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector 537a	Name Victor Jordan 2 Oakleigh Albert Road Ballater AB35 5QL	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Context

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

Page 7 para 2.1 I object to the words "It also reflects emerging changes created as a result of the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006". If you are referring to the legal framework the wording should be "and so far as in operation, the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006." If you are referring to anticipatory policies their basis should be indicated where they are formulated. Page 7 para 2.1 I object to the words "It also reflects emerging changes created as a result of the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006". If you are referring to the legal framework the wording should be "and so far as in operation, the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006." If you are referring to anticipatory policies their basis should be indicated where they are formulated.

INQUIRY

Objector	Name	Agent
020b	Dr A Watson Clachnaben Crathes, Banchory Kincardineshire AB31 5JE	

Company

Policy/site General - Context

Representation to Deposit Plan

Page 10, ix, should add 'where this would not damage the sites'.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. However the wording referred to is a quote from the National Park Plan which has now been adopted. The consultation undertaken here relates to the wording within the local plan rather than cross references to other documents. No modification considered necessary as a result of this representation.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The reference is a direct link to the Park Plan and is included for information only. No further modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Thank you for your letter of 5 November. I am content for the written representations that I made earlier to be used for the public inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector 425x
Name Rona Main
Scottish Enterprise Grampian
27 Albyn Place
Aberdeen
AB10 IDB

Agent Steve Crawford
Halliday Fraser Munro
8 Victoria Street
Aberdeen
AB10 IXB

Company Scottish Enterprise Grampian

Policy/site General - Context

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

Section 1.16 (p 5). The modifications are welcomed and we fully support a partnership approach and collaborative working with strategic partners on the delivery of key projects. We would wish to see the following addition in bold: ' Partners of the Cairngorms National Park and statutory consultees will be key in the delivery of the Local Plan both through advice during the planning process and through their strategic work involved in areas of work such as cultural and natural heritage, tourism, infrastructure and economic development. '

We welcome the modification under Section 2.14 (p 9) outlining the Park's vision and 2.15 second bullet the role of the Park as a destination for Visitors. We wish to see this vision expanded to embrace the Park as a major national and international visitor destination, and to encourage business development for the provision of world class visitor accommodation and experiences, which are complimentary to the National Park environment.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

Para 1.16 will be amended in line with the comment. 2.15 2nd bullet 'and internationally' will be added.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector 037b	Name DW and IM Duncan Pineacre West Terrace Kingussie PH21 IHA	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Context

Representation to Deposit Plan

The regulatory bodies responsible for implementing the policies in section 4 are Scottish Natural Heritage (policies 2,3,4 and who also have input to 5,6,7 and 8), Historic Scotland (policies 8,9,10 and 11), yet there appears to be no mention of this in the text.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Additional reference will be included within the background text in support of each application to clarify the roles of partner organisations.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The delivery of the Local Plan will be achieved by partnership working with many organisations. This is recognised in para 1.16. The Planning Authority will however remain the key agency in ensuring that developments are approved in accordance with the policies. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to your letter of 5th November regarding modifications to the Local Plan.

I have no further comments to make on these modifications but I would reiterate that I still have serious concerns regarding the extent of the zoning for new housing development across the area and I believe that this is at odds with the first aim of the National Park.

I am happy for my written submissions to be considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector 4001	Name Dr A M Jones Badenoch and Strathspey Fiodhag Nethybridge PH25 3DJ	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Economic Development

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

5.79 Object.

HC's 'enterprise strategy' should not be slavishly followed. We understand that neither Aberdeenshire nor Moray local authorities have an equivalent aspiration to increase population. The population of Badenoch & Strathspey is not projected to decline and nor has it done so in the recent past.

Increasing the population in a NP is an inappropriate aspiration for the CNPA in conflict with the 1st aim.

Object to misleading lack of clarity as the strategies referred to are not specified.

Object to use of phrase 'improving the demographic structure'.

Object. The statement regarding being an exemplar of the country's best, is spin not substance and such an aspiration is inappropriate in the mDLP.

Object. The CNPA should not be 'in support of this' (being the Enterprise Strategy etc).

Object to lack of clarity in the statement that the Local Plan approach must be flexible.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

It is not true to say that the economic development policies slavishly follow any Highland Council strategy, but we do work in partnership with all four local authorities and take into account their various strategies and programmes. The para 5.79 is intended to set some context for the economic development policies and developments which promote a more balanced demographic structure, with better economic opportunities are considered to be in line with the aims of the Park.

No modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Maintain objections

5.79 Object.

HC's 'enterprise strategy' should not be slavishly followed. We understand that neither Aberdeenshire nor Moray local authorities have an equivalent aspiration to increase population. The population of Badenoch & Strathspey is not projected to decline and nor has it done so in the recent past.

Increasing the population in a NP is an inappropriate aspiration for the CNPA in conflict with the 1st aim.

Object to misleading lack of clarity as the strategies referred to are not specified.

Object to use of phrase 'improving the demographic structure'.

Object. The statement regarding being an exemplar of the country's best, is spin not substance and such an aspiration is inappropriate in the mDLP.

Object. The CNPA should not be 'in support of this' (being the Enterprise Strategy etc).

Object to lack of clarity in the statement that the Local Plan approach must be flexible.

HEARING

Objector	Name	Agent
041	Fergus Ewing MSP Constituency Office Highland Railhouse Station Square, Inverness IV1 1LE	

Company

Policy/site General - Economic Development

Representation to Deposit Plan

RE: My constituent; Burgess Hay; FirScot Ltd, Newtonmore Industrial Estate, Newtonmore, Inverness-shire, PH20 1AR – Industrial jobs and land in Badenoch
I'm writing in my capacity as constituency MSP for the above constituent. I have recently had correspondence with My Hay regarding this business FirScot which is based on Newtonmore Industrial Estate.

My Hay has described to me how his business has been going for years and currently employs 8 people (including 2 apprentices) in skilled engineering jobs. They work out of 2 industrial units owned by the Highland Council. They make a significant contribution to the local economy. However, my constituent informs me that FirScot Ltd has outgrown its current sit location and they have been looking to purchase a new site.

Mr Hay has informed me that he has been round the Council, HIE, National Park, and all the local land owners with securing a new purchase site but has had no success.

The lack of available industrial land is now hurting his business, and is preventing expansion and growth from occurring. My Hay has recently had a meeting with the local planning officer and has been informed that no industrial land has been zoned for the Newtonmore area within the new proposed local park plan.

Plainly, this is unacceptable and I would ask that this be reviewed. I agree with the view of HIE that the CNP plan does not make adequate provision for business. I would ask that you could take a look into this case and respond to be in due course.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Modifications will endeavour to ensure a more appropriate balance is struck between development opportunities, allocation of land for services to support this including creating the appropriate level of opportunities for employment growth, and the protection of the special qualities of the area as identified as a National Park. The wording used within policies throughout will be clarified to ensure the appropriate level of guidance is available for developers, and the Plan is easy to understand and use. As a result of this consultation process further work will be undertaken to link more closely the demand for housing to economic prosperity and the need to work within the aims of the Park. This will be linked to the work ongoing relating to sustainability.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

Additional land has been included for employment uses. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
390u	Roy Turnbull Torniscar Nethy Bridge Inverness-shire PH25 3ED	

Company

Policy/site General - Housing

Representation to Deposit Plan

I OBJECT to the large number of houses allocated within the Deposit Local Plan, as outlined in Tables 2, 3 and 4, p.43-44.

The figures presented in Tables 2, 3 and 4, p.43-44 have been calculated without any reference to the natural or cultural heritage, yet development indubitably impacts on the natural and cultural heritage. Likewise the documents "Population and Household Projections for the Cairngorms National Park Authority", University of Manchester, 2005 and "Cairngorms Housing System Analysis", Heriot Watt University, 2006, make no assessment of the impacts of development on the natural and cultural heritage.

This is contrary to the National Park Plan, which emphasises that, "The starting point must always be to work towards all four aims collectively" and reflects the National Parks (Scotland) Act, 2000, which requires that the four aims of the Park must be achieved collectively and in a co-ordinated way. That is not possible if the first aim of the Park, which is impacted upon by development, is ignored during the process of determining how much development should be allocated.

Further, there is no evidence in the Deposit Local Plan that the amount of development initially suggested by the above studies has been adjusted by subsequent consideration of the first aim of the Park. Indeed the summary Strategic Environmental Assessment states that "relatively few changes to the Local Plan have [been] made due to the SEA alone". This could only be justified were there to be no "conflict" between the first aim of the Park and the initial proposals for development, but that is indubitably not the case.

Indeed, there was already ample evidence of conflict between development on the one hand and the natural and cultural heritage on the other well before the Park was established. The following brief list provides a few examples, but it is by no means exhaustive:

Conflicts with the (mainly) natural heritage:

- Proposal for 117 houses within species rich native pinewood at Carrbridge.
- Proposal for 40 houses within ancient woodland site at School Wood, Nethy Bridge
- Proposal for 100+ houses in birch woodland, Aviemore.

Conflicts with the (mainly) cultural heritage:

- Statement in First Draft Highland Regional Council Badenoch and Strathspey Local Plan 1991, thus:

"Despite spare capacity in land and infrastructure in most settlements, concern is emerging about the rate and scale of change in established villages. Unsympathetic cramming and expansion of communities is eroding their character and setting, threatening to overwhelm facilities, or creating imbalance in the social structure. ... Similarly in the countryside, stronger safeguards are needed to avoid servicing problems or compromising important heritage features and rural resources."

- A well-attended public meeting in Nethy Bridge on 12th January 2005 voiced unanimous opposition to developments of more than four houses at one location within the village.

- The proposal for 117 house at Carrbridge would increase the size of the village by about one third and faced strong local opposition.

That the previous HRC Local Plan was already allocating land for development that impacted on woodlands of high natural heritage value and caused unsympathetic cramming of communities that eroded their character, indicated that further allocations of significant area for development would be attended by significant conflicts with the natural and cultural heritage. The present Deposit Local Plan shows that to be the case.

Further, the CNPA is charged with sustainable development, yet the allocations of land for housing in the Deposit Local Plan indicate a sharp increase in the rate of building over historical rates. 2931 houses were constructed in Badenoch and Strathspey in the thirty year period from 1976 to 2005, an average of just under 100 houses per year, yet the Deposit Local Plan proposes allocations of land there for 888 houses for years 0-5 and 678 for years 5-10, an average of 177 and 135 per year respectively. Beyond that time (2016) there is an allocation of a further 1426 houses for the “medium to long term”, though the deposit Local Plan does not define what that means. If it refers to the year 2025, as in the Univ. of Manchester report, that would equate to an annual allocation rate of 158 houses. On average, these figures, if the allocations were fully developed, would represent a 60% increase in the rate of house building in Badenoch and Strathspey for the next twenty years compared with the previous thirty years. And that is for a district that in recent decades has had the highest rate of growth of any rural district in Scotland.

Whatever is being “sustained” by such growth rates, it is certainly not the “natural and cultural heritage” of the area, which should be the over-riding concern of the CNPA if it is to comply with the National Parks (Scotland) Act, 2000. Instead, what is being sustained is a culture of rampant growth that will be all the more difficult to restrain the longer it is allowed to flourish. It is only necessary to project the proposed allocation rates a hundred years into the future to foresee a Park whose lowlands are significantly impacted upon by either the suburban sprawl of an additional 16,000 houses, or their equivalent in large townships, in Badenoch and Strathspey. And what would then be abundantly apparent is that the crucial mistake was the failure of the first Local Plan produced by the CNPA back in the early years of the twenty-first century to address the true needs of its communities, which is for relatively small numbers of houses for local people, whilst abiding by its statutory function of conserving and enhancing the natural and cultural heritage of the area.

In this context it may be helpful to review the history of housing completions in Badenoch and Strathspey in recent years compared with the projections from the Highland Region Structure Plan 1990, upon which the HRC Badenoch and Strathspey Local Plan was based. The Structure Plan “Estimated Demand for Housing” (Fig.14.3 p.82) gave 965 houses as the total expected for Badenoch and Strathspey for the period 1988-1998. The actual number of housing completions was as follows: 1988-168, 1989-211, 1990-166, 1991-108, 1992-79, 1993-117, 1994-76, 1995-105, 1996-81, 1997-141, 1998-76 giving a total of 1328 houses built during this time, (1206 houses if the series from mid 1988 to mid 1998 is used). Thus, the actual number of houses built in Badenoch and Strathspey during this time was some 37% more than that envisaged in the 1990 Structure Plan.

Para 5.30 p41 The HC Adopted Local Plan 1997 envisaged 2250 houses being built in Badenoch and Strathspey between 1993 and 2011, an average of 125 houses per year. During the last five years (2002-2006 inc.), 615 houses (2002-89, 2003-80, 2004-135, 2005-105, 2006-206), an average of 123 houses per year have been built. Thus, the statement in 5.30 that “in Badenoch and Strathspey, in particular, fewer homes have been built than were anticipated in the Development Plan” is misleading. Although it is true that the average rate of house build in the district has averaged less than that envisaged (95 per year) since 1993, most people reading the Deposit Local Plan will be unaware that they are being misled by the CNPA concerning more recent events in Badenoch and Strathspey.

Second Homes

The most unacceptable feature of the proposals on housing is the proposed increase in provision for second homes (Table 2, page 43), which betrays the driving

influence behind the housing allocation figures. Because “demand” is expected to be higher, therefore supply must be increased. This is “predict and provide”, the same market forces housing provision that has caused such problems for the natural and cultural heritage, and failed to address local needs, during recent decades. This proposal flies in the face of repeated expressions of concern by local people about the over-supply of second/holiday homes in the Park, briefly and inadequately reported in the Consultation Report July 2007, para. 3.21, thus: “The ongoing issue of holiday and second homes was also raised as adding to the problem.” **CNPA**

analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

In addition to the detrimental effects upon the natural and cultural heritage of the Park, this proposal will also add to its unnecessary carbon (and other resource) footprint. Two background papers undertaken by consultants relating to population figures and affordable housing requirements are available on line. A summary of the house building is a carbon and resource intensive activity and one must question why the CNPA should be encouraging the building of houses for people who already have a dwelling elsewhere, whilst claiming that it is attempting to minimise its own carbon footprint. Park.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The allocation of land for housing is in response to work undertaken to establish the need for housing within the Park. Underlying all developments are the aims of the Park and this is linked through Policy I. The CNPA position regarding the allocation of land for housing in Aviemore has not changed. No modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector 020j	Name Dr A Watson Clachnaben Crathes, Banchory Kincardineshire AB31 5JE	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Housing

Representation to Deposit Plan

p.41, purple box, incorrect use of mix again.

b), drop “proactive”, which is unnecessary and meaningless, use “concentrate” instead of “focus”

5.34 right column, line 3, sale of council houses, why not say this instead of council owned property? Also, what is the policy on this sale of council houses. Why not suggest that it should end?

5.39, accepts the rapid increase of housing for commuters, holiday homes and retired incomers, and the accompanying lack of sustainability of population, energy use, pollution, and destruction of habitats.

5.49, IV, last sentence. A very good idea and policy.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Amend the text to support the housing policeis to clarity the wording.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The references to the Park Plan are included for information. The background text to provide context for the housing policies has also been redrafted for clarity.

No further objections therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Thank you for your letter of 5 November. I am content for the written representations that I made earlier to be used for the public inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector 037p	Name DW and IM Duncan Pineacre West Terrace Kingussie PH21 IHA	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - housing

Representation to Deposit Plan

Encouraging to see that the woodland surrounding the town is not included in the settlement area, but where is the local requirement for an additional 300 house units?

KG/OSI: The word 'valley' is incorrect in both geographical and cultural terms – should be replaced with 'gorge'.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

A detailed paper outlining the background to the housing land requirement calculations, land supply requirements and proposed balance of house sizes will be prepared to clarify the rationale behind the housing policies. Within this reference will be made to the relationship between the provision of new housing within the Park and the National Park Plan and aims of the Park. Further explanation will also be required to justify the allowance made in table 2 for second homes and vacant properties, and detail how the approach taken will benefit local people. On completion of this paper, information will be circulated to all those who made representation on this issue, and detailed consultation undertaken to assess the level of continued objection, which may result in a modification to the calculations and allocations made. The comment regarding terminology is also noted. Confirm allocations are based on consultants work, waiting lists, etc and is continually monitored.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The position regarding housing demand and supply of land for housing in Kingussie has not changed. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to your letter of 5th November regarding modifications to the Local Plan.

I have no further comments to make on these modifications but I would reiterate that I still have serious concerns regarding the extent of the zoning for new housing development across the area and I believe that this is at odds with the first aim of the National Park.

I am happy for my written submissions to be considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector 537c	Name Victor Jordan 2 Oakleigh Albert Road Ballater AB35 5QL	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - housing

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

Page 4 | additional footer | object to this proposal as it does not give the wording of the proposed addition.

INQUIRY

Objector	Name	Agent
400g(e)	Dr A M Jones Badenoch and Strathspey Fiodhag Nethybridge PH25 3DJ	

Company Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group

Policy/site General - Housing

Representation to Deposit Plan

5.28 - Object to the statement "This means that many more households working in the Park have difficulty in purchasing a home than was the case previously", because this is an important and sweeping statement that is not supported by any figures or timescales. Given the amount of housing proposed in the DLP and the need for this to be properly and transparently justified, we object to statements such as this that provide the public with no means of assessing its validity.

