

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

Reference Number:	HWLDP-MIR-203
Organisation/Individual:	Fortrose and Rosemarkie Community Council (J Cornwell & G Phillips)

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	x
Phasing of Development	x
Developer Contributions	
East Inverness	
Nairn	
Tomagraim	x
Smaller Settlements in A96	
Caithness and North Sutherland	
Easter Ross and Nigg	x
Development of Local Centres	x
Wider Countryside and Fragile Areas	x
Population and Housing	
Housing in the Countryside	x
Affordable Housing	x
Planning for an Ageing Population	x
Gypsies/Travellers	
Retailing	x
Developer Contributions	
Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage	x

Previously used Land	
Wild Land	
Water Environment	x
Renewable Energy	
Flooding	
Waste Management	
Air Quality	x
Sustainable Design	x
Business and Industrial Land	
Accessibility and Transport	x
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	x
Access to the Outdoors	x
Comments on Consultation Process (+ve)	
Comments on Consultation Process (-ve)	

Key:

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

Notes:

Over-reliance on development at Nigg
 Protection of agricultural land is high priority
 Accuracy of Housing Needs and Demands is sought
 Development of supermarkets is not compatible with protection of town centres
 Document should look at enhancing wealth of region rather than economic growth
 Risk of over-development of Black Isle

Action Sheet Completed by:	SH
Date:	10/12/09

Simon Harrison

Sent: 08 November 2009 18:55
Subject: Fields from form

Submit Submit

q01a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q01a_comments Master plans should not be developer led.
q01b_agree_with_alternative no
q01b_comments
q01c_agree_with_alternative no
q01c_comments
q02a_agree_with_preferredoption no
q02a_comments Current spending constraints likely to delay upgrade of A96.
q02b_agree_with_alternative yes
q02b_comments
q02c_agree_with_alternative no
q02c_comments
q03a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q03a_comments There should be irrevocable commitment from publicly funded sources to support key infrastructure.
q03b_agree_with_alternative no
q03b_comments
q03c_agree_with_alternative no
q03c_comments
q04a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q04a_comments no comment
q04b_agree_with_alternative no
q04b_comments
q04c_agree_with_alternative no
q04c_comments
q05a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q05a_comments no comment
q05b_agree_with_alternative no
q05b_comments
q05c_agree_with_alternative no
q05c_comments
q06_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q06_comments Is this included in NPF2?
q07_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q07_comments These communities must NOT be swamped with high density housing.
q08_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q08_comments no comment
q09_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q09_comments There is an over-reliance on the development at Nigg. It and the proposed expansion on the A9 corridor will have an important impact on the Black Isle.
q10_agree_with_preferredoption no
q10_comments How important is a "settlement hierarchy". It means nothing and this community was identified as a local centre ten years ago. This idea is FIVE YEARS too late.
q11_agree_with_preferredoption yes
q11_comments Protection of agricultural land from developments is a HIGH PRIORITY in future planning.
q12a_agree_with_preferredoption no
q12a_comments "a generous identification" of housing land is undesirable. Less In-migration is not synonymous with slower economic growth.
q12b_agree_with_alternative yes
q12b_comments
q12c_agree_with_alternative no
q12c_comments
q13a_agree_with_preferredoption no
q13a_comments
q13b_agree_with_alternative yes
q13b_comments Alternative no. 1 is preferred. Local experience indicates that Councillors pay little regard to the current Guidelines.
q13c_agree_with_alternative no
q13c_comments

