

**Highland-wide Local Development Plan - Main Issues Report
Consultation Summary and Actions Sheet**

Reference Number:	HWLDP-MIR-196
Organisation/Individual:	Maria De La Torre

Action:

Immediate Response Required	
Meeting required with Respondent	
Issue for Area Local Development Plan	
Further Information Required	
Other (Please Specify)	

If no box ticked - issues raised will be dealt with in preparation of the Proposed Plan.

Issues Raised in Response:

Purpose of Main Issues Report	
NPF2 for Scotland	
Vision for the Highlands	
Inverness and A96	x
The A96 Corridor	
Phasing of Development	
Developer Contributions	
East Inverness	x
Nairn	
Tornagrain	x
Smaller Settlements in A96	
Caithness and North Sutherland	
Easter Ross and Nigg	
Development of Local Centres	
Wider Countryside and Fragile Areas	
Population and Housing	
Housing in the Countryside	x
Affordable Housing	
Planning for an Ageing Population	
Gypsies/Travellers	
Retailing	
Developer Contributions	
Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage	x

Previously used Land	
Wild Land	
Water Environment	
Renewable Energy	
Flooding	
Waste Management	
Air Quality	
Sustainable Design	x
Business and Industrial Land	
Accessibility and Transport	
Agricultural Land	
Subdivision of Existing Crofts	x
Allocation of Inbye Land	x
New Crofting Township	
Small Scale New Crofts	
Coastal Development	
Forestry and Woodland	
Minerals	
Open Space and Physical Activity	
Access to the Outdoors	x
Comments on Consultation Process (+ve)	x
Comments on Consultation Process (-ve)	

Key:

Background	Spatial Strategy	Policy Options	Consultation
------------	------------------	----------------	--------------

Notes:

City Vision should take a more holistic approach – creating greenspaces and networks of paths
 Concern over road capacity to cope with Ness-Side
 General comments on spatial strategy and support for Tornagrain
 Vision focuses too heavily on new development – a key issue should be the special characteristics of the Highlands

Action Sheet Completed by:	GW
Date:	09/12/09

Simon Hindson

Sent: 09 November 2009 01:05
Subject: Fields from form

Submit Submit
q01a_agree_with_preferredoption no
q01a_comments I would support the alternative proposal (focus on opening opportunities in the A96) Inverness is already becoming congested and beyond capacity. Some of the proposed developments such as Ness Castle are of a high density and there isn't the road capacity to cope with the increase in traffic. This will affect the quality of life for those in Inverness and businesses will suffer. On the other hand some of the new proposed settlements in the A96 such as Tornagrain could give a boost to the area and if properly planned provide attractive places where people want to live.
There is nevertheless scope to prepare and updated city vision for Inverness, however the focus shouldn't be about development, but taking a more holistic view of the needs of Inverness, in particular creating and protecting green areas and networks (paths) and sport facilities.
q01b_agree_with_alternative yes
q01b_comments
q01c_comments
q02a_agree_with_preferredoption no
q02a_comments Agree with a phased approach, however it is essential that the required infrastructure (including schools, community halls and leisure facilities) are built at the same time as the new development (experience shows that otherwise these facilities can take years in being delivered, but more critically they will help to attract people). New A96 proposals should not be linked to development in Inverness, which is already subject to a lot of pressure
q02b_comments
q02c_agree_with_alternative yes
q02c_comments Phased development with infrastructure. Not linking A96 expansion to the situation in Inverness
q03a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q03a_comments A critical aspects should be the identification of green areas and networks, and attractive features that need to be protected and enhanced, possible local nature reserves.
q03b_comments
q03c_agree_with_alternative yes
q03c_comments Not only about infrastructure but land to be protected from the development (see comments to 3(a))
q04a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q04a_comments The proposed plan appears to cover a wide range of community needs. Important also the quality and appearance of the buildings and that there is sufficient green spaces (protected from development) and paths. Infrastructure needs to be built early in the process to attract and provide the services required by those living there.
q04b_comments
q04c_comments
q05a_comments No comment
q05b_comments
q05c_comments
q06_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q06_comments Tornagrain is an interesting and visionary proposal, which if implemented in accordance with the vision provide a good model for development
q07_comments The potential for growth in the A96 corridor should be considered taking into account the character of these villages and how to enhance them, for example Cawdor.
q08_comments No comment
q09_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q09_comments No comment
q10_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q10_comments Local Plans should not be just about land for development but the needs of these areas and how to enhance them
q11_agree_with_preferredoption no
q11_comments I would like to see a more ambitious policy for the wider countryside, which beside protecting important areas (designated sites) recognises that there are green areas/parts of the countryside (not only out of settlements but sometimes closeby or in these) that have an amenity value, or a lanscape or wildlife

interest.