5.30 - Object to the statement "supply of new housing has been limited in the Cairngorms National Park area in the past 5 years. The limited supply of land has meant that, in Badenoch and Strathspey in particular, fewer homes have been built than were anticipated in the Development Plan" as it is misleading and regrettably, no figures are provided in the DLP to support the statement.

In fact, B&S has had the highest growth rate of any rural district in Scotland over recent decades; and the average number of houses built in B&S over the last 5 years (2002-2006 inc) is 123 houses/year. This compares to an average of 125 houses/year envisaged in the HC Adopted Local Plan (1997) being built from 1993 to 2011. We are concerned that what we consider to be a highly misleading statement on such an important issue to any Development Plan should be included in the DLP. Given the figures that we have presented, what were the figures used by the CNPA to arrive at their statement? It is possible to conclude that the CNPA has demonstrated a serious lack of objectivity on this crucial and central planning issue.

5.34 - We object to the statement "the increasing proportion of the population who have difficulty in accessing the open market due to its recent inflation" on the basis that it is not substantiated. We are further concerned that it is simplistic, and may be misleading.

5.35 - Object to this paragraph, because the housing requirements of the communities living and working in the Park cannot be specifically met as it is our understanding there is no means of controlling who gets a house, either social or open market. Object to "provide housing to meet everyone's needs" because it is unclear who is being referred to by 'everyone'. This requires clarification. Taken as a whole, parts of this paragraph appear to us to be potentially seriously misleading.

5.37 - Object to the omission of reference to any serious study to assess the carrying capacity of for example existing infrastructure. Gathering information on this subject would appear to be a fundamental part of the CNPA's duties given the Authority's responsibility to deliver the aims of the NP.

5.38 - Object to "improved" on grounds that this is subjective and can be viewed as biased, and that it is not specified what the improvement is. An improved housing supply can be viewed as directly associated with a degradation of other aspects of the NP, such as landscape and recreational opportunities.

Object to "communities of the Park" on grounds of lack of clarity. Development is by no means a clear improvement for communities of the Park.

Tables 2, 3 and 4 and 5.39 - Object to figure for household growth of 950. No rigorous explanation as to how this figure is derived is provided in the DLP, and no reasoned justification is provided for taking a higher rather than a mid way or lower estimate.

Object to figure of 1640 houses being used. The justification for this figure is not coherently argued

Object to the appropriateness of an upper figure being used without an acceptable justification. Object to reference to "backlog of demand for housing from recent

years” as unsubstantiated and potentially misleading (see earlier comments under 5.30).

No reliable data to support this claim and a possible allied controversial assumption that everyone should have a right to have housing wherever they want in a NP in a manner not possible say in a Scottish city are provided (see Sunday Times Sept 07).

There is not reliable data on workers from EU accession countries and significant uncertainty about how long they are going to stay and on their housing aspirations. Some predictions are apparently that present levels of immigration are likely to be temporary. No justification is provided as to why housing for EU workers should be particularly provided within a NP.

We object to a 50% allocation of second homes and vacant property as this is inconsistent in significant respects with the aims of the NP.

Object to CNPA inferring that the DLP should seek to meet “demand”.

Object that the figures in the Tables appear to have been calculated without any reference to the natural and cultural heritage, yet development inevitably impacts on these. This is not in accordance with the Park Plan, which emphasises the importance of working towards all four aims of the NP.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comments regarding unsupported statements throughout the text are noted. In the modifications it is hoped to address such situations. The wording used within policies throughout will be clarified to ensure the appropriate level of guidance is available for developers, and the Plan is easy to understand and use.

The supply of housing land is based on studies undertaken to assess need and methods of provision in particular affordable housing. The policies regarding housing do however have to be read together with all the other policies of the plan, and the aims of the Park, and development will not therefore occur to the detriment of the natural resources of the Park or undermine its aims.

Modifications will also endeavour to ensure a more appropriate balance is struck between development opportunities and the protection of the special qualities of the area as identified as a National Park. The wording used within policies throughout will be clarified to ensure the appropriate level of guidance is available for developers, and the Plan is easy to understand and use.

Response to 1st modifications

Object. - There is an inference that runs through this chapter that affordable housing is geared towards local people. However allocation rules to a large extent preclude this, so any such assumption is liable to be misleading.

5.23 Object (and note a lack of clarity in the revised wording where it is stated “modest incomes have will [sic] continue...”.)

The argument advanced appears over simple and thus misleading. Providing more affordable housing does not necessarily support a more sustainable community. Already at least one community council in the NP has indicated that it is not in favour of further affordable housing in the immediate future in their community.

Any major housing proposal can be divisive within, rather than supportive to a community. The large scale housing proposed in the mDLP is typically a contentious issue within a community. More houses mean less countryside and associated environmental, social and economic benefits in and around a community, and there is a sizeable body of opinion in any community that validly does not regard that loss as supportive of a sustainable community.

The provision of affordable housing through the private sector and as a proportion of open market housing, as is proposed in the mDLP, is contentious. This

approach has already created conflict between communities and the National Park Authority.

The need for affordable housing will predictably rise as a result of the increased population associated with the housing allocations in the mDLP (as each new generation of first time buyers enters the housing market). The mDLP is promoting unsustainable growth at the expense of the special qualities of the Park and opportunities for future generations.

5.25 Object. - We wish to see a more critical and in depth appraisal of the forecasts made around a decade ago. We do not consider the mDLP should be slavishly following these forecasts.

5.32 - Object. The meaning of 'housing market area' and its significance need to be defined.

5.33 Object. - The higher figure should not be used.

Object to the reason for this of coping with unforeseen circumstances. We consider proposing 200 more houses to be built to cope with unforeseen circumstances, when the population is projected to remain stable or only rise slightly, and we are already approximately a quarter of the way through the relevant time period, is unjustifiably excessive. This approach fails to give proper priority to enhancing and conserving the special environment of the NP in line with the 1st aim.

Object to the unqualified use of the word 'dynamic'. Object to use of the word 'likely' in relation to estimates of household numbers. This implies an unwarranted level of certainty.

Object to final sentence.

5.34 - Object. We do not consider that the mDLP has provided convincing evidence to demonstrate that the NP faces any more of a dilemma than some other areas. Object to final sentence stating that the CNPA etc 'need to work together to provide housing to meet everyone's needs'.

5.35. - Object to inference in 1st sentence that the land allocations made in the Local Plan for affordable housing are to meet the 'needs of the Park's communities'. The allocation of affordable housing only slightly favours local people; therefore affordable housing cannot be significantly geared towards meeting the needs of the Park's communities.

Object to inference in the 1st sentence that the land allocation made in the mDLP for market housing meets economic and social needs of local communities. Large scale market housing developments have many negative impacts on the economic and social needs of local communities.

Object to the lack of reference to the fact that land for housing is a finite resource.

5.38 - Object to higher figure of 950 being used (adds 200 units). Object to further allowance being made to take account of vacant properties and provision not controlled by planning system (adds 475 units). Object to additional 15% to allow for uncertainty (adds 214 units). These add 889 units. We do not consider this approach to planning for future housing meets the 4 aims of the NP.

Tables 2,3,4 Object. - Object to the information that is provided in these tables. The derivation of all the information in these tables is not clear and readily understandable, nor appropriately provided. For example, the detailed derivation of the higher figure of 1845 compared to 1639 is not provided. Did the CNPA take into account the affordable unit allocations that have been made in extant permissions? Moreover, providing the explanation for adding 206 units (a figure not itself

provided) as a footnote does not give this addition proper emphasis.

Object to omissions of information. These Tables should also provide information on areas of land required for the numbers of houses given and should provide the total area of land within the proposed settlement boundaries of each settlement and the proportion of this that is proposed for built development in the mDLP allocations.

The Tables should also provide a breakdown of the areas of land of different habitats (birch woodland etc) in the proposed allocations in each settlement and the total area of that habitat in the whole CNP area.

This information would enable the public and the CNPA to better assess the impact of the developments proposed on the land and habitat resources.

The Tables should also provide information on the number of present houses and present population in each settlement. This information would enable the public and the CNPA to better assess the environmental and social aspects of developments proposed.

Table 2. Object to number of units proposed as explained above.

Table 3. Object to addition of 206 units. - Object to lack of clarity concerning this addition as explained above.

5.39 - Object to assumption made. Object to lack of clarity.

5.41 Object. - The approach taken does not necessarily support sustainable communities nor their economies.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The issue of local waiting lists is key to the success of the housing policies in the local plan and CNPA continue to work with the local housing authorities to try and influence this. Local people or people with a local connection can however get additional points on waiting lists and we aim to build on this. The issue raised regarding para 5.2 is not accepted as all developments will take place with the 4 aims of the National Park and the reasons for its original designation in mind. Regarding land allocations, the CNPA conducted a study to assess the need for housing within the Park and has allocated land accordingly. However it is not considered to have allocated excessive amounts of land which are more than the established need would suggest. The allocations do therefore comply with the requirements of SPP17.

Regarding para 5.23 the paragraph is intended to highlight the reasons for the growth in demand for affordable housing, as throughout the consultation for the local plan, this was seen as a key issue and important to help retain local people within their communities. The development proposed will be carried out in accordance with the 4 aims of the Park and it is considered an important part of the local plan by the CNPA Board. No modifications are therefore proposed in light of this objection.

The position regarding land allocation as set out in tables 2-4 has not changed. The background information has been made available, and this remains the basis for the approach. The paragraphs 5.22-5.40 aim to explain what is a complex issue and important part of the local plan and is intended to clarify the CNPA board thinking behind the approach taken. This thinking has not changed, and therefore no modifications are proposed to this section.

A definition of 'housing market area' will be added to the glossary.

response to 2nd modifications

Maintain objection 5. Object.

The CNPA should make available a summary of the assumptions and other factors that underpin the population and housing projections on which this chapter relies. As is stated in the mDLP, population and housing projections are inexact, yet they are the foundation for housing allocations, the most significant aspect of development.

Running through the chapter is a lack of rigorous thinking and clear, specific explanation.

One example of this seemingly muddled approach is an inference that runs through this chapter that affordable housing is geared towards local people. However

allocation rules to a large extent preclude this, so any such assumption is liable to be misleading. References to affordable houses and local need should make allocation policy thoroughly clear.

Maintain objection

5.3 Object.

The proposed zoning for development in the mDLP is not compliant with SPPI7. The scale of housing growth is not 'modest'. In Badenoch & Strathspey the proposed scale of housing is unprecedented. The suburbanisation of the countryside is precisely what the mDLP proposes at Grantown, Kingussie, Newtonmore, Aviemore, Nethybridge, Boat of Garten, Kinncraig and Carrbridge.

Maintain objection

5.23 Object (and note a lack of clarity in the revised wording where it is stated "modest incomes have will [sic] continue...".)

The argument advanced appears over simple and thus misleading. Providing more affordable housing does not necessarily support a more sustainable community. Already at least one community council in the NP has indicated that it is not in favour of further affordable housing in the immediate future in their community.

Any major housing proposal can be divisive within, rather than supportive to a community. The large scale housing proposed in the mDLP is typically a contentious issue within a community. More houses mean less countryside and less of the associated environmental, social and economic benefits derived from the countryside. There is a sizeable body of opinion in any community that validly does not regard the loss of countryside and its numerous economic and social benefits as supportive of a sustainable community.

The provision of affordable housing through the private sector and as a proportion of open market housing, as is proposed in the mDLP, is contentious. This approach has already created conflict between communities and the National Park Authority.

The need for affordable housing will predictably rise as a result of the increased population associated with the housing allocations in the mDLP (as each new generation of first time buyers enters the housing market). The mDLP is promoting unsustainable growth at the expense of the special qualities of the Park and opportunities for future generations.

Maintain objection

5.25 Object.

We wish to see a more critical and in depth appraisal of the forecasts made around a decade ago. We do not consider the mDLP should be slavishly following these forecasts.

Maintain objection

5.32

Object. The meaning of 'housing market area' and its significance to the LP need to be defined, so as to be clear to everyone.

Maintain objections

5.33 Object.

The higher figure should not be used.

Object to the reason for this of coping with unforeseen circumstances.

We consider proposing 200 more houses to be built to cope with unforeseen circumstances, when the population is projected to remain stable or only rise slightly, and we are already approximately a quarter of the way through the relevant time period (2006-2016), is unjustifiably excessive.

This approach fails to give proper priority to enhancing and conserving the special environment of the NP in line with the 1st aim.

There is a lack of rigour in 5.33. Providing affordable and open market housing draws people into the NP, and the projected increase in households will only take place if there are houses available.

Maintain objections

5.34

Object. We do not consider that the mDLP has provided convincing evidence to demonstrate that the NP faces any more of a dilemma than some other areas.

Object to final sentence stating that the CNPA etc 'need to work together to provide housing to meet everyone's needs'.

Maintain objections

5.35.

Object to inference in 1st sentence that the land allocations made in the Local Plan for affordable housing are to meet the 'needs of the Park's communities'. The allocation of affordable housing only slightly favours local people; therefore affordable housing cannot be significantly geared towards meeting the needs of the Park's communities.

Object to inference in the 1st sentence that the land allocation made in the mDLP for market housing meets economic and social needs of local communities. Large scale market housing developments have many negative impacts on the economic and social needs of local communities.

Object to the lack of reference to the fact that land for housing is a finite resource.

Maintain objection

5.38

Object to higher figure of 950 being used (adds 200 units).

Object to further allowance being made to take account of vacant properties and provision not controlled by planning system (adds 475 units).

Object to additional 15% to allow for uncertainty (adds 214 units).

These add 889 units.

We do not consider this approach to planning for future housing meets the 4 aims of the NP.

Maintain objection

Tables 2,3,4 Object.

Object to the information that is provided in these tables. The derivation of all the information in these tables is not clear and readily understandable, nor appropriately provided. For example, the detailed derivation of the higher figure of 1845 compared to 1639 is not provided. Did the CNPA take into account the affordable unit allocations that have been made in extant permissions? Moreover, providing the explanation for adding 206 units (a figure not itself provided) as a footnote does not give this addition proper emphasis.

Object to omissions of information. These Tables should also provide information on areas of land required for the numbers of houses given and should provide the

total area of land within the proposed settlement boundaries of each settlement and the proportion of this that is proposed for built development in the mDLP allocations.

The Tables should also provide a breakdown of the areas of land of different habitats (birch woodland etc) in the proposed allocations in each settlement and the total area of that habitat in the whole CNP area.

This information would enable the public and the CNPA to better assess the impact of the developments proposed on the land and habitat resources.

The Tables should also provide information on the number of present houses and present population in each settlement. This information would enable the public and the CNPA to better assess the environmental and social aspects of developments proposed.

Maintain objection

Table 2. Object to number of units proposed as explained above.

Maintain objection

Table 3. Object to addition of 206 units.

Object to lack of clarity concerning this addition as explained above.

Maintain objection

5.39

Object to assumption made.

Object to lack of clarity.

Maintain objection

5.41 Object.

The approach taken does not necessarily support sustainable communities nor their economies.

HEARING

Objector	Name	Agent
410	AW Laing Ltd 110 High Street Grantown-on-Spey PH26 3EL	

Company AW Laing Ltd

Policy/site General - Housing (affordable)

Representation to Deposit Plan

As an employer in a fourth generation local building firm, employing 10% local staff, you must appreciate the above plan and its policies relating to housing will have major negative influences to our future existence.

The attached submission is on behalf of the following firms who strongly believe the plan in its current form is presenting a strategic direction that is counter productive and negative to the sustainability of the many smaller building related businesses who live and work in the Park.

AJ Builders, 12 Seafield Court, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3LE
Brown Electrical, 53 Strathspey Drive, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3EY
Findlay Binnie, Beinn Lee, Strone Road, Newtonmore, PH20 1BA
Patrick Botos, Grantown-on-Spey
Bryan R Cameron, 8 Cairngorm Avenue, Grantown-on-Spey
DD Rose Joiners, Jamica, 4 Strathspey Drive, Grantownon-Spey
GJ Paterson and Co, Haygrove, 13 Greyfriars Street, Elgin, Moray, IV30 1LF
Glenalmond Contracts, 4/5 Newmills Road, Dalkeith, EH22 1DU
Grampian Builders, Plot No 6, Newtonmore Industrial Estate, Newtonmore, PH20 1AR
Mr RM Grant, Dalbeg, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3PR
Mr C Gray, 19 MacGregor Avenue, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3ET
J&J Gunn, Cairnview, South West High Street, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3QH
K Ingram, Builder, Quarry Ridge, Dallas, Moray, IV36 0RW
Dai Lovatt, 11 Chapel Road, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3EP
Ian MacLean Contracting, Drmmondii, Mossie Road, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3HW
David MacLeod, 22 MacGregor Avenue, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3ET
Brian Mackie, Ettenbreck, Glen Conrie, Strathdon, Aberdeenshire, AB36 8YR
MacPherson Electrical Limited, 18 Birch Grive, Boat of Garten, PH24 3BA
M McAllister Groundworks Ltd, Sarren, Newmill Road, Keith, AB55 5BT
Graham McIntosh, Plumber, Upper Croft-na-Garn, Boat f Garten, PH24 3BY
Colin McKinlay, Waterford, 24 The Square, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3HF
Iain Michie, 1 Curr Road, Dulnain Bridge, PH26 3NY
Jamie Munroe, 2 Birchview Cottages, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3HB

Mr N Mutch, Beechwood, Woodside Avenue, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3JR
Mr R Taylor, Sofala, Carr Road, Carrbridge, PH23 3AD
Ross and Co Painters, Caberfeidh Avenue, Dingwall, Ross-shire, IV15 9TD
S A Borthwick, Plumber, Tigh Mhor, Ardbrocilach Road, Kingussie, PH21 1LD
Speyside Plumbing, Tomneen Farm, Craigellachie, Aberlour, AB38 9SB
WJ Sellars, Glengarry, Forest Road, Grantown-on-Spey, PH26 3JL

The consultation period coincided with our employees main holiday period, when employees are stretched to the limit covering staff shortages made it very difficult to allocate time to study this document.

