## Kirsty Mackenzie

F	
From: Sent:	01 March 2018 12:33
To:	Planning
Subject:	CNP - Main Issues Report Public Consultation - Insh
<b>,</b>	
Below is in my res	ponse to the proposal for Insh settlement
1. Do you agree with	the proposed settlement objectives?
in selected plots. I wou individual/organic feel	al for small scale organic growth. However, this should be single house development ld not agree to a development of several houses together that would impact on the to the village. Insh should not have a small uniform housing estate style any future housing development should be for local people rather than holiday homes.
	eant by 'economic growth to support the local community'? Many residents are in home, others travel to work. I would not support economic development within
2. Do you agree with	the protected open space?
current large protected village boundary). I kn	ected open space should be extended. I am concerned by the ground to East of the area (that is the higher ground to the South-East of the RSPB office running to the ow there have been proposals for significant housing development on this land – I significant development there and would prefer it became protected space.

## 3. Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary?

I am broadly happy with the settlement boundary. Whilst, I have no objection to the proposed house at THC001, does this imply that the settlement boundary will be extended to include this property (and any future development on the settlement periphery)? I think the settlement boundary should be fixed.

Is the land surrounding the settlement boundary protected from building development?

## 4. How should Insh develop in the future

I think Insh should remain much as it is, with some limited individual housing development. Small scale development for families in affordable homes would be good, as long as it was sympathetic to the local area like the Ardgael scheme (and not a small housing estate).

Rod Purcell