q24c_agree_with_alternative no
 q24c_comments
 q25a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
 q25a_comments 25 a) and b) both have merit.
 q25b_agree_with_alternative no
 q25b_comments 25 a) and b) both have merit.
 q25c_agree_with_alternative no
 q25c_comments
 q26a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
 q26a_comments no comment
 q26b_agree_with_alternative no
 q26b_comments
 q27a_agree_with_preferredoption no
 q27a_comments This subject needs more thought. Sustainable energy-
 efficiencies are not always compatible with traditional design.
 q27b_agree_with_alternative yes
 q27b_comments
 q281a_comments The link with the Local Transport Strategy is important but
 the rest of the proposals are not practical. Rural fuel stations have been suggested
 before but are not usually economically viable.
 q281b_agree_with_alternative no
 q281b_comments
 q281c_agree_with_alternative no
 q281c_comments
 q28Aa_agree_with_preferredoption no
 q28a_agree_with_preferredoption no
 q28a_comments Ref. bullet point 5: This policy could be a licence for
 speculative developments rather than solidly based, small scale, business projects.
 q28b_agree_with_alternative yes
 q28b_comments
 q28c_agree_with_alternative no
 q28c_comments
 q29a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
 q29a_comments
 q29b_agree_with_alternative no
 q29b_comments
 q29c_agree_with_alternative no
 q29c_comments
 q30a_agree_with_preferredoption no
 q30a_comments Why perpetuate subsistence farming by creating smaller crofts?
 However, much depends on the sizes of the crofts to be sub-divided.
 q30b_agree_with_alternative no
 q30b_comments No additional houses should be erected on croft land only a
 REPLACEMENT croft house.
 q30c_agree_with_alternative no
 q30c_comments
 q31a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
 q31a_comments
 q31b_agree_with_alternative no
 q31b_comments
 q31c_agree_with_alternative no
 q31c_comments
 q32a_agree_with_preferredoption no
 q32a_comments All Crofting Developments should be subject to normal planning
 rules to ensure transparency and consistency.
 q32b_agree_with_alternative no
 q32b_comments
 q32c_agree_with_alternative no
 q32c_comments
 q33a_agree_with_preferredoption no
 q33a_comments This is only a licence for more building in the countryside.
 q33b_agree_with_alternative no
 q33b_comments
 q33c_agree_with_alternative no
 q33c_comments
 q34a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
 q34a_comments no comment.
 q34b_agree_with_alternative no
 q34b_comments
 q34c_agree_with_alternative no
 q34c_comments

q35a_agree_with_preferredoption no
 q35a_comments The Preferred Option is good but prefer the alternative.
 q35b_agree_with_alternative yes
 q35b_comments
 q35c_agree_with_alternative no
 q35c_comments
 q36a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
 q36a_comments
 q36b_agree_with_alternative no
 q36b_comments
 q36c_agree_with_alternative no
 q36c_comments
 q37a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
 q37a_comments The Facilities Planning Model, if regularly updated, should be a key core-policy document.
 q37b_agree_with_alternative no
 q37b_comments
 q37c_agree_with_alternative no
 q37c_comments
 q38a_agree_with_preferredoption yes
 q38a_comments Provided that the access-ees are educated to behave considerately and responsibly.
 q38b_agree_with_alternative no
 q38b_comments
 q38c_agree_with_alternative no
 q38c_comments
 q39_general_comments Further Comments:

The basic premise in this document is that there MUST be economic 'growth'. An alternative should be considered: namely to concentrate on improving the WEALTH of the Highland area with lower rates of growth. (see the comment on Question 12)

The combination of the Scottish Government decision to increase house building across Scotland and Highlands and Islands Enterprise objective of population growth up to 500,000 imply an appropriate supply of suitable land and employment prospects for in-migrants. This report admits that land supply is inadequate (page 34). Apart from the Caithness and Nigg action plans there are no proposals for the type of economic development that ought to be encouraged and supported. Which comes first? Jobs or In-migration.

Preservation of high grade agricultural and croft land to maintain stocks of home produced food, including dairy products, is highly important for a developing economy. This is a contra-indication to the search for housing land supply. In this connection the reference on page 64 to using crofts for second home development is a further argument in favour of discouraging these high rates of demographic projections. Second homes are not wealth generating and fragment communities.

The Strategy Map (page 31) illustrates the possible impact on the Black Isle of the key development locations north and south. These could lead to an increased housing demand, including a high affordable quota, for the potential workforce. The current local plans have already put the whole area at serious risk of over-development, as public local enquiries have already established, and this tendency must be effectively restrained.

The overall strategies for ENERGY and TRANSPORT require a very detailed and practical planning approach.

TRANSPARENCY AND CONSISTENCY IN PLANNING ARE PARAMOUNT.

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

qz1_name J Cornwell and G Phillips
 qz2_address Fortrose & Rosemarkie Community Council
 c/o Black Isle Service Point
 Deans Road
 FORTROSE

qz3 post code

IV10 8TJ

qz4 phone

[REDACTED]

qz5 email

[REDACTED]

zema in formato

[REDACTED]