Also major additional demands on our time is being made due to recent changes in the building regulations, this compounded with severe staff shortages of Building Control Officers resulting in great difficulties to obtaining building warrants, is creating 'work load' problems.

In the following therefore, we have tried to set out the matters that concern us most: and until such time as they are fully and properly addressed, we feel we have no option but to object formally to the Plan.

That said, the main areas of concern we have are as follows:-

1. The plan is complicated, full of jargon and without further consultation with officials, one could not easily identify where one might be allowed to develop. The exception being the larger housing developments which only volume builders, Tulloch and Robertsons' can finance. Ie the policy seems to promote the large scale developments at the expense of smaller local firms.
2. Apart from the development areas designated within settlement boundaries, which must constitute less than 5% of the parkland area no other potential housing development zones are identified (preciously we had a 'general countryside ' zone, which was more sympathetic towards development). The idea that there are no other suitable housing sites in the remainder of the area is fanciful in the extreme, as there must be countless laces where individual houses can be sited without difficulty. Given the importance of housing to the area, to leave the Markey to find these sites in the way proposed in the Plan is the opposite of good planning; and we object to that approach as being unhelpful; unwieldy; and prejudicial to the interests of those whose livelihoods depend on the building trade in the area.
3. Your policy 26 relating to housing out with settlements is non-specific and very restrictive, and clearly demonstrates an apparent lack of understanding of what constitutes the workload of small local firms.
4. The Cairngorms National Park Deposit Local Plan is not like a conventional local plan, which shows the distribution of the policies on a map base, and is therefore very easy to understand. The result of that convention not being used here, is that the Deposit Local Plan is very difficult to understand, and will be even more difficult to use in practice.
5. We understand that the principle behind the Deposit Local Plan is that the onus is on the users, having identified land in which they have an interest, to read through the plan and form a conclusion as to what level of development, if any, might be acceptable on it.
6. If that is the situation, then we object to the Plan specifically on the grounds that it is so complicated in character, and so confusing to use, that it falls well short of the prescription in the government advice on the form and content of local plans.
7. Moreover, a great many of the policies include words which carry value judgements, which ultimately depend on the new of the Planning Authority rather than the view of the user. The Plan is therefore seriously flawed, since in many cases, the user cannot reach a conclusion on the basis of the text of the Plan alone, as should be the case, if it is doing its job properly.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

8. It is also impossible to understand how these value judgements will be made on a consistent basis, in a situation in which, as we understand it, any one of five The policies as drafted do provide for small scale development on sites which are not specifically allocated within the Plan. The wording of policies for new

different development control authorities could be involved. development outwith allocated sites will be revisited to clarify the range of opportunities available and provide the appropriate level of guidance is available for

9. The plan lists a number of major housing opportunities, but the majority if not all of these, under the control of the volume builders, who have the financial developers. Also in text for larger sites make reference to securing opportunities for small scale builders.

strength to acquire large tracts of land, and bank them until the time to develop them is right. The problem was initiated by the creation of CNPA. **Response to 1st modifications**

Without a supply of small building sites to sustain local builders, which in the case of Badenoch and Strathspey equals a workforce of several hundred people, they We unite representing three of the larger local building firms operating from Grantown on Spey. As a group we support directly and indirectly over 100 local will undoubtedly falter, and in some cases, may fail. tradesmen and apprentices. Recent large housing, planning applications and current housing development are being monopolised by large construction firms, this

That situation is seriously compounded by the practice favoured by the volume builders in the area, of importing their own labour into the Badenoch and Strathspey trend coupled with the National Parks policies on housing in the countryside is representing a serious threat to our separate firms sustainabilty.

area, from further afield. The current draft local plan further erodes our potential landbank eg the residential areas identified in the 1997 local plan in Nethy Bridge at former nursery Dell

10. Regrettably, the plan in its present form fails to acknowledge the responsibility the Park Authority has to the local building trade, and the contribution it makes to Road (8 houses) and Duack Bridge (6 houses) are no longer zoned for residential development (see attached pages). Small sites such as these have historically provided a solid backbone on which to run our businesses. We unite to ask on the feasibility of reinstating areas such as these for residential development and suggest a meeting to discuss this issue further.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The sites referred to were not included in the deposit plan, and no objection was raised to their removal at that point. The objection therefore raises a new issue which is not appropriate at this time. It is therefore not proposed to add any second modification or amendment to these allocations.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 409j	Name William Stuart Paterson 3 Lynstock Park Nethy Bridge PH25 3EL	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Housing (affordable)

Representation to Deposit Plan

Community councils have been asked to identify land for 'affordable houses', but after a recent development of 17 houses in Nethy Bridge where only 3 residents managed to upgrade to larger homes I would suggest that this is a flawed policy. It appears that these homes can be given to people within a wider area, who then require to travel increased distances therefore increasing the carbon footprint of the area.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Review the approach in line with the findings of the 3Dragons report. The model used in this report will then underpin the delivery of the local plan. Further work will also continue with the local authorities on the role of waiting lists and the provision for local people.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained. Some concerns appear to have been addressed.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The definition of affordable housing has been included in the appendix. The issue of local houses for local people remains important and CNPA staff continue to work with the housing authorities to influence the allocations policies. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Inverburn Ltd
408b

Agent Bill Hepburn
Tulloch Homes Ltd
Stoneyfield house
Inverness
IV2 7PA

Company

Policy/site General - Housing (affordable)

Representation to Deposit Plan

In addition to the specifics of Nethybridge, my clients seek recognition of the need for flexibility of land use within existing community areas and adjacent hinterland in order to meet the well documented aspiration of delivering affordable housing for the area. Particular emphasis should be placed on highly sustainable, environmentally friendly developments which compliment the ethos of CNPA and community integration whilst meeting identified need. It is anticipated, that such flexibility be afforded only to schemes which provide circa 75% social housing.

I would welcome the opportunity of discussing these representations with you further prior to the preparation of any modifications to the deposit local plan.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Review the approach in line with the findings of the 3Dragons report. The model used in this report will then underpin the delivery of the local plan. Further work will also continue with the local authorities on the role of waiting lists and the provision for local people.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The intent of the policy to secure 40% affordable units where subsidy exists is to ensure provision on the ground which does not adversely impact on the developer and economics of the scheme. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. The benchmark set by the Scottish Government does not refer to land values or availability of subsidy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation and no modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

housing in the Park. Throughout also ensure a more positive tone is achieved.

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Donald Lockhart **Agent**
385c Albyn Housing Association
 98-100 High Street
 Invergordon
 IV18 0DL

Company Albyn Housing Association

Policy/site General - Housing (affordable)

Representation to Deposit Plan

Again, the Society commends the boldness of the 50% quota (Policy 24) but would be concerned about whether this would deter developers in bringing forward development proposals. A preferred route might be to consider this on a case by case basis depending on the level of housing stress in the area. Some sites may merit a greater quota than the 50% stated.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Amend policy to reflect findings of 3Dragons work on affordable housing provision. Two background papers undertaken by consultants relating to population figures and affordable housing requirements are available on line. A summary of the approach taken will be appended to the Local Plan. Also amendments will be made to the introduction to the housing section to clarify the need for housing in the Park.

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 020a	Name Dr A Watson Clachnaben Crathes, Banchory Kincardineshire AB31 5JE	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Hardly appears to be for a National Park, because it is overwhelmingly about new housing, an impression emphasised by the cover photograph. Out of 96 pages, pages 35-54 and 62-91, i.e. totalling 50, are on living and working in the Park and on settlements. Section 4 on Conserving and enhancing the Park occupies 18 pages, while Section 6 Enjoying and understanding the Park takes up 4 pages. This lopsidedness is highly revealing.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Modifications will endeavour to ensure a more appropriate balance is struck between development opportunities and the protection of the special qualities of the area as identified as a National Park. The wording used within policies throughout will be clarified to ensure the appropriate level of guidance is available for developers, and the Plan is easy to understand and use. A review of the Introduction and Context sections is necessary to clarify and refine the vision for the Plan and set out clearly the strategic background to the policies drafted. Similarly further clarification is needed in the introduction section to each Chapter to state clearly the justification for the approach taken and the aspirations sought as a result of implementation of the policies.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The housing allocations are a response to housing needs within the National Park for all sectors of the community. Amendments have been made to ensure a balance is struck between housing and other forms of development. No further amendment is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Thank you for your letter of 5 November. I am content for the written representations that I made earlier to be used for the public inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
037h	DW and IM Duncan Pineacre West Terrace Kingussie PH21 IHA	

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Table 2 - It is rather concerning that there is an acceptance here of the requirement for nearly 500 units to be classed as second homes and vacant property. Other NP areas in the UK have taken a more robust approach to the issue of second homes and we can see no reason why the Cairngorms NP Authority should not do likewise.

The total allocation of 1640 house units in the next 10 years is surely unsustainable. We have already mentioned the issue of water supply and waste water treatment, but what of the increase in energy usage, pollution, vehicles and associated traffic congestion in the towns and villages?

The negative impact of this scale of house building will undoubtedly damage important habitats and ecosystems mainly in Strathspey and Badenoch in areas such as An Camus Mor, Carrbridge and Nethy Bridge. The harmful impacts on the landscape and the character of the existing settlements will be evident in the villages of Aviemore, Boat of Garten, Carrbridge, Newtonmore and Kincaig.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Amend table 2 to reflect the parts of the housing market not controlled by the planning system. The total figures are however based on work undertaken to establish need within the Park and this study is available online. Issues such as infrastructure are considered through the planning process and the local plan feeds into the investment programmes for supplies. The policies regarding housing do however have to be read together with all the other policies of the plan, and the aims of the Park, and development will not therefore occur to the detriment of the natural resources of the Park or undermine its aims.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The CNPA position regarding housing land supply and allocation of sites has not changed. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to your letter of 5th November regarding modifications to the Local Plan.

I have no further comments to make on these modifications but I would reiterate that I still have serious concerns regarding the extent of the zoning for new housing development across the area and I believe that this is at odds with the first aim of the National Park.

I am happy for my written submissions to be considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** The Proprietors of Mar Centre
394i

Agent Steve Crawford
Halliday Fraser Munro
8 Victoria Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1XB

Company The Proprietors of Mar Centre

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

These tables have been altered with Aberdeenshire part of the Park and Braemar in particular losing housing sites over the period to 2016. Braemar can and should accommodate more housing than is proposed in order to support its future role in the Park

Changes Required to Resolve the Objection

Increase the housing allocation in Braemar in line with the sites identified in this report.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The tables have only been altered to reflect extant permissions and to correct errors in the previous version. The figures are not accurate and no further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector **Name** Muir Homes Ltd
0381

Agent Malcolm Smith
TMS Planning and Development Services
Balclune, 32 Clune Road
Gowkhill, Fife
KY12 9NZ

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

I am aware that the text below is largely commentary rather than forming an objection in light of the terms of the original local plan text. The general tenor for support for new development to support communities appears, again, not to provide sufficient support for allocated sites. Table 4 “Phased land supply by local authority area” is wrongly labelled as it refers to the “indicative capacity of additional sites identified” where some of these are in fact existing sites identified within the adopted local plan (including site H1 in Grantown-on-Spey) and therefore should be reflected as such. Policy 21 relates to affordable housing. Its terms are preferable to the original affordable housing policy within the Deposit local plan but here lies another problem with the failure of the local plan to provide “support” for allocated sites. Without the private development the 121 affordable houses required annually will not be provided.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The comments are noted. However they are recognised as commentary rather than objection. No further action is therefore recommended.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to the letter from Cairngorm National Park Authority dated 5 November, 2008 and the attached “2nd Modifications to the Deposit Local Plan” related to the above. I would confirm at this stage that Muir Homes Limited retains its objections to the plan for those reasons set out within the representation submitted by TMS Planning and Development Services dated July 2008. Muir Homes Limited will wish all of its objections to be considered as part of the Local Plan PLI process and is likely to wish to support some objections in the form of oral evidence at a hearing with the remainder by further written submissions. This position will be clarified in due course.

HEARING

Objector 056i	Name James and Evelyn Sunley 12 Lochnagar Way Ballater AB35 5PB	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

5.1 to 5.3 We stated that the Park's attempt to make "one size fit all" is of particular importance in relation to "sustainable communities". Ballater would not exist if it had not been its attraction to the wealthy and important as a retirement place of residence and health spa. This has been the case for more than one hundred and fifty years. Very different to Aviemore's history. The Park Local Plan appears to want to stifle the opportunity for people to buy homes in Ballater in its housing policy (5.21/5.85) Without the constant influx of 'grey money' Ballater as we know it will die. The spending power of those coming into the village helps sustain many businesses in Ballater, therefore the Sustainable Community policy for Ballater has to contain land for high value housing development of the type that will still attract people who want to retire to Ballater and help subsidise affordable housing in the form of planning gain.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Two background papers undertaken by consultants relating to population figures and affordable housing requirements are available on line. A summary of the approach taken will be appended to the Local Plan. Also amendments will be made to the introduction to the housing section to clarify the need for housing in the Park.

Response to 1st modifications

The modified Park Plan does not address any of the objections that we made, we therefore continue our objections and ask you to think again.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The housing allocations are a response to housing needs within the National Park for all sectors of the community. The wording does not therefore highlight particular sectors or age ranges. The allocations do not in any way intend to stifle development or opportunities, rather the opposite is true, and the policies aim to ensure that a greater cross section of the population are able to get an appropriate house. No further amendment is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Thank you for your letter dated 5th Nov. 2008 with regard to the arrangements for the Local Plan inquiry and the further modifications to the Local Plan.

I refer you to the changes indicated in appendix page 8 of your letter and point out that "page 68 , Ballater ..."is in fact page 72, page 68 refers to Kingussie. I further point out that the change to 16.2ha from the original 10.99ha, is a change due to the inclusion by CNPA of areas E2, and E3 areas which did not form part of development land on the Aberdeenshire CC Local Plan. This change should be properly delineated as a change from the ACC Local Plan.

With regard to my intentions with regard to the Reporters enquiry, it is decided on this matter but will probably follow the informal route.

HEARING

Objector **Name** North East Mountain Trust **Agent**
443f Burnhead Farmhouse
 Raemoir
 Banchory
 AB31 4EB

Company North East Mountain Trust

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Section 5 Living and Working in the Park — Specifically on Housing Development Policies.

We find the approach to housing in the park seriously deficient and incompatible with the first, second and fourth aims of the park. This concern focuses on the scale of holiday home construction envisaged in Table 2 on page 43. It is vital that housing affordable to the local population is provided and provision to meet that demand incorporated into the plan.

Holiday homes are already a major feature of housing in the park especially in Badenoch and Strathspey and their purchase a major cause of the lack of housing for local people who cannot compete in the bidding system. Commitment to large scale provision of holiday homes is also a commitment to how important aspects of tourism development will take place in the Park. There is adequate experience and knowledge from tourism development in areas, such as the Alps that clearly demonstrate the social damage done by permitting large scale holiday home development in communities and of the reduction in economic wealth generated by a tourism industry emphasizing this approach.

In addition, there is increasing evidence that proposed and planned housing developments, through their scale and number, are already affecting the natural resources of the Park. Examples are the threatened impacts on semi-natural woodlands. In this respect, the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (1994) is relevant as it states the UK Government's published policies. Viz: p.100, 6.48. "Action. Continue to protect ancient semi-natural woodlands and encourage forms of management which conserve their special characteristics. Encourage the extension and creation of native woodlands. Support the creation of community woodlands near population centres"

p.163, 10.15. "Policies and programmes have as their objective to maintain the present area of ancient and semi-natural woodlands; to expand the area of native woodland of a natural character;..."

An additional example of the growing pressure on natural resources through excessive house building is Scottish Water's proposed increased demand on water resources from the Spey, which already sees heavy demands on its resources.

Lastly, the carbon footprint of a policy that encourages sizeable housing development based on persons or families owning two homes is unacceptable in terms of its contribution towards climate change.

We therefore object, to the current housing policies and approach that would permit such development.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The supply of housing land is based on studies undertaken to assess need and methods of provision in particular affordable housing. The policies regarding housing do however have to be read together with all the other policies of the plan, and the aims of the Park, and development will not therefore occur to the detriment of the natural resources of the Park or undermine its aims.

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
462b	Phillip John Swan 30 Monaltrie Avenue Ballater AB35 5RX	

Company

Policy/site General - housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

This objection relates to Section 5, Table 4, 'Phased land supply by local authority area', page 44 (Ballater data specifically). The proposed number of 250 homes for Ballater seems grossly over-estimated; I believe the real foreseeable number of new homes, required to serve the needs of all legitimate 'stakeholders' in Ballater is around 30-40 units, of affordable housing. This could be achieved by means of intelligent infill developments and upgrading/conversion of existing properties. Over-estimating Ballater's future housing requirements as done in the plan will lead to a number of possible problems in the future, including:

- Natural uptake will be lower than planned, leaving many houses empty for lengthy periods and likely targets for vandalism;
- Large numbers of new residents living in affordable housing will not be required for local employment (because the true size of the future labour market is much lower than 250 new homes would be able to service) and this would lead to social problems associated with increased numbers of long-term unemployment.