q12a_agree_with_preferredoption no
q12a_comments
q12b_agree_with_alternative yes
q12b_comments
q12c_agree_with_alternative no
q12c_comments
q13a_agree_with_preferredoption no
q13a_comments A housing in the countryside design guide seems an essential tool. But as a general rule there is a need to restrict building in the countryside beyond that what is required, particularly taking into account the capacity of an area or we risk losing the character of the countryside. The situation in much smaller settlements, where the nature of housing is more disperse may be different.
q13b_comments
q13c_agree_with_alternative yes
q13c_comments Design guide also for new developments, and in some places more disperse housing
q14a_comments No comment
q14b_comments
q14c_comments
q15a_comments No comment
q15b_comments
q15c_comments
q16a_comments No comment
q16b_comments
q16c_comments
q17a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q17a_comments Agree with the proposal to support the role of town centres
q17b_agree_with_alternative yes
q17b_comments There is a need to direct retail development to specific sites (rather than let developers, in particular big supermarkets, dictate the shape of towns).
q17c_comments
q18a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q18a_comments
q18b_comments
q18c_comments
q19a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q19a_comments Yes it is important that existing features are mapped and that development/developers are encouraged to look at the whole natural heritage.
q19b_agree_with_alternative yes
q19b_comments In the long term it would be good to develop more detailed information that could be part of a more proactive approach to enhancing the natural heritage, e.g. green networks (for wildlife and recreation)
q19c_agree_with_alternative yes
q19c_comments Any new development should cover/propose green networks (see 19(b))
q20a_comments
q20b_agree_with_alternative yes
q20b_comments
q20c_comments
q21a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q21a_comments
q21b_comments
q21c_comments
q22a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q22a_comments
q22b_comments
q22c_comments
q23a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q23a_comments Planning should take account of the negative natural heritage impacts for individual projects and the cumulative negative impacts.
q23b_comments
q23c_agree_with_alternative yes
q23c_comments Planning should take account of the negative natural heritage impacts for individual projects and the cumulative negative impacts.
q24a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q24a_comments
q24b_comments
q24c_comments
q25a_agree_with_preferredoption yes

q25a_comments The proposed map in page 54 shows that the only recycling facility in the Highlands is in Inverness, it would be good to see further facilities developed acrossed

q25b_comments

q25c_comments

q26a_agree_with_preferredoption yes

q26a_comments

q26b_comments

q27a_agree_with_preferredoption yes

q27a_comments Yes, good quality and sustainable design should be an essential part of the Vision for the Highlands!

q27b_comments

q281a_comments

q281b_comments

q281c_comments

q28Aa_agree_with_preferredoption yes

q28a_comments No comment

q28b_comments

q28c_comments

q29a_comments Beside protecting prime agricultural land (1,2, and 3.1), there are other cases where there is merit in protecting agricultural land which is not in the 'prime' classification (e.g. landscape features, valuable habitats), and this should be considered.

q29b_agree_with_alternative yes

q29b_comments Beside protecting prime agricultural land (1,2, and 3.1), there are other cases where there is merit in protecting agricultural land which is not in the 'prime' classification (e.g. landscape features, valuable habitats), and this should be considered.

q29c_comments

q30a_comments Not clear whether this is about subdivision of crofts or new building on crofts. It would be good to have a policy that recognises the value of croft land and encourages the use of crofts, beyond providing plots for houses.

q30b_comments

q30c_agree_with_alternative yes

q30c_comments Encouraging new land use of the land, horticulture, forestry, etc, Allocation of crofts to those wanting to use the land.

q31a_agree_with_preferredoption no

q31a_comments

q31b_agree_with_alternative yes

q31b_comments Common grazings may contain important habitats, the value of the land, whether agriculture or wildlife should be taken into account.

q31c_comments

q32a_agree_with_preferredoption yes

q32a_comments

q32b_agree_with_alternative yes

q32b_comments Both community consultation and Area Local Development Plan review would seem logic steps.

q32c_comments

q33a_agree_with_preferredoption yes

q33a_comments

q33b_comments

q33c_comments

q34a_comments No comment

q34b_comments

q34c_comments

q35a_agree_with_preferredoption yes

q35a_comments

q35b_comments

q35c_comments

q36a_comments NO comment

q36b_comments

q36c_comments

q37a_agree_with_preferredoption yes

q37a_comments Yes! this is an essential element of the Highland Plan and Vision, which should be much more at the fore and centre of the whole plan. This should be a requirement for new developments

q37b_comments

q37c_comments

q38a_agree_with_preferredoption yes

q38a_comments This should not be optional but required for new developments.

q38b_comments

q38c comments

q39 general comments

Although the policies in the Main Issues Report cover a wide range of issues, I find it disappointing that the emphasis on the vision, and specifically the spatial aspect, is mostly just about new development. A key issue in the vision should be about the special characteristic of the highland and the need to enhance the place and the different landscapes. Any new development should be planned with this in mind (as well as the other objectives in the vision section). What is key for many of those living in the area is the sense of being in a special place, the quality of life, attractive landscapes, the special characteristic that make it different to other parts of Scotland and this doesn't come through in the Vision. However I am pleased to note that safeguarding the environment, sustainable, fair and healthy communities are part of the objectives. Plus also to note the wide range of aspects covered by the different policies.

Another essential aspect is also what new developments will look like, people want to see attractive designs, in accordance with the character and sustainable buildings - there is a need for the Vision and plan to provide leadership on this.

Finally thanks for providing a real opportunity for people to hear about this Vision and Plans and contribute to them. And in particular for opening the consultation up for a reasonable amount of time. This should be the model for all development plans consultations.

[REDACTED]

qz1_name Maria de la Torre
qz2_address Boyndie
Dores Road
Inverness
IV2 4LT
qz3_postcode IV2 4LT
qz4_phone [REDACTED]
qz5_email [REDACTED]
zemailformto [REDACTED]

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of a 12-week training program on the physical fitness and health-related quality of life (HRQL) of sedentary middle-aged men. The study was a randomized controlled trial. The participants were divided into two groups: a training group and a control group. The training group performed a supervised aerobic and resistance training program three times a week for 12 weeks. The control group remained sedentary. Physical fitness was measured using a 6-minute walk test, a 10-meter walk test, and a 400-meter walk test. HRQL was measured using the SF-36 questionnaire. The results showed that the training group had significantly higher physical fitness and HRQL compared to the control group at the end of the 12-week period.

Keywords: aerobic training, resistance training, physical fitness, HRQL, middle-aged men.