Requested change: to reduce the target number of new homes from 250 to around 50 units.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The figures for housing supply are based on work undertaken to establish the need within the Park as a whole, and in the various parts thereof. The Local Plan is obliged to make adequate provision for a 5 year period and table 4 is therefore only amended to correct previous mistakes in the figures.

Response to 1st modifications

I wish to maintain my objections to the CNPA Deposit Plan.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The CNPA position regarding housing land allocation H1 in Ballater has not changed. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

INQUIRY

Objector	Name	Agent
462a	Phillip John Swan 30 Monaltrie Avenue Ballater AB35 5RX	

Company

Policy/site General - housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Table 2

This objection relates to Section 5, Table 2, 'Housing land requirement calculation' and Table 3, 'Phased land supply by local authority', page 43. The basis of total housing requirement for the Park, as estimated, seems excessive. Specifically, the 50 per cent allowance for second homes and vacant property, plus 15 per cent for 'uncertainty', on top of a base figure that already looks generous, leads to an unnecessarily high commitment for new development more than 70 per cent above the best available realistic estimate.

Requested change: to revert to the household projection figure of 950 units as a realistic total requirement.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The housing supply figures are based on work commissioned by the CNPA and this is on line for information. The view is therefore maintained that the plan includes the correct amount of land for the need.

Response to 1st modifications

I wish to maintain my objections to the CNPA Deposit Plan.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The CNPA position regarding housing land supply and allocation of sites has not changed. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to page 40, paragraph 5.28. The late addition of the identity of two important sources of information on such a critical matter as housing demand, at this late stage in the consultation process, is not acceptable and I wish to register an objection, on the grounds that it leaves too little time for concerned parties in the Community to examine these information sources in order to assure themselves of the integrity of the decisions made by the CNPA with respect to housing matters.

I therefore request that, now these information sources have been revealed, the second modifications be given a further period of consultation.

INQUIRY

Objector 057	Name Clare Jenkins 6 Railway Cottages Newtonmore PH20 1AR	Agent
------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

I am writing to express my concern about the unsustainable growth envisaged in the Deposit Local Plan. I understand the need for more housing for those living and working in the Highlands, especially the need for affordable housing for local people but to make an allowance for the predicted demand for second homes is inexcusable. Second homes add little to the life and the economy of the Highlands with many standing empty for a large proportion of the year. They contribute little to the social or financial fabric of the area, keep property prices high and keep property unavailable for local people. I know this too well as I have found it very difficult in the recent past to find anywhere to live in Newtonmore, and had to resort to living in a caravan and holiday cottage for periods of time while second homes stand empty and unused. It is also a very difficult situation for others in a similar situation.

I feel strongly that the current Deposit Local Plan can only make this problem worse and make houses more and more unaffordable for local people. The irony is that more and more building will ultimately detract from the beauty and desirability of the area. Surely the CNPA is meant to promote sustainable development of the area and protect a sensitive area rather than allowing itself to be controlled by market forces. I implore you to review your current policy and protect this beautiful area and promote affordable housing for those who live and work here keeping the place alive rather than just a theme park for the tourists.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Amend table 2 to reflect issue of sectors of the market not controlled by the planning system.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The reference to second homes has been removed from table 2. CNPA continue to work with the government in regards the issue of second homes. The policies regarding affordable housing have been amended to ensure they are robust but realistic and we continue to work on economic modelling to ensure that affordable houses are achieved through this plan. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 437o	Name Mrs Jane Angus Darroch Den Hawthorn Place Ballater AB35 5QH	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Housing pp 41-52; including Policies 23-9. Mixed housing development and the sustainable balance of affordable and open markets is more likely to be successful when there is local housing for local people. The latest figures of stated requirements are about 60 small rented and under 40 units for affordable purchase as above. It does not seem possible to produce the balance in the Plan without bringing in a dangerously disrupting change of population and financial problems if we discuss that as 50 or 30% of development. Inclusion of private and play spaces must be balanced also by accommodation for those who do not want to garden and allotments for those who prefer that kind of separate cultivation. It should be possible to have walkways separate from heavy traffic so that children may move safely and visibly about their activities. It is helpful to have easy access to Planners for discussion for people who wish to have small developments especially if it is not considered desirable to have open discussion of the sums required as contribution before plans are in more than the concept stage.

The Sustainable Design Guide should emphasize sound insulation as well as heat and general energy sustainability so that quiet, large flats are a feasible possibility in a bagpipe-playing area. Also garages underneath as a protection against flooding on the 1:200 year plain OR moving uphill. There is nothing firm here about heat exchanges or geothermal.

We are not sure that more houses on severely as they are now or in Policy 28. Rural businesses might benefit from isolation. The Plan intends to identify sites and land for development over a five year period. Whilst we accept that this Local plan is intended for this length of time, the development of land for housing in Ballater has to be over a much longer period. I await the Green Paper in October.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The National Park authority is committed to the creation and support of sustainable communities. Confirm in cpt 7 this issue.

Response to 1st modifications

response received - need to confirm actual position regarding formality of objection

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response received - need to confirm actual position regarding formality of objection

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
037g	DW and IM Duncan Pineacre West Terrace Kingussie PH21 IHA	

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Para 5.27 'Housing demand is related to the ability and interests of householders to fund their aspirations for housing'. It is rather ironic that the very designation of the area as a national park has led to an increase in the demand for housing both directly as a result of the requirement for housing by NP staff, the majority of whom appear to have moved in from out with the area and indirectly as a result of the supposed desirability of living within the NP area. This is clearly reflected in estate agents and developments adverts keen to promote the idea that their properties lie within the National Park. This probably adds about 10% to the asking price.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The policies in the plan and the allocations for housing development are intended to redress the balance in house prices and the need for affordable housing across the Park. Whilst the asking prices for open market houses cannot be controlled by the CNPA the policies are designed to impact particularly on affordable homes, and provide choice for those in need of such accommodation. No modification considered necessary as a result of this representation.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

CNPA continue to collect and analyse information in relation to house prices and use this information in the production of policies for the future. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to your letter of 5th November regarding modifications to the Local Plan.

I have no further comments to make on these modifications but I would reiterate that I still have serious concerns regarding the extent of the zoning for new housing development across the area and I believe that this is at odds with the first aim of the National Park.

I am happy for my written submissions to be considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
344	John Davison Locheil Drumuille Boat of Garten PH24 3BX	

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Where one arrives AT depends upon where one is coming FROM. You choose to start the debate from the basis of all those listed paragraphs of the draft Deposit plan – a welter of ambitious, often conflicting, aims, a recipe for endless prioritising debate. I choose to start from a much more secure and single basis: Although the 4 aims of the Park are expressed in woolly intangible phrases (with the word ‘housing’ not even included), the intention in setting up the park was clearly stated at the beginning by the then Minister responsible, Sam Galbraith, that it “should become an icon of peace and beauty”. However that phrase is interpreted, and despite MOD warplanes still practicing overhead, it is clear that the intention was that the Park should be something very DIFFERENT from non-park. If not different, what is the point of setting up a Park, with all the money spent and travail involved in so doing?

But if we look at housing development in north Aviemore today, can one see any difference to development going on around Inverness City? In both, industrial housing juggernauts are moving in to create huge suburban sprawls. Such developments are totally inappropriate adjuncts to Highland villages, whose character is thereby destroyed by the size, shape and uniformity of the attached schemes. Yet the deposit plan envisages / licences ever more such housing developments coming in to attach themselves to villages. Once set in motion, the juggernauts need to be fed, to gobble up ever more land. And for what? Just to spew out more profit for landowners and developers?

Who are all these houses for? The builders are only really interested in the free market 50% that can be sold to retirees, as holiday homes, to buy-to-rent speculators. The Park want 50% to be so-called affordable, so that young artisans can be on hand to provide the services the other 50% will require from demographic change. This argument is so flawed: it completely ignores the amazing mobility of labour. As many working people are probably commuting TO Inverness as are currently commuting FROM.

And what is going to happen at the end of 5 years? The next tranches of land sacrificed to feed at the greed of developers? The same process of concreting over ever more of the strath, taking in the last few villages as yet undamaged: Drumguish, Insh, Laggan, Dulnain Bridge??

Your deposit plan assumes continued growth and stability in the housing market. Perhaps the Seventh cavalry are appearing even now over the hill – a pattern change occurring, not as a result of any CNPA debate or decision-making, but by market forces: a sudden collapse in the housing market. If/when houses prices suddenly drop 25%, you won’t see these developers for the dust created by their rapid EXIT!

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The supply of housing land is based on studies undertaken to assess need and methods of provision in particular affordable housing. The policies regarding housing do however have to be read together with all the other policies of the plan, and the aims of the Park, and development will not therefore occur to the detriment of

the natural resources of the Park or undermine its aims.

Response to 1st modifications

The modifications don't alter any of my objections in the least.

So you poor girl floundering in a quagmire of regulation, changes of regulation, hopelessly lost. I have strong feelings of sympathy for you trying to deal with the morass.

Lets start with the guiding motto: where one gets to depends on where you start from'.

You start from an advanced position already and previously handling all sorts of situations, objections, arrangements, pressure groups, regulations, modifications, etc etc.

I start from Sam Galbraith's resolution at the beginning that CNP should be 'an icon of peace and beauty' ie that this Park should be built on the model of John Muir and national parks in the States and Canada. (see the odd Simon King TV prog that epitomises the ideal.)

But now 'tis clear that the 2 national parks are nothing of the sort. 'Titular' parks perhaps, but pretend parks not real ones. So not to be taken seriously. (the icon bit didn't last long as MOD insisted on aerial war games practised) Because:

A – the govt setting them up fudged the issue in not giving the Boards crystal clear directional aims that they should achieve. Instead of which – pass the buck – 4 very woolly worded aims that any Philadelphia lawyer could argue indefinitely about as to practical conclusions. The Board meets fortnightly to resolve planning applications but there is no clear word in the 4 aims of how to deal with housing. So plan, local plan, modification to local plan ...

And hence you're landed wallowing in the morass like a hippopotamus.

B – the Board – what a ramshackle set up this is! Clear that govt has no high regard for it as allowed poaching of the chairman, the one person with a clear sense of leadership as to where the Board should go. All of them were self promoted in arriving on the Board, so self seeking, nice little earners, floundering like yourself under a regime of no clear leadership of where they are going and what the Park should be. So fudge, balancing acts, sops to lobbies, local plans, modifications to local plans, in 5 yrs more local plans, industrial housing estates going up, Falkirk rulings.

So how can we take CNPA seriously?

Why don't you have a champagne, have a good weep, resign the job, write a really good book on the 'Follies of National Parks in Scotland' and join J K Rowland in making a lot of money?

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The CNPA position regarding allocations in Aviemore has not changed. It is therefore not proposed to add any second modification or amendment to these allocations.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** James and Evelyn Sunley **Agent**
056m 12 Lochnagar Way
 Ballater
 AB35 5PB

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

5.27/5.41 The Park plan is again guilty of forming policy for the Park as a whole when in fact the affordable housing needs and housing development market potential are quite different in Ballater than in other settlements in the Park. The number of affordable houses required in Ballater for LOCAL PEOPLE and for commercial employment needs has not been established. It should not be the function of the CNP or the Park Plan to be used as a vehicle for the Scottish Executive to solve the housing shortages in other parts of Scotland.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The supply of housing land is based on studies undertaken to assess need and methods of provision in particular affordable housing. CNPA also work closely with the housing authorities to ensure the most up to date information is available on local need. Also we continue to try and influence the use of housing waiting lists.

Response to 1st modifications

The modified Park Plan does not address any of the objections that we made, we therefore continue our objections and ask you to think again.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The allocations reflect work undertaken to establish local need, and we continue to work closely with the local housing authorities to ensure the most up to date information. The requirements for affordable housing have also been altered. No further amendment is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Thank you for your letter dated 5th Nov. 2008 with regard to the arrangements for the Local Plan inquiry and the further modifications to the Local Plan.

I refer you to the changes indicated in appendix page 8 of your letter and point out that "page 68 , Ballater ..."is in fact page 72, page 68 refers to Kingussie. I further point out that the change to 16.2ha from the original 10.99ha, is a change due to the inclusion by CNPA of areas E2, and E3 areas which did not form part of development land on the Aberdeenshire CC Local Plan. This change should be properly delineated as a change from the ACC Local Plan.

With regard to my intentions with regard to the Reporters enquiry, it is decided on this matter but will probably follow the informal route.

HEARING

Objector	Name	Agent
458	D Scobbie 22 Seafield Court Grantown on Spey PH263LE	

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Comments on the Introduction - The combination of natural and cultural heritage will fail. The majority of people taking up the majority of homes will know nothing of the area's cultural heritage, indeed many will seek to introduce their own concept of culture. It should be a priority to retain local people who do know and appreciate the cultural heritage. Planned housing developments will neither maintain the Park's distinctive character or its coherent identity. It may even destroy many of these assets. An example is the architecturally disastrous housing developments in Aviemore. These appear to be an amalgam of Disneyland and Balymory designed by architects to whom the concept of vernacular architecture means a strip of Fifestone or a blue, green or ochre frontage.

General Comments - "Meeting the special needs of the area and be the best means of ensuring that the Park aims are collectively achieved in relation to the area in a coordinated way" It appears that the special needs of the area are more open-market housing and many more people. What is driving this demand? I find little justification for this policy in the Plan. For years it has been obvious that the prime requirement in the Park area - as in most of Scotland - is affordable housing to enable local young people to stay and work in their own home area. It is a clear and undeniable requirement yet the ratio of affordable to open market housing is poor, some 20 to 25 percent of planned build. The Plan lists the number of houses that could be built in 14 towns and villages but only in Carrbridge is the number of affordable houses mentioned (89 open market and 28 affordable). My percentage may not be accurate but the proposed development in Grantown on Spey gives a similar figure. So demand for 75% of planned houses comes from outwith the Park. Even allowing for a reasonable percentage being generated from existing residents wishing to upgrade or move (thus freeing more existing housing stock) it can be assumed that the Plan anticipates and is committed to a very large increase of population. I repeat my earlier question, what is generating this demand? At 5.21 the Plan states that the proposed delivery of housing is to meet the needs of the communities in CNP. I doubt very much that existing communities are clamouring for housing other than affordable housing and I trust that the CNP Board can produce evidence to justify the proposed construction of so many open market houses. At 5.24 there is a list of strategic objectives one of which is to increase the accessibility of rented and owned houses to meet the economic and social needs of existing communities. If so, will the percentage of affordable houses satisfy this demand? It appears that CNP can gauge the percentage required within a few percent but what exactly is generating demand for the other 75% percent of open market housing? The Plan is somewhat vague in this area.

Naturally people want to move into national park areas. Anyone who has driven from Manchester to the Lake District on a Friday night can speak of the endless traffic tailbacks that vanish when past the Lakes' slip roads. Fortunately, England has more demanding regulations to prevent inappropriate development. There is sufficient evidence to indicate that, throughout the Park area, a large proportion of the housing stock is used as present or future retirement homes, second homes, holiday homes, buy and wait, buy and lease or purely speculative purchase. None of these uses meets the professed aims and principles set out in the Introduction and it is highly likely that the same pattern of ownership will be repeated in future. None of these reasons for purchase add real value to the life and sustainability of the Park, in fact they merely add to demand for water, power and other services to be provided by the respective regional councils and agencies such as SWS. They do, however, provide attractive investment opportunities for large construction companies, non residents and property speculators.

The employment of large out-of-area construction companies who will import out-of-area workers will destroy the smaller, local construction firms currently providing long term sustainability to a fair proportion of the Park communities. Substantial increase in population will attract the big chain stores that will eliminate the smaller shops in the villages and small towns. In time altering the ambiance of these settlements. The very things that tourists find attractive in the smaller villages will metamorphose into a series of cheap souvenir sellers and fast food outlets. Again, Aviemore is a good example.

Despite the new Plan's laudable attention to minimising the effects of climate change and carbon footprint, one can anticipate an average of one car per house. Unfortunately, there is a tendency for newcomers to purchase one of the larger 4-wheel drive versions, presumably to deal with severe winters now long gone. A subsidiary effect is to increase demand for parking spaces and car parks thus reducing available space particularly in the smaller settlements. Examples of this problem can be seen on any day in Newtonmore, Kingussie, Aviemore and Grantown on Spey.

I note that SWS is to provide Newtonmore with a long awaited upgrade to the waste water treatment plant at a cost of 3.5 million pounds. In 2009 up to 120 more houses will be able to connect to the public sewerage supply. Unfortunately, this is 100 fewer houses than are planned for Newtonmore. Presumably another upgrade will be required, perhaps costing only 2.5 million. SWS intend to upgrade facilities at Grantown (which is to have another 235 houses) possibly at twice the cost of the Newtonmore works. If one extrapolates this level of expenditure and applies it to other communities with similar problems (nearly all) the total sum is enormous and effluent handling is only one aspect of the infrastructure shortfall. Water supply is a case in point. SWS have already expressed concern about the inadequacy of the current supply and I understand there is a proposal to take water from the Spey. Should the proposals in the Plan be adopted it appears that Cairngorms National Park will become (concurrently with the conversion of the A9 to dual carriageway, the installation of a new power supply system [under or over ground), and the efforts of SWS and other agencies) a gigantic building site condemning its inhabitants to a decade of noise, dust, mud, huge lorries and total inconvenience. One begins to understand why Scottish Government is expressing doubts about the competence of appointees to boards of National Parks.

The Plan covers anticipated development in the Park over the next five years. Assuming the proposals are adopted, there will be a very large increase in open market housing, far beyond the capacities of existing infrastructure and apparently driven by unspecified demand. As it stands, the Plan appears to be a competently constructed wish list dealing adequately with a multitude of subsidiary matters. It does not address major concerns, for instance it refers to healthcare facilities and care services in two sentences which place responsibility on the relevant NT-IS Trusts. As the originating authority for unprecedented population expansion one would expect CNPA to consider this matter in more detail. There will be a major increase in the percentage of older people living in the Park and, while NHS has responsibility for some aspects of these matters, it is the appropriate councils that are responsible for the greatest part. In this case Highland Council Social Work Department. The Social Work Department is already overworked, understaffed and financially embarrassed. It is already committed to major undertakings throughout the life of the Plan. I am confident that they will be delighted to learn that CNPA intends to add so many people to their area of responsibility. So too will the people of Highland Region who will undoubtedly pay the price in increased Council Tax. I assume the same principle applies to suppliers of other infrastructure services.

Additionally, the Plan does not consider the effect of proximity to Inverness - the fastest growing city in the UK. As has happened in England, many villages and small towns have become dormitory areas denuded of all local inhabitants and local facilities. The fact that CNP should be, to some extent, protected from such depredation is yet to be demonstrated. In UK terms the commuter distance to Inverness is quite short and the A9 will be upgraded to dual carriageway. Deeside, Badenoch and Strathspey are prime dormitory territory and, despite the safeguards listed in the Plan, the Board has yet to withstand the full weight of commercial, political and financial pressures and other inducements masquerading as pragmatism that will be exerted in future. On current performance I doubt if it is competent to do so. I have little doubt that in 25 years time the real "Park" will be considerably smaller.

CNPA has to meet many EU and UK requirements but one pivotal requirement should be noted; it is required to maintain the local quality of life. This Plan does not fulfil that requirement, in terms of housing provision it may well achieve the opposite. It will, however, make things easier for horses (Action Programme 2007-2012, para 1h)

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO RESOLVE OBJECTIONS

1. CNPA should reconsider their priorities in housing provision. Construction of affordable housing for local people should be given priority and the proportion of affordable houses to open market houses should be increased initially to over 50% until demand has been fulfilled. Any subcontracting of affordable housing must go to local firms
2. If not already available, a study should be made to identify specific areas in which demand for affordable housing is greatest.
3. Very large (over 50 houses) projects should be subject to staged construction over a minimum 5 year period.
4. All housing developments should be phased to coincide with the completion of all essential infrastructure projects. Examples are water, drainage, effluent and power.
5. Local construction companies and suppliers must be utilised to the maximum extent possible including combination for large projects.
6. Speculative building should be banned and construction limited to areas able to demonstrate a clear, valid and proven demand. **CNPA analysis of objection to**

Deposit Plan

7. The Plan contains a number of issues that require clarification. The outstanding deficiency is failure to consider the cumulative effect of all the proposals. The figures for housing supply are based on studies commissioned by the Park Authority to support the local plan. The policies in the plan and the allocations for housing development are intended to redress the balance in house prices and the need for affordable housing across the Park. Whilst the asking prices for open market houses cannot be controlled by the CNPA the policies are designed to impact particularly on affordable homes, and provide choice for those in need of such

1. CNPA should reconsider their priorities in housing provision. Construction of affordable homes for local people should be given priority and the proportion of accommodation. No modification considered necessary as a result of this representation. affordable homes to open market homes should be increased.

2. If not already completed, a study should be made to identify specific areas in which demand for affordable homes is greatest. **Response to 1st modifications**
Thank you for the copy of the modified LP, much appreciated. Unfortunately, for domestic reasons, I have been unable to devote enough time to digest fully the implications of the amendments and I am unlikely to do so before the 30th. I appreciate that you too may be short of time so, if it helps, I would like to give my conditional approval to the proposed changes. It is certainly an improvement on the original. I would also like to take advantage of your offer and receive a full copy of the document.

One statement does puzzle me somewhat. The wording in the Grantown on Spey settlement proposal GS/H1 appears to imply that the application will be approved. GS/ED1, however states that the caravan and camping site will be protected from adverse development. These statements are mutually incompatible. Which is correct?

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The wording does not imply that any application has been or will be approved. It merely highlights that there is an outstanding application on the site yet to be determined and any housing which is developed will contribute to the housing needs of the area. No further action required.

3. Very large (over 50 houses) developments should be subject to staged construction over a 5 year period although access roads and sub-surface utility connections **response to 2nd modifications**

can be completed during initial construction.

6. All housing developments should be phased to coincide with the completion of essential infrastructure projects. Examples are water, effluent and power supplies.

7. Local construction companies and suppliers should be utilised to the maximum possible extent.

8. Speculative building should be banned and construction limited to areas demonstrating clear and valid demand for housing. CNPA must either reduce the number of open market houses or spread the intended development over a minimum of 20 years.

9. The Plan contains a number of issues that require clarification.

HEARING

Objector **Name** Alistair McLeod **Agent**
389 McLeod Building Ltd.,
78 High Street,
GRANTOWN ON SPEY
PH26 3EL

Company McLeod Building Ltd.

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

We write to express our concern on various aspects of the above and how they would affect our Company. McLeod Building Ltd is a family owned and run business and was established in Grantown on Spey in 1908. We directly employ over 30 staff all of whom are local. In addition we employ up to approximately 20 sub-contractors, again locally, to carry out various trades.

It would seem that the Local Plan will from now on favour bigger builders almost all of whom will come from outwith the Park. Smaller local companies like ourselves have always depended on land being available for smaller developments and also one-off dwellings. The smaller developments will now not be viable due to the high percentage of provision for affordable housing and one-off houses will be severally restricted, if built at all, due to the guidelines of the Plan in Policy 26.

Much more thought needs to go into both these objectives to take into account the views of the local building industry which after all is a huge contributor the economy of Badenoch and Strathspey and the wider area of the Park.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The policies as drafted do provide for small scale development on sites which are not specifically allocated within the Plan. The wording of policies for new development outwith allocated sites will be revisited to clarify the range of opportunities available and provide the appropriate level of guidance is available for developers. Also in text for larger sites make reference to securing opportunities for small scale builders.

Response to 1st modifications

We unite representing three of the larger local building firms operating from Grantown on Spey. As a group we support directly and indirectly over 100 local tradesmen and apprentices. Recent large housing, planning applications and current housing development are being monopolised by large construction firms, this trend coupled with the National Parks policies on housing in the countryside is representing a serious threat to our separate firms sustainability.

The current draft local plan further erodes our potential landbank eg the residential areas identified in the 1997 local plan in Nethy Bridge at former nursery Dell Road (8 houses) and Duack Bridge (6 houses) are no longer zoned for residential development (see attached pages). Small sites such as these have historically provided a solid backbone on which to run our businesses. We unite to ask on the feasibility of reinstating areas such as these for residential development and suggest a meeting to discuss this issue further.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The sites referred to were not included in the deposit plan, and no objection was raised to their removal at that point. The objection therefore raises a new issue which is not appropriate at this time. It is therefore not proposed to add any second modification or amendment to these allocations.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Goldcrest (Highland) Ltd
445a

Agent Claire Smith
Ryden LLP
25 Albyn Place
Aberdeen
AB10 1YL

Company Goldcrest (Highland) Ltd
Policy/site General - Housing land supply
Representation to Deposit Plan

Our client, Goldcrest (Highland) Ltd objects to the housing and requirement and supply as contained in Section 5 of the Cairngorms National Park Deposit Local Plan. In particular, Table 2: Housing Land Requirement Calculation on page 43 of the Deposit Local Plan should be increased. Similarly, Table 4: Phased Land Supply by Local Authority Area should be amended to make provision for additional units in Nethy Bridge. Currently in this settlement, there are no additional sites identified for residential development, only sites with existing planning consent.

Paragraph 5.37 of the Deposit Plan highlights that there is no exact measure of how many houses will be required in the future, nor any accurate method of predicting how many houses will be built during the lifetime of the Local Plan. The Planning Authority are therefore simply estimating the likely need and demand for additional houses. The Cairngorms National Park Plan 2007 highlights that the lack of access and good quality housing has been identified by many communities as a key issue facing the National Park. The lack of access to good quality affordable housing is one of the key challenges to creating and maintaining sustainable communities in the long-term, so it is a priority to address now.

An Analysis of the Cairngorms Housing System prepared in February 2006 also indicates that significant population and household growth is anticipated in the Local Plan area over the next few years. Affordable housing is also an issue in the area due to the high proportion of second and holiday home owners which both pushes up house prices in the area and reduces the supply available to meet permanent housing need. It advises that the projected level of new supply as a whole would have to be fully devoted to Low Cost Home Ownership (LCHO) or affordable rent in order to meet the backlog of need and newly arising need. This is unrealistic and therefore the most pressing policy consideration is to bolster the supply of new housing in the Park area.

This was supported by consultations carried out which highlighted that a satisfactory amount of land must be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan. Without sufficient zoning of land for housing, supply would be further stifled, driving up demand further. Land availability was viewed as a particular constraint and some settlements had very little land for future housing land. It is considered by Goldcrest (Highland) Ltd that Nethy Bridge is such a settlement with very little land for future housing; in fact, no sites are identified for future housing.

It is therefore essential to increase the supply of new housing in the Park area and the efficient flexibility is built in to allow for uncertainty to accommodate the highest growth scenario. Accordingly, the figures in Table 2 should be increased substantially and additional sites should be identified for residential development in Nethy Bridge. This would help meet demand for housing in the area and help address the affordable housing problem.

Modifications:

Housing Land requirement to be increased in table 2 to allow for additional flexibility.

The phased land supply in table 3 relative to the highland area should be increased to make provision for additional units at Nethy Bridge.

Table 4 should be amended to include additional allocations at Nethy Bridge

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Table 2 is based on work undertaken by consultants and available on line to consider the issue of need and housing land. The plan allocates sufficient land for housing development, and there is no need therefore to include additional land such as that suggested.

Response to 1st modifications

I refer to your letter dated 13 June 2008 advising of the publication of the further modifications to the Cairngorms National Park Local Plan which were agreed by the Park board.

In total three representations were previously made on behalf of my client, Goldcrest (Highland) Ltd. These were referenced as 445a in relation to housing land requirement and supply; 445b in relation to Nethy Bridge; and, 445c in relation to Grantown on Spey.

As no modifications have been made in relation to these matters, I would be grateful if these representations were maintained. I trust this is acceptable; however, should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The position regarding housing land supply and allocations has not changed since the plan was modified. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to the above and your letter dated 5 November 2008. I have considered the options available to present the case at the Local Plan Inquiry and would request that this objection is dealt with by means of informal hearing. I trust that this is appropriate, however should you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

HEARING

Objector	Name	Agent
437k	Mrs Jane Angus Darroch Den Hawthorn Place Ballater AB35 5QH	

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Social effects of too rapid enlargement in Section 7 | p.51 Have social, economic, educational and medical matters been considered, and if so by whom? Surely this should involve Counties as well as local consultation. The full Rural Needs Survey seems to have been cast aside. It cannot be sustainable for such large housing developments for local or self-employment to be built and the impression we take from this is that they will be for retired people, or those commuting to work in the Boom City of Inverness. If the Transport section included a turntable at Dalwhinnie so that commuting trains were used, I might think differently on this point. Nor is there discussion of new working categories ie: c-selling, IT consultancy work, publishing etc., depends on more Broadband or secure wireless methods. Tourism is also affected by lack of this, with so many people being workaholics and this applies to new mobile phones' reception. Taxation changes, foreign ownership and educational failure have huge effects on employment, transport and enterprise. I have seen nothing about consultation with organisations like Imperial Innovations to explore possibilities in the designing, pharmaceutical, communication or educational sectors. And we are still waiting for information on digital reception.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The policies of the plan endeavour to provide a balanced approach to land allocation and services to support this, including creating the correct level of opportunities for employment. Further work is needed to ensure that land allocations are matched with the appropriate level social support (WORK WITH LOCAL AUTHORITIES ON THIS). A detailed paper outlining the background to the housing land requirement calculations and land supply requirements will be prepared to clarify the rationale behind the housing policies. Within this reference will be made to the relationship between the provision of new housing within the Park and the National Park Plan and aims of the Park. Further explanation will also be required to justify the allowance made in table 2 for second homes and vacant properties, and detail how the approach taken will benefit local people. On completion of this paper, information will be circulated to all those who made representation on this issue, and detailed consultation undertaken to assess the level of continued objection, which may result in a modification to the calculations and allocations made.

Response to 1st modifications

response received - need to confirm actual position regarding formality of objection

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response received - need to confirm actual position regarding formality of objection

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector 456c
Name Reidhaven Estate
Seafield Estate Office
Cullen
Buckie
Banffshire

Agent Jill Paterson
Halliday Fraser Munro
8 Victoria Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1XB

Company Reidhaven Estate

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Reidhaven Estate object to the overall housing strategy, figures and allocations of these units and Tables 2, 3 and 4. The estimate of housing need seems to be based on a set of assumptions that are not entirely clear from the plan itself. The total additional household projection calculation to 2016 seems to be based on a low growth scenario and does not take into account the 132 units of affordable housing.

The allocation of these units in Table 4 is of key concern. Capacity in many of the intermediate (e.g. Boat of Garten, Dulnain Bridge, Nethybridge) settlements in the medium to long term shows little growth. It is important that future development opportunities in these settlements are identified in order to provide choice and support existing services.

Reidhaven Estate do not object to the principle of a new settlement at An Cambusmore but consider that development should also be directed to the existing settlements as well as this new settlement. Concern regarding timescales for new settlement and whether the number of units is achievable as forecast due to infrastructure requirements.

Modifications:

Revision to the housing strategy to include future opportunities for housing in the intermediate settlements.

Revision to household projection calculation.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Place consultants work on line. Confirm therefore that sufficient land has been included within the Plan, and continue to work closely with the An Camas Mor team to ensure delivery of housing within the appropriate time scales.

Response to 1st modifications

Maintain objection.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The CNPA position regarding housing land supply has not changed. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector **Name** Donald Lockhart **Agent**
385b Albyn Housing Association
 98-100 High Street
 Invergordon
 IV18 0DL

Company Albyn Housing Association

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

In terms of specific land allocations, again it is not intended to make comment on every settlement as this would be beyond the scope of this reply, however it is still of concern that relatively little new land has been added to the existing land allocation. Unquestionably the Plan places an over-reliance on the prospect of An Camus Mor becoming a development reality despite the very significant infrastructure challenge that it poses. In respect of the settlement maps and comments associated with them, it has become clear in the various other Local Plan reviews that are currently ongoing in the Highland Council area, the vexed issue of indicative density levels has become an area of significant concern. Often these are not informed by the subsequent rigorous feasibility studies which come at a later stage which often prove that at Local Plan density levels the project is unviable. This then becomes a matter of intense interest among parties opposed to development and one which is difficult to argue against. It would be better if the Plan made it clear that these numbers were truly indicative and that considerations of acceptable density levels were to be subject to other tests, such as maximising the use of diminishing serviceable sites together with rigorous analysis of the sustainability issues. In a Plan not over-supplied with allocated land it is important that nothing is done to make zoned sites less likely to come forward.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Table 2 is based on work undertaken by consultants and available on line to consider the issue of need and housing land. The plan allocates sufficient land for housing development, and there is no need therefore to include additional land such as that suggested. The CNPA staff will continue to work with the developers at An Camas Mor to ensure that it is delivered to support the local plan.

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
037a	DW and IM Duncan Pineacre West Terrace Kingussie PH21 IHA	

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

While there are many favourable proposals which we would expect to see within an area designated as a National Park, the emphasis on development ie a major house building programme, is we believe at odds with the first aim of the National Park which is 'to conserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage of the area' and is in the long term unsustainable.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The aims of the Park are paramount in all decision making the Policy I must be complied with to allow any development to go forward.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The housing allocations are a response to housing needs within the National Park for all sectors of the community. Amendments have been made to ensure a balance is struck between housing and other forms of development. The aims of the Park remain paramount in all decision making. No further amendment is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to your letter of 5th November regarding modifications to the Local Plan.

I have no further comments to make on these modifications but I would reiterate that I still have serious concerns regarding the extent of the zoning for new housing development across the area and I believe that this is at odds with the first aim of the National Park.

I am happy for my written submissions to be considered by the Reporter at the Local Plan Inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
387	John M Smith 92 Main Road Langbank Renfrewshire	Malloy Smith Associates 92 Main Road Langbank Renfrewshire

Company

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Planning Policy Scottish Planning Policy 3 (SPP3) "Planning for Housing" sets out the Scottish Government's key themes for housing in Scotland, which are to:

- Create quality residential environments;
- Guide development to the right places; and
- Deliver an adequate supply of housing land.

Paragraph 64 states specifically that: "Local plans must conform to the structure plan and provide sufficient effective land to meet the housing land requirement for at least 5 years from the date of adoption. Local plans should also identify further sites to meet requirements in the medium term." We are of the opinion that there may be a short to medium term shortfall in the supply of effective housing land which can be partly resolved by incorporating these two sites in the new local plan.

Paragraph 19 promotes access to open space, preferably within walking distance, as being important to the health and well being of communities. There is a clear opportunity in these sites being included within the local plan and implemented that access routes and the environment of the area can be enhanced to the benefit of the area. The location of the sites, together with the provision of well designed access routes with good linkages to the town can also contribute to the effective integration of land use and transport. This is given policy support by Paragraph 35 and is augmented by Paragraph 49 which states that most housing requirements should be met within or adjacent to existing settlements.

In terms of creating long-term sustainable settlement strategies, Paragraph 28 states that key considerations should be:

- efficient use of land and existing buildings, energy and infrastructure;
- co-ordination of housing land provision with improvements in infrastructure, including transport and educational investment, and with other major proposals such as business or industrial development;
- the need to ensure that all sections of the community have good access to jobs and services; and
- the protection and enhancement of the environment.

Paragraph 29 expands what is meant by using land efficiently and is supportive of the re-use of previously developed land. Parts of both sites have previously been used as a sewage treatment works and car park. Whilst part of the land is recognised as greenfield, Paragraph 37 states that: "in seeking to locate new housing where it will be accessible by a range of forms of transport, planning authorities may conclude that the release of certain areas of greenfield land would result in a more sustainable pattern of development."

We are of the opinion that these sites meet the requirements for new development to be fully accessible by different modes of transport and which can be integrated into existing networks. The inter-related design of new housing, flood alleviation measures and access and environmental improvements can be achieved at these sites.

Scottish Planning Policy 7 (SPP7) Paragraph 1 of SPP7 states that its central purpose is to:

"prevent further development which would have a significant probability of being affected by flooding or which would increase the probability of flooding elsewhere."

It also stresses in paragraph 3 that: "communities should be free from the threat of flooding."

The proposed site, whilst being within SEPA's indicative 1 in 200 year flood risk area, would incorporate measures to both protect any new development from flooding and extend that protection to properties currently affected by flooding. In relation to new development, paragraph 15 includes the following principles:

"In areas characterised as 'medium to high' flood risk for watercourse and coastal flooding new development should be focused on built up areas and all development must be safeguarded from the risk of flooding

New material should not:

- increase the probability of flooding elsewhere;
- add to the area of land which requires protection by flood prevention measures;
- affect the ability of the functional flood plain to attenuate the effects of flooding by storing water;
- interfere detrimentally with the flow of water in the flood plain;
- compromise major options for future shoreline or river management.

The proposed sites can substantially satisfy these requirements through responsive design and the integration of water bodies which will accommodate an amount of floodwater in a managed way. It is contested that the sites, which are partially vacant/derelict, are within the built up area and with the implementation of appropriate landraising measures will contribute to the safeguarding both proposed and existing properties.

Design proposals would be based on an element of landraising to achieve the aforementioned benefits and paragraph 19 of SPP7 is particularly relevant in that regard. It states that landraising may have a role and that proposals should:

- be linked to provision/maintenance of floodwater storage to replace lost capacity of floodplain elsewhere;
- have a neutral or positive effect on the probability of flooding elsewhere, INCLUDING EXISTING PROPERTIES;
- not create a need for flood prevention measures elsewhere;
- not create islands of development but adjoin developed areas;
- be set back from the bank of the watercourse.

The paragraph concludes that in the context of the SPP land affected by landraising will no longer be part of the floodplain and will not be construed as a flood prevention measure. The effect of releasing the proposed site and implementing such a scheme would therefore be to remove existing properties and new development from flood risk. The great potential of these sites lies in an integrated approach. An example of this is the opportunity to integrate improved access routes bounding the river which allows the landraised platform to be set back from the river bank, thereby creating better outdoor access, improved environmental amenity and sustainable flood alleviation.

The incorporation of elements such as water bodies and path routes within a responsive design could transform a partially vacant site to one which achieves high quality urban form, alleviates flood risk at existing properties and promotes local biodiversity and outdoor access.

Structure Plan - The Structure Plan vision is founded on three interdependent principles of sustainable development. Reflecting the local context, these are expressed as:

- supporting the viability of communities;
- developing a prosperous and vibrant local economy; and

- safeguarding and enhancing the natural and built environment.

These three principles can also be found within "Designing for Sustainability in the Highlands" which was produced as development plan policy guidance in 2006. The purpose of this document is to support the preparation of "Sustainable Design Statements"(SDS) in support of planning applications. It is however considered that many of the issues to be explored by an SDS have already been taken into account and indications are that a successful development which accords with the spirit of sustainable design/development can be achieved.

The Highland Structure Plan recognises that adequate provision of housing is a pre-requisite of economic growth, but that it must be done in such a way to minimise impacts to the environment. The structure plan identifies a need for 1,750 new houses within the Badenoch and Strathspey area between 1998 and 2017. This housing allocation should be facilitated by the relevant local plan.

The proposed new community at An is noted within the structure plan and it is stated that housing land supply in the area can only be maintained if this site is brought forward. However, in the short to medium term, a number of constraints exist which prevent this site from being fully implemented. It is therefore contested that it will not in fact immediately contribute to housing land supply and a shortfall may exist. Including these sites within the new local plan can contribute to resolving any potential shortfall.

The infrastructure section of the structure plan recognises flooding issues associated with the River Spey. It states that flood consultation areas will be identified by local plans using the SEPA flood risk map. Proposal NHI 'Flood Consultation Areas' states that:

Local plans will identify areas with a perceptible risk of flooding. Within these areas, all development proposals will be assessed for their compatibility with the flood risk and with the flow character of the watercourse.

The new local plan does not appear to fulfil this requirement.

The strategic themes of the Draft Community Plan are referred to by the structure plan and these include consolidating the settlement hierarchy. This approach recognises the benefits in terms of service provision and the ability to support a range of facilities.

It is considered that including these sites in the new local plan is completely in accordance with structure plan policies.

Local Plan - Policy 13 'Water Resources' of the deposit local plan includes provision that new development will:

- have no significant adverse impact on the current hydrology/water environment; and

- Be free from significant risk of flooding, not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, not add to the area of land that requires flood prevention measures, or affect the ability of the functional flood plain to store or move flood waters. Development in areas susceptible to flooding (as defined by SPP7s Flood Risk Framework, SEPAs

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Flood Risk maps, or other flood risk information) will require a developer-funded flood risk assessment. Table 2 is based on work undertaken by consultants and available on line to consider the issue of need and housing land. The plan allocates sufficient land for housing development, and there is no need therefore to include additional land such as that suggested.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The position regarding the allocation of housing land within Aviemore and in general terms has not changed. As such no modifications are proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

INQUIRY

Objector **Name** The Clouds Partnership
398c Kinakyle
 Aviemore

Agent John Wirght
Strutt and Parker
28 Melville Street
Edinburgh
EH3 7HA

Company

Policy/site General - housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Introduction

1.1 This is a written submission prepared by Strutt & Parker on behalf of The Clouds Partnership, who are the owners of the subject site at Kinakyle, Aviemore.

1.2 This written submission addresses the policy designations as contained in the Deposit Version of the Cairngorm National Park Local Plan, which have an impact on the land in his ownership, and proposes a number of changes to the Local Plan in relation to the settlement of Aviemore generally, and particularly to the subject site at Kinakyle.

1.3 Policies which are the subject of this written submission are as follows:

- Section 5 Living and Working in the Park, the housing land requirement and supply
- Table 4, Section 5
- Section 7 Settlement Proposals, strategic settlements, Aviemore
- Section 7 Settlement Proposals, strategic settlements, An Camus Mor

The Site

2.1 Kinakyle is located on the southern boundary of the settlement of Aviemore. The northern boundary of the site abuts the southern boundary of the settlement of Aviemore as identified in both the Adopted and Emerging Local Plans.

2.2 Kinakyle is currently used for agricultural purposes, and is generally devoid of prominent landscape features.

2.3 Kinakyle is approximately 60 hectares in total area, and subject to the flood map as produced by SEPA, the area available for residential and associated development is approximately twenty hectares.

Cairngorms National Park Plan 2007

3.1 The Cairngorms National Park Plan 2007 contains at Section 5.2.4 Strategic Objective relating to the provision of housing in the Park. The Park Plan Strategic Objectives for housing which are applicable to this submission are 5.2.4a - increase the accessibility of rented and owned housing to meet the needs of communities throughout the Park, and 5.2.4d — ensure there is effective land and investment for market and affordable housing to meet the economic and social needs of communities throughout the Park.

National Planning Policy and Guidance

4.1 As set out in the original submission to the Cairngorms National park Local Plan Consultation Draft October 2005 on behalf of The Clouds Partnership, we would reiterate the provisions of SPP3 — Planning for Housing (February 2003) which requires Local Plans to contain a five year supply of effective housing land. SPP3 also provides for the provision of sustainable settlement strategies, through the provision of certainty and variety for both developers and the local community.

4.2 SPP15 — Planning for Rural Development (February 2005). The provisions of SPP15 apply to Aviemore in that it is a smaller settlement in a rural context. SPP15 identifies the scope for considerable small scale rural housing development, to be expressed in development plans either as part of settlement policies or separate subsets on rural housing policy.

4.3 There are numerous planning advice notes prepared by the Scottish Government which relate to the provision of housing in small towns and to the housing quality in general.

The Cairngorms National Park Deposit Local Plan 2007

5.5 Table 4 - Phased Land Supply by Local Authority Area

The Clouds Partnership would object to Table 4 Phased Land Supply by Local Authority Area, particularly in relation to the proposed land supply for Aviemore, as the proposed land supply is not in accordance with the Adopted Cairngorms National Park Plan which encourages the proactive growth of the mains settlements including Aviemore, and for the provision of land for housing growth to meet the social and economic needs of other settlements and communities.

5.5.1 The 0 to 5 year target numbers of units for Aviemore in the Deposit Local Plan is 250. The indicative 5 to 10 year target numbers of units in the Deposit Local **CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan**

Plan for Aviemore is 50, and the identified capacity for medium to long term numbers of housing units is 0. The details of Table 4 and the background to housing land requirement calculations and land supply requirements are based on work undertaken by consultants to

5.5.2 Therefore, in Aviemore, the Deposit Local Plan does not accord with SPPI in that it does not secure an ongoing five year land supply in Aviemore during the support the local plan. The view is maintained that sufficient land is included to meet this need, and no additional land is therefore required.

lifetime of the Local Plan. **Response to 1st modifications**

Please find enclosed completed objection forms for the above consultation. From the enclosed you will see that we have maintained our objections to the following:

Conclusion

7.1 The Clouds Partnership continue to object to the over-reliance of the Cairngorms National Park Deposit Local Plan on An Camas Mor for the provision of

Policy 1 - development in the Cairngorms National Park

housing numbers at Aviemore, and would urge the Cairngorms National Park Authority to allocate land at Kinakyle, Aviemore as an effective housing site in the

Table 4 - phased land supply

S7 Settlement proposals - Aviemore

S7 Settlement proposals - An Camas Mor

We look forward to hearing from you to discuss these objections in more detail.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The position regarding the allocation of land for housing as set out in Table 4 has not changed, and as such no modifications are proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 438b	Name Dinnet and Kinord Estate Estate Office Dinnet Aboyne AB34 5LL	Agent Claire Smith Ryden 25 Albyn Place Aberdeen AB10 1YL
-------------------------	---	--

Company Dinnet and Kinord Estate

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This formal objection to Cairngorms National Park Deposit Local Plan is made on behalf of Dinnet and Kinord Estate. Failing a resolution of this objection, Dinnet and Kinord Estate wish the opportunity for their objection to be considered at a future Public Local Inquiry into the Deposit Local Plan.

1.2 Dinnet & Kinord Estate, which extends to approximately 25,000 acres, is located at the main eastern entry point to the Cairngorms National Park. The Estate has embraced the objectives of the Cairngorms National Park Authority and contributes significantly to the economy of the area. It currently employs 15 full time workers with a significantly greater number in seasonal occupation. Employee numbers have increased in recent years and it is anticipated this growth will continue. The Estate's activities include farming, forestry, country sports and property lettings.

1.3 Dinnet & Kinord Estate would welcome the opportunity to discuss the terms of this Objection and their related Objections with the Cairngorms National Park Authority.

2.0 OBJECTION

2.1 This objection by Dinnet and Kinord Estate relates to the housing land requirement and supply, as specified in the Cairngorms National Park Deposit Local Plan. The housing land requirement calculation in Table 2 of the Deposit Local Plan should be increased. Similarly, the phased land supply should be increased in the Aberdeenshire part of the Cairngorms National Park with provision made in Table 4 for the allocation of 60 units to Dinnet.

3.0 GROUNDS OF OBJECTION

3.1 Dinnet and Kinord Estate have set out in Objection 1 their justification for the identification of Dinnet as a settlement with provision for future housing development amounting to around 60 units. The National Park Plan directs the Local Plan to provide enough effective land for market and affordable housing to meet the economic and social needs of the Park's Communities, encouraging proactive settlement growth in the main settlements and the provision of land for housing growth to meet the social and economic needs of other settlements/communities.

3.2 It is the Estate's contention that the phased land supply currently proposed by the Local Plan fails to meet those objectives. Paragraph 5.37 of the Plan highlights that there is no exact measure of how many houses will be required in the future, nor any accurate method of predicting how many houses will be built during the lifetime of the Local Plan. The Planning Authority simply makes an estimate of the likely need and demand, as well as the implications of its own housing and economic objectives. In such circumstances it is, therefore, essential that efficient flexibility is built in to allow for uncertainty and in order to accommodate the highest growth scenario, Accordingly, the figures in Table 2 should be increased substantially in order to accommodate the level of housing considered necessary at Dinnet. That scale of housing is necessary to realise diversification opportunities in terms of new business and tourism related developments, which will contribute to the overall economic benefit of the National Park Area.

4.0 PROPOSED MODIFICATION

4.1 Having regard to the above, it is Dinnet & Kinord Estates contention that the housing land requirement requires to be increased in Table 2 to allow for additional flexibility. The phased land supply in Table 3 relative to the Aberdeenshire part of the Cairngorms National Park Authority Area should be increased to make provision for an additional 60 units at Dinnet. Furthermore, Table 4 should be amended to include Dinnet with a housing allocation specified of 60 units.

4.2 Dinnet and Kinord Estate would welcome dialogue with the National Park Authority on the terms of this objection in an attempt to agree a modification to the Plan in advance of the Public Local Inquiry into the Plan. Failing agreement, the Estate would wish the objection to be considered at that Public Inquiry.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Table 2 is based on work undertaken by consultants and available on line to consider the issue of need and housing land. The plan therefore allocates sufficient and adequate land for housing development.

Response to 1st modifications

In relation to representation 438b it is noted that there is no increase in the housing land calculation in Table 2. Similarly, no increase in housing land supply is provided in Table 3 in the Aberdeenshire Local Authority Area. Finally, no provision is made in Table 4 for housing in Dinnet. Therefore we would maintain our original objection in that regard.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The position regarding the allocation of land for housing remains and the need to change table 2 and 3 is not therefore accepted. No modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
425a(d)	Rona Main Scottish Enterprise Grampian 27 Albyn Place Aberdeen AB10 IDB	Steve Crawford Halliday Fraser Munro 8 Victoria Street Aberdeen AB10 IXB

Company Scottish Enterprise Grampian

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

Housing - On housing we have made the point that the housing allocations tend to lead the development of employment opportunities. Concentrating the majority of houses on the western side of the Park is not an appropriate policy response to the issues affecting the SE Grampian area. SE Grampian would therefore wish to see a more equal spread across the Park settlements and more viable housing sites allocated in settlements on the eastern side of the Park.

Housing for key workers is an essential element of economic development and the future viability of settlements. The affordable housing policies as they stand appear very restrictive and may discourage development. We believe a more equitable approach is required to ensure that affordable and key worker housing is achievable. This could include allocating sites specifically for such housing.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Table 2 is based on work undertaken by consultants and available on line to consider the issue of need and housing land. The plan allocates sufficient land for housing development, and there is no need therefore to include additional land such as that suggested. The allocations also reflect the centres of population and demand. The approach to affordable housing is based on the work of the 3Dragons and the benchmark of the Scottish Government.

Response to 1st modifications

The new housing allocation under Section 5 Table 4 has not been modified and there is a high concentration of housing allocation on the western side of the Park. We believe this is not an appropriate policy response to the issues affecting the Scottish Enterprise Aberdeen City & Shire Area (formally SE Grampian area). We therefore wish to see a more equal spread across the Park settlements and more viable housing sites allocated in settlements on the eastern side of the Park.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The approach to housing land allocation reflects the centres of population and areas of pressure within the Park. It would not be appropriate to equal out the allocations between Highland and Aberdeenshire as the Highland section of the Park contains much more population and settlements. The approach taken therefore reflects the geography and settlement pattern.

Policy 21 has been amended to secure 40% affordable units where subsidy exists is to ensure provision on the ground which does not adversely impact on the developer and economics of the scheme. The CNPA are also promoting the use of a residual land value toolkit to ensure that the most accurate economic situation can be reflected in the implementation of this policy. It is therefore considered that the policy has endeavoured to reflect the market situation and no modifications are therefore proposed. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector **Name** The Cairngorms Campaign **Agent**
448f PO Box 10037
 Alford
 AB33 BWZ

Company The Cairngorms Campaign

Policy/site General - Housing land supply

Representation to Deposit Plan

We find the approach to housing in the park seriously deficient and incompatible with the first, second and fourth aims of the park. This concern focuses on the scale of holiday home construction envisaged in Table 2 on page 43. It is vital that housing affordable to the local population is provided and provision to meet that demand incorporated into the plan.

Holiday homes are already a major feature of housing in the park especially in Badenoch and Strathspey and their purchase a major cause of the lack of housing for local people who cannot compete in the bidding system. Commitment to large scale provision of holiday homes is also a commitment to how important aspects of tourism development will take place in the Park. There is adequate experience and knowledge from tourism development in areas, such as the Alps that clearly demonstrate the social damage done by permitting large scale holiday home development in communities and of the reduction in economic wealth generated by a tourism industry emphasizing this approach.

In addition, there is increasing evidence that proposed and planned housing developments, through their scale and number, are already affecting the natural resources of the Park. Examples are the threatened impacts on semi-natural woodlands. In this respect, the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (1994) is relevant as it states the UK Government's published policies. Viz:

"p. 100, 6.48. "Action. Continue to protect ancient semi-natural woodlands and encourage forms of management which conserve their special characteristics. Encourage the extension and creation of native woodlands. Support the creation of community woodlands near population centres"

p. 163, 10.15. Policies and programmes have as their objective to maintain the present area of ancient and semi-natural woodlands; to expand the area of native woodland of a natural character..."

An additional example of the growing pressure on natural resources through excessive house building is Scottish Water's proposed increased demand on water resources from the Spey, which already sees heavy demands on its resources.

Lastly, the carbon footprint of a policy that encourages sizeable housing development based on persons or families owning two homes, is unacceptable in terms of its contribution towards climate change.

We therefore object, to the current housing policies and approach that would permit such development.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The supply of housing land is based on studies undertaken to assess need and methods of provision in particular affordable housing. The policies regarding housing do however have to be read together with all the other policies of the plan, and the aims of the Park, and development will not therefore occur to the detriment of the natural resources of the Park or undermine its aims.

Response to 1st modifications

Living and Working in the Park – Housing

The shortage of affordable housing for residents of the Park is easily the most important social issue facing the Park authority and we strongly support efforts by the authority to solve this problem which, while it is widespread in rural Scotland, is almost certainly worse within the Park area due to the natural attractions of the Park. However, we maintain our objection to the scale of holiday home construction envisaged within the Local Plan, particularly within Badenoch and Strathspey.

The statement by Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group on the previous draft of the plan seems to us to bring out the issue clearly:-

“Second Homes

The most unacceptable feature of the proposals on housing is the proposed increase in provision for second homes (Table 2, page 43), which betrays the driving influence behind the housing allocation figures. Because “demand” is expected to be higher, therefore supply must be increased. This is “predict and provide”, the same market forces housing provision that has caused such problems for the natural and cultural heritage, and failed to address local needs, during recent decades. This proposal flies in the face of repeated expressions of concern by local people about the over-supply of second/holiday homes in the Park, briefly and inadequately reported in the Consultation Report July 2007, para. 3.21, thus: “The ongoing issue of holiday and second homes was also raised as adding to the problem.” In addition to the detrimental effects upon the natural and cultural heritage of the Park, this proposal will also add to its unnecessary carbon (and other resource) footprint. House building is a carbon and resource intensive activity and one must question why the CNPA should be encouraging the building of houses for people who already have a dwelling elsewhere, whilst claiming that it is attempting to minimise its own carbon footprint.”

This is a particularly important objection since the plan states it aims to achieve socially and economically sustainable communities, and there is ample research into tourism development abroad that excessive development of holiday homes damages communities both socially and economically, especially in tourist areas. Accepting large scale holiday home construction is simply not compatible with the aims of the Park.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The issue of second and holiday homes continues to cause a problem within the housing market and the impact these have on the availability of affordable homes. However the Planning Authority cannot control this sector of open market development and no modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector **Name** Muir Homes Ltd
038b

Agent Malcolm Smith
TMS Planning and Development Services
Balclune, 32 Clune Road
Gowkhall, Fife
KY12 9NZ

Company

Policy/site General - Introduction

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

Paragraph 1.6 - This paragraph states that 'The Local Plan provides a development framework for the whole of the Park, bringing together areas where development proposals were previously considered under four separate local authority plans. It creates a clear and consistent approach to guide development proposals and opportunities within the National Park, while allowing an appropriate level of flexibility to ensure that the Plan can be reactive and accommodate good ideas which further the aims of the Park. Its duration for up to five years from adoption identifies strategic sites and land for some development to provide certainty about the use of land in the medium to longer term beyond the next five years'.

The underlying ethos of this statement appears fine on the surface. It is only when you consider it is association with a number of Policies that the inherent contradictions can be seen. The policy framework, and in particular Policies 1, 4, 6, 7, 14 and the various other local plan paragraphs identified within this statement provides no certainty about land use development within the Park. Again, the status of allocated sites is questioned as is the clear and consistent approach to guide development proposals which is clearly absent in respect of allocated sites wherein the principle of development in the first instance appears to remain “up for grabs”.

Paragraph 1.20 - This paragraph states that “The planning authorities will use conditions and legal agreements, produced at the expense of the applicant, to ensure that consented developments comply with the Plan’s policies. In carrying out its planning function the National Park Authority will act in line with its Codes of Conduct, and ensure that all developments are carried out in line with its obligations created through various legislation such as the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 which places a duty to further the conservation of biodiversity in carrying out its function”.

This statement is too vague and the implications of compliance are unclear. The implication here is that all development must further the conservation of biodiversity. Built development will inevitably require the use of Greenfield land resources and therefore to some extent will impact adversely on biodiversity. Development within the Park has many functions including the requirement to promote economic and social development. The plan requires to recognise these impacts and to plan for them.

How to Use the Local Plan - Everyone applying for planning permission must look at all of the policies in the Plan. Policies are not cross referenced. You must therefore make sure your proposal complies with all of the policies that are relevant. The settlement maps identify sites proposed for particular types of development. In considering options for these sites, proposals must comply with all relevant policies, as well as working to achieve the four aims of the Park. The local plan needs to provide certainty in order that investments decisions can be made with a degree of confidence in order to ensure that beneficial development

within the Park can be delivered. This is the only means by which the National Park Outcomes related to supporting sustainable communities and making housing more affordable and sustainable can be delivered. There is a need to recognise the balance between development and the environment and to ensure that the balance is such as not to fail the Parks' communities by failing to deliver the type and level of development required. As presently written there appear little acceptance of the status of allocated sites over and above any other area. There is no dispute that development should be carried out in such a manner in order to minimise its environmental impacts while delivering beneficial development for the community. The approach adopted fails to accept this and indeed where is the certainty related to land use allocations (reasonably caveated as indicated)?

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

para 1.6 - The representation considers that the plan does not give sufficient guidance to developers and as such the policies are contradictory with this paragraph. However this view is not considered correct, and the modifications as agreed by the Board are considered to give the appropriate level of guidance. No second modification or amendment is therefore proposed.

Para 1.20 - this paragraph is intended to highlight the fact that planning authorities can, through their planning function, use conditions and legal agreements. The cases when these may be used is further expanded in the relevant policies throughout the plan. Also the reference to the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 is given as an example, and not the only example of other legislation and obligations which exist. No second modifications or amendments are therefore proposed.

How to use the Plan - The paragraph explains that cross referencing has not been included and applicants must therefore look at all relevant policies. This is the case in all local plans, and is part of the planning process, where developers must look not only at proposals, allocations and policies, but also government policy and guidance, and other guidance from agencies, european regulations etc. The paragraph is included to assist in this process and ensure that applicants are clear that they must refer to the plan as a whole. No second modifications or amendments are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to the letter from Cairngorm National Park Authority dated 5 November, 2008 and the attached "2nd Modifications to the Deposit Local Plan" related to the above. I would confirm at this stage that Muir Homes Limited retains its objections to the plan for those reasons set out within the representation submitted by TMS Planning and Development Services dated July 2008. Muir Homes Limited will wish all of its objections to be considered as part of the Local Plan PLI process and is likely to wish to support some objections in the form of oral evidence at a hearing with the remainder by further written submissions. This position will be clarified in due course.

HEARING

Objector	Name	Agent
371a	James Hall Craigdhu Braeside Place Newtonmore PH20 1DW	

Company

Policy/site General - Introduction

Representation to Deposit Plan

The Deposit Local Plan has ignored comments on the Draft Local Plan formally submitted by Newtonmore & Vicinity Community Council.

Proposed modifications to resolve objection: Either delete all references to community engagement or engage the Newtonmore & Vicinity Community Council in a meaningful way.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Representation has been received separately from the Community Council referred to and the representations made by them will be analysed full in connection with their submission. No modification considered necessary as a result of this representation.

Response to 1st modifications

Since there is no reference to community councils at all in the Local Plan, how will you implement the Sustainable Communities Strategic Objectives outlined in the National Plan, which includes the statement that "Communities should be supported in developing effective community councils,..." (5.2.2 para d), as well as the objective to promote community involvement (para e)?

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The local plan has been drawn up through extensive community engagement and consultation and the introduction, although not referring to particular parties or organisations does refer to partners, consultees, a wide range of organisations and groups, etc. all of which are key to the success of the Plan. The Park Plan also the strategic context for the local plan. The planning process will continue to seek the views of community councils and continue to seek their engagement. However the view has been taken not to highlight any particular group or body. No modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector	Name	Agent
017g	Mrs Sally Spencer Pitagowan House Newtonmore Inverness-shire PH20 IBS	

Company

Policy/site General - layout

Representation to Deposit Plan

Given the four Aims of the Park have to be taken into consideration in every Planning Application, and round them really everything else revolves, I think they should be set out rather more clearly, i.e. right at the beginning of the document – perhaps on the same page as the map.

I know they appear on page 03, in a mauve block, but (a) the block is headed “National Parks (Scotland) Act 2000 section 1” and it is the apparently less important couple of ‘white’ lines about that tells you that the block contains the Aims, (b) the document is full of mauve blocks, and when trying to check on the exact working

I spent quite a time trying to find the right mauve block, and (c) if you look under ‘Aims’ in the index, it refers to page 13, where the Aims are not set out. By all means keep them where they are on page 03, but also have them right there up front, at the very beginning, where nobody could miss them – then nobody can say they couldn’t find them!

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Modifications will endeavour to clarify terminology and phrasing used. A review of the Introduction and Context sections is necessary to clarify the context for the Local Plan and its relationship with other documents, the Park Plan, and also to expand on the thinking behind the policies as drafted.

Response to 1st modifications

response received - need to confirm actual position regarding formality of objection

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response received - need to confirm actual position regarding formality of objection

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector Name Scottish and Southern Energy Plc
447j

Agent Jones Lang Lasalle
7 Exchange Crescent
Conference Square
Edinburgh
EH3 8LL

Company Scottish and Southern Energy Plc

Policy/site General - Links to other plans

Representation to Deposit Plan

There are a number of individual policies, as highlighted above, which are considered to be in conflict with national planning policy and advice; specifically NPPG 14, PAN 49, SPP 1 and SPP 6. In addition, policy 19 is specifically considered to conflict with Circular 12/96.

The policies referred to above in this objection are considered not to comply with relevant guidance as set out in SPP1 namely paragraphs 25 et seq which make it clear that given the importance attached to the development plan, it is essential that policies:

- Provide clear guidance to developers and the public on the relevant planning issues affecting an area;
- Are properly justified to explain their intention;
- Are expressed simply and unambiguously.

The aim of a development plan is to provide a land use framework in which investment and development can take place with confidence. SPP1 makes it clear that it is only if development plans meet the criteria referred to above, will they offer a sound basis for consistent decision making which is important for maintaining public and investor confidence. At present, it is considered that the draft Local Plan does not meet the standards as expressed in SPP1.

The Local Plan should include specific locational guidance with regard to transmission infrastructure. Furthermore, the Plan should specify the “special qualities” of the National Park and provide appropriate spatial guidance on special qualities within the National Park and relate this to policies within the Plan.

SSE wish to express their support for proactive, enabling policies, which would properly reflect national planning policy and guidance.

This representation is submitted as a constructive response to the Deposit Local Plan. It is trusted that the representation will be given full consideration and the objections incorporated as pre-Inquiry modifications as appropriate. If the above objections to the Local Plan cannot be resolved appropriately, the most suitable method of presenting this objection further will be through the Local Plan Inquiry process.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Modifications within the Context section will endeavour to clarify the relationship of the Local Plan and its relationship with other documents including national planning guidance. Further cross reference to the requirements of the SPP series will be made to ensure the Plan complies with the latest Scottish Government thinking.

Response to 1st modifications

The special qualities of the National Park have still not been clearly defined and there is still a lack of specific locational guidance for electricity infrastructure development. It is therefore considered that the modifications do not comply with elements of SPP1.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The comment is noted, however there is considered to be adequate guidance and direction to comply with SPP1 and whilst a number of second modifications are proposed, none are directly proposed as a result of this representation.

response to 2nd modifications

I refer to your letter of 5th November 2008 with regard to the above which enclosed the “second modifications” to the wording of the first modifications to the Local Plan. I note that the Second modifications generally relate to points of clarification and the correction of errors rather than any substantive changes to policy wording.

As you are aware, Jones Lang LaSalle act on behalf of Scottish and Southern Energy plc and its subsidiary companies (SSE) and representations were submitted to the Cairngorms National Park Local Plan – First Modifications. The objections to the First Modifications maintained those made in response to the original Deposit Local Plan.

SSE has always maintained the position that they support the Cairngorms National Park Authority (CNPA) in delivering an appropriate Local Plan for their administrative area. Within a ‘plan-led’ system it is important that the Local Plan reflects up to date national planning policy in respect of land use planning objectives and that the Plan provides clear and helpful policy guidance for developers and investors in accordance with planning guidance.

Following a review of the Second Modifications SSE is disappointed that their objections have not been reflected in any changes to policy wording, with the exception of the Modification to Policy with regard to transportation matters. The representations previously submitted are therefore maintained, except those in relation to Policy 30.

You have requested clarification as to how SSE would wish their objections to be dealt with at the forthcoming Public Local Inquiry. As previously stated, my client would wish for evidence to be presented verbally at the Inquiry by way of formal Inquiry process. However if the CNPA intends to seek to resolve objections prior to any Public Inquiry, then SSE would be willing to engage in appropriate discussions.

HEARING

The wording of the policy has been drafted to reflect the aims of the Park and the special qualities of the Park, and the responsibilities of the Park Authority. The proposed change would not be in accordance with this and no further modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 425a(f)	Name Rona Main Scottish Enterprise Grampian 27 Albyn Place Aberdeen AB10 IDB	Agent Steve Crawford Halliday Fraser Munro 8 Victoria Street Aberdeen AB10 IXB
----------------------------	---	---

Company Scottish Enterprise Grampian

Policy/site General - Links to other plans

Representation to Deposit Plan

Comparison with SE Grampian's Draft Plan Response - SE Grampian issued a response to the Draft Local Plan in April 2006. The key issues related to the Development Strategy and General Policies, Topic Policies and Settlement Statements. The Development Strategy element has been covered in further observations in this report.

On Topic Policies, we would make the following commentary. (Previous representations are in italics):

- Proposal 1 — Remove permitted development rights: this was major concern as we are pleased to see that it is no longer part of the Plan;
- Policy 28 — negative reference to the two Ski Areas: the policy is more positive in the Finalised Plan but we still feel that the two ski areas merit specific attention as national visitor 'draws' in their own right.
- Policy 30 — no new caravan parks: this seems to have been removed.
- Policy 38 — residency clause: we are pleased to see that this has been dropped.

On Settlement Statements we would make the following commentary. (Previous representations are in italics):

- Dinnit — business designations should be reviewed in order to facilitate a robust gateway role for the village: Dinnit is no longer identified in the Plan's proposals maps, it has no settlement boundary and no allocations. This has the potential to allow development in an unstructured manner. We suggest this is not the best way to develop gateway sites, which should be recognised for their importance and a strategy for such sites/settlements is needed.
- Braemar — required a policy for the promotion of tourism, consideration of innovative tenure housing for seasonal workers, and in-depth business/commercial land analysis: if anything the role of Braemar has diminished in the Finalised Plan. The Plan's lack of recognition of Braemar remains a missed opportunity to place Braemar at the "heart" of the Park as a key leisure and tourist destination.
- Ballater — required a pro-active approach to the development of tourism, increased affordable housing, and a proper and-use framework that supports business development and controlled growth: These comments remain valid to this Plan as the Draft.
- Angus Glens — tourism development supported in the Draft Plan: missing in this Plan and requires reconsideration

Key Observations: Conclusion

This paper comprises SE Grampian's initial response to the Cairngorms National Park Finalised Local Plan and we would request that further discussions are required to clarify the issues. In the meantime we wish to thank the CNPA for allowing SE Grampian this opportunity to comment. It is important to note that, regardless of the comments in this report, SE Grampian believes the Local Plan has been well written and laid out and that the policies are generally very well framed. We look forward to continued positive engagement with the ONPA on day to day and strategic matters.

The detail to substantiate the above key observations are outlined in the following Section (Section 2).

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comments are noted but relate to the draft plan. Specific comments on current policies are considered under those representations. No modification considered necessary as a result of this representation.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The comments regarding the consultation draft plan are noted. The position regarding these has not changed and no further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications**HEARING**

Objector	Name	Agent
443a	North East Mountain Trust Burnhead Farmhouse Raemoir Banchory AB31 4EB	

Company North East Mountain Trust

Policy/site General - Links to other plans

Representation to Deposit Plan

We welcome the scope of natural heritage; cultural and social issues addressed by the plan and support many of the policies within it. In our opinion, however, if these policies are to be effective they need to be strengthened. We are also concerned that important objections raised within comments made on the consultative plans were not addressed.

We note also the comments of the Mountaineering Council of Scotland and support the views expressed by them in their submission.

Broader Context of the Plan

While the Plan refers to the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas, and the importance of the EU Habitats Directive reflected in the protection of Natura 200 sites is recognised, there is a need to take more cognisance of other international conventions etc, particularly since, in para 2.1, the essential role of the Cairngorms in delivering national objectives is acknowledged. These include the European Landscape Convention and the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (1994). We comment where these seem most relevant.

Other broader issues that need taken into account include Climate Change and the carbon footprint of developments.

It is also essential that careful note is taken of the insights derived from research into tourism development in other areas, such as the Alps and actual experience of such development. We do not feel that this is adequately done.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Modifications will endeavour to ensure a more appropriate balance is struck between development opportunities and the protection of the special qualities of the area as identified as a National Park. A review of the Introduction and Context sections is necessary to clarify and refine the vision for the Plan and set out clearly the strategic background to the policies drafted. Similarly further clarification is needed in the introduction section to each Chapter to state clearly the justification for the approach taken and the aspirations sought as a result of implementation of the policies. Reference to current successes should also be included where relevant.

Response to 1st modifications

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

response to 2nd modifications

WRITTEN

Objector 425b	Name Rona Main Scottish Enterprise Grampian 27 Albyn Place Aberdeen AB10 IDB	Agent Steve Crawford Halliday Fraser Munro 8 Victoria Street Aberdeen AB10 IXB
-------------------------	---	---

Company Scottish Enterprise Grampian

Policy/site General - Links to Park Plan

Representation to Deposit Plan

SE Grampian support the Parks aims in particular the latter two aims (c & d) to promote understanding and enjoyment (including enjoyment in the form of recreation) of the special qualities of the area by the public; and to promote sustainable economic and social development of the area's communities. It is important the Local Plan underpins these aims.

Section 1.7 of the Plan indicates that the Adopted Local Plan will be used by the four Local Authorities and the CNPA when determining planning applications and calling- in respectively. It is extremely important, therefore, that the policies are framed to avoid confusion or misinterpretation. This multi-authority location, however, does create policy issues. Each of the 4 authorities has their own Structure Plan to which the CNP Local Plan must conform, as well as its own National Park Plan. There is some uncertainty on the role that this Local plan will play. This should be clarified where possible in the Plan and especially which Structure or Local Plan takes priority in the decision making process.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. Modifications within the Context section will endeavour to clarify the relationship of the Local Plan and its relationship with other documents including the aims of the Park, the Park Plan and structure plans, and also to expand on the thinking behind the policies as drafted. Throughout proposed modifications will endeavour to clarify while providing an appropriate level of guidance for developers and interested parties.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

Additional clarity and information has been added to the introduction sections of the plan to highlight the role of the aims of the Park. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector 464a	Name Bob Garrow RS Garrow Ltd 4 Mossspark Avenue Milngavie Glasgow, G62 8NL	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company RS Garrow Ltd

Policy/site General - Links to Park Plan

Representation to Deposit Plan

Policy ref: Conserving and enhancing biodiversity and landscapes – outcomes for 2012 vii. The habitat and water quality of rivers and wetlands will be enhanced through commencement of positive management initiatives guided by catchment management planning

Traditional public water services have large local environmental impacts. These draw substantial volumes of raw water at a few points, process this to drinking quality water in large plants, then distribute this water in resource intensive, typically costing upwards of £150,000 per km, water mains to relatively large numbers of users. After use the waste water is collected in infrastructure sewers, typically costing upwards of £200,000 per km, and then processed in large waste water treatment plants before being returned in bulk to the water environment from where it was drawn out.

Technologies have been available for some decades which can cost effectively from a single dwelling size units upwards a) process raw water from many parts of the water environment, including collected rainwater, into drinking water and b) process sewage waste water back to drinking quality water, 100% of the time, in small footprint non odiferous aerobic natural bacterial digestion continuous process package plants which do not sludge up like a septic tank.

Particularly in rural areas and small settlements raw water can be drawn from the local water environment, processed into drinking water, used, processed nearby to drinking water quality and returned to the water environment. The water supply industry reckons that 95% of the water they meter in, emerges in sewers. The net impact on the local water environment is thus 5% of the 200 litres drawn, ie. 10 litres about a bucket full to the brim, per resident per day, with the discharge water probably cleaner than the raw water taken in. We suggest that promoting these technologies will cause less impact on and enhance the quality of the water environment.

Modifications proposed

We propose that vii. should now read "The habitat and water quality of rivers and wetlands will be enhanced through commencement of positive management initiatives guided by catchment management planning and promotion of local ultra-filtration units for drinking water preparation and membrane bio reactor package plants for waste water treatment"

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. However the wording referred to is a quote from the National Park Plan which has now been adopted. The consultation undertaken here relates to the wording within the local plan rather than cross references to other documents. No modification considered necessary as a result of this representation.

Response to 1st modifications

I wish to maintain my comment as the modifications move in the opposite direction from my comment which suggested we encourage the adoption of newer but proven technology techniques to provide water services. As these newer technologies are more capable they are effectively independent of site conditions and as they use only modest amounts of energy to process drinking water and waste water their environmental signature is much reduced compared to the methods preferred in the CNPA Deposit Local Plan. They are also more compact, do not use consumable chemicals, are quicker to install and cheaper to buy and operate.

I recognise that much central public guidance excludes these newer technology techniques.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The policy does not preclude the use of modern technology as referred to in the objection. No modification is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

I would like to take the informal hearing route on verbal presentation.

HEARING

Objector **Name** Dr A M Jones **Agent**
400b Badenoch and Strathspey
 Fiodhag
 Nethybridge
 PH25 3DJ

Company Badenoch and Strathspey Conservation Group

Policy/site General - Links to Park Plan

Representation to Deposit Plan

2.6 - Object on grounds of emphasis on 'partnership' working, and lack of mention of working in accordance with good governance. In addition we recommend that the wording should be revised to be more readily intelligible.

2.7 - Object. We are concerned at the approach to management that views 'long term' as 25 years. We recommend the words long term are omitted from 1st sentence. We are concerned that all outcomes should be viewed as 'intended' outcomes. Therefore we suggest intended is added before 'outcomes' in 1st bullet point.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comment is noted. However the National Park Authority is fully committed to partnership working as the best way of taking forward the delivery of both the National Park Plan and the Local Plan.

Response to 1st modifications

2.10 2nd bullet point. We recommend inserting 'Park' before 'Plan' to clarify which Plan is being referred to.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

2.10 - the word Park will be added. This will be included in the 2nd modifications to the local plan.

response to 2nd modifications

Withdrawn 2.10 2nd bullet point. We recommend inserting 'Park' before 'Plan' to clarify which Plan is being referred to.

HEARING

Objector **Name** The Proprietors of Mar Centre
394f

Agent Steve Crawford
Halliday Fraser Munro
8 Victoria Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1XB

Company The Proprietors of Mar Centre

Policy/site General - Living and working

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

This section is key to our Client's philosophy. As landowners in a populated area they have a responsibility to the community to ensure that Braemar has a positive future, that land-use policies and decisions are forward-looking rather than simply preserving the status quo and that development, in whatever form, helps to ensure a bright future for Braemar. Policy 17 is therefore fully supported and, indeed, its sentiments are those that should support further development in Braemar. Braemar's services are suffering and need a higher critical mass of resident population to maintain higher quality shops, community facilities and services. As suggested by the CNPA in their response to the original objections, concentrating on elements that are controllable is the best means forward.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The comments are noted. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

Objector	Name	Agent
020o	Dr A Watson Clachnaben Crathes, Banchory Kincardineshire AB31 5JE	

Company

Policy/site General - Maps

Representation to Deposit Plan

Map D is incorrect. The green for ancient woodland really covers all woodland. Ancient woodland is dark blue, and this should be on the guide on the left top side.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The presentation of the maps will be reviewed and modified to ensure correctness of information and ease of understanding.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The information regarding ancient woodland is provided by SNH and the maps are constructed using this and other datasets not in the control of CNPA. The map also shows semi natural woodland inventory shown in blue. The most accurate information is always used. No further modifications proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Thank you for your letter of 5 November. I am content for the written representations that I made earlier to be used for the public inquiry.

WRITTEN

Objector 056c	Name James and Evelyn Sunley 12 Lochnagar Way Ballater AB35 5PB	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - SEA

Representation to Deposit Plan

The Strategic Environmental Assessment document requires considerable further explanation as to how it reaches its conclusions and appears to ask more questions than it answers. We therefore do not think it worthwhile going into detail in this submission. We hope the Park will open this up for further discussion

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comments are noted, but CNPA must refer to the responses from the 4 statutory consultees on SEA who have all commented on the clarity and soundness of the Environmental Report. The findings of the ER will impact directly on the local plan, its policies and proposals and this will be done in line with the legislative requirements and in liaison with the consultees.

Response to 1st modifications

The modified Park Plan does not address any of the objections that we made, we therefore continue our objections and ask you to think again.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The SEA has been amended and is available on line. No further amendment is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Thank you for your letter dated 5th Nov. 2008 with regard to the arrangements for the Local Plan inquiry and the further modifications to the Local Plan.

I refer you to the changes indicated in appendix page 8 of your letter and point out that "page 68 , Ballater ..."is in fact page 72, page 68 refers to Kingussie. I further point out that the change to 16.2ha from the original 10.99ha, is a change due to the inclusion by CNPA of areas E2, and E3 areas which did not form part of development land on the Aberdeenshire CC Local Plan. This change should be properly delineated as a change from the ACC Local Plan.

With regard to my intentions with regard to the Reporters enquiry, it is decide on this matter but will probably follow the informal route.

HEARING

Objector 056f	Name James and Evelyn Sunley 12 Lochnagar Way Ballater AB35 5PB	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - SEA

Representation to Deposit Plan

1.12 The SEA assessment needs to be more thoroughly examined. A great responsibility for the future of our community rests with the conclusions of this document and may provide the catalyst for irrevocable damage to the adjacent rivers, the environment, and the culture of Ballater.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

The comments are noted, but CNPA must refer to the responses from the 4 statutory consultees on SEA who have all commented on the clarity and soundness of the Environmental Report. The findings of the ER will impact directly on the local plan, its policies and proposals and this will be done in line with the legislative requirements and in liaison with the consultees.

Response to 1st modifications

The modified Park Plan does not address any of the objections that we made, we therefore continue our objections and ask you to think again.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The SEA has been amended and is available on line. No further amendment is therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

Thank you for your letter dated 5th Nov. 2008 with regard to the arrangements for the Local Plan inquiry and the further modifications to the Local Plan.

I refer you to the changes indicated in appendix page 8 of your letter and point out that "page 68 , Ballater ..."is in fact page 72, page 68 refers to Kingussie. I further point out that the change to 16.2ha from the original 10.99ha, is a change due to the inclusion by CNPA of areas E2, and E3 areas which did not form part of development land on the Aberdeenshire CC Local Plan. This change should be properly delineated as a change from the ACC Local Plan.

With regard to my intentions with regard to the Reporters enquiry, it is decide on this matter but will probably follow the informal route.

HEARING

Objector 400n	Name Dr A M Jones Badenoch and Strathspey Fiodhag Nethybridge PH25 3DJ	Agent
-------------------------	---	--------------

Company

Policy/site General - Settlements

Representation to Deposit Plan

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

Response to 1st modifications

We are very concerned at the CNPA's failure to apply the precautionary principle in light of significantly inadequate data sets held by the CNPA. The CNPA has virtually no idea of the impact of the housing proposals in the mDLP on habitats and species.

Object to the scale of housing proposed. The CNPA has not addressed issues of sustainability. Increasing the population within the Park, through large scale housing developments, will increase the demand for affordable housing in the future as every new generation of first time buyers enters the housing market.

We object that there is not a clause included in the mDLP to the effect that there should be no carry over whatsoever of housing allocations which are being determined under HC's LP due to the application having been started, should these applications lapse or be refused planning permission; and that the settlement boundary will be redrawn to avoid there being a presumption in favour of built development on these sites. One reason for this is conflicts with the aims of the NP. This applies to many settlements.

We object to the inadequate information provided in the mDLP. For example information such as Ancient Woodland Inventory sites should be included on the settlement maps to enable the public and the CNPA to make proper appraisals. Similarly, current land use should be clear on the maps, e.g. where an extension to an industrial site is proposed, the present extent of the industrial site and the extent of the proposed allocation should both be clearly shown. At present it is only through local knowledge that anyone can know the difference. Built development that is under construction should be clearly depicted as such, with the number of units being built indicated in the area. At present sites under construction are not indicated in any way at all, and it is only through local knowledge that anyone can know they are sites for built development. These are important aspects of enabling the public and the CNPA to assess the proposals in the mDLP.

Areas classed as Environment should be protected from any built housing, industrial or employment development and this should be unequivocally stated in the mDLP. It should be clear to developers that Environment areas are not available for built development.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The figures regarding the need for housing within the Park has come as a result of work undertaken to establish population growths and housing land supply.

Where an application is lodged with the planning authority, it will be determined in the normal way using the adopted local plan. The sites have not only been included within the draft local plan because of any outstanding application and to remove them if a refusal ensues would only be considered appropriate where the need was no longer existing and the local plan was under review again.

The issue of maps is noted and the approach taken has endeavoured to keep the maps as simple and clear as possible. The maps are intended as proposals maps and

therefore they indicate proposals and do not include schemes underway etc. We do however seek regular updates from OS to ensure we have the most up to date bases for the proposals maps. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

SETTLEMENTS

Maintain objections

We object to, and are very concerned at, the CNPA's failure to apply the precautionary principle in light of significantly inadequate data sets held by the CNPA. The CNPA has virtually no idea of the impact of the housing proposals in the mDLP on habitats and species.

Object to the scale of housing proposed. The CNPA has not addressed issues of sustainability. Increasing the population within the Park, through large scale housing developments, will increase the demand for affordable housing in the future as every new generation of first time buyers enters the housing market.

We object that there is not a clause included in the mDLP to the effect that there should be no carry over whatsoever of housing allocations which are being determined under HC's LP due to the application having been started, should these applications lapse or be refused planning permission; and that the settlement boundary will be redrawn to avoid there being a presumption in favour of built development on these sites. One reason for this is conflicts with the aims of the NP. This applies to many settlements.

We object to the inadequate information provided in the mDLP. For example information such as Ancient Woodland Inventory sites should be included on the settlement maps to enable the public and the CNPA to make proper appraisals. Similarly, current land use should be clear on the maps, e.g. where an extension to an industrial site is proposed, the present extent of the industrial site and the extent of the proposed allocation should both be clearly shown. At present it is only through local knowledge that anyone can know the difference. Built development that is under construction should be clearly depicted as such, with the number of units being built indicated in the area. At present sites under construction are not indicated in any way at all, and it is only through local knowledge that anyone can know they are sites for built development. These are important aspects of enabling the public and the CNPA to assess the proposals in the mDLP.

Areas classed as Environment should be protected from any built housing, industrial or employment development and this should be unequivocally stated in the mDLP. It should be clear to developers that Environment areas are not available for built development.

HEARING

Objector 434b	Name Robert Maund Scottish Council for National Parks The Barony 2 Glebe Road Kilbirnie, Ayrshire	Agent
-------------------------	--	--------------

Company Scottish Council for National Parks

Policy/site General - Vision

Representation to Deposit Plan

The Local Plan uses the NPP vision of ‘the Cairngorms National Park as an exemplar of sustainable development where people and place thrive together’. This is laudable but difficult to sustain when measured against the historical record. We hope the Park Authority will not shrink from vigorously promoting the exemplar approach.

Looking at the ‘Outcomes for Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Landscapes for 2012’ as produced on page 10, this uses similar positive and confident language.

e.g. iii The location, scale, layout and design of all new development will make a positive contribution to the natural, cultural and built landscapes of the Park and the adverse impacts of some existing developments will be reduced. This is not in any way borne out by the number of house allocations being identified.

Similarly, ‘iv. Species and habitats identified as the highest priorities in the Cairngorms Local Biodiversity Action Plan, the UK and Scottish Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and the Scottish Species Framework will be protected and under active management’. Some of the allocation sites comprise habitat and species which are part of the Biodiversity Action Plan.

CNPA analysis of objection to Deposit Plan

A review of the Vision will be undertaken to ensure that it gives an appropriate level of imaginative and coherent guidance for the future of the Park, and promotes a level of partnership working which is accepted by all.

Response to 1st modifications

Objection maintained as in 434a.

CNPA analysis of response to 1st modifications

The vision has been completely redrafted in 2.15. No further modifications are therefore proposed.

response to 2nd modifications

HEARING

