

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

Reference Number:	<b>HWLDP-MIR-250</b>
Organisation/Individual:	John Waring

### 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		Previously used Land	X
NPF2 for Scotland		Wild Land	
Vision for the Highlands		Water Environment	
Inverness and A96		Renewable Energy	X
The A96 Corridor	X	Flooding	
Phasing of Development		Waste Management	
Developer Contributions		Air Quality	X
East Inverness		Sustainable Design	
Nairn	X	Business and Industrial Land	X
Tornagrain	X	Accessibility and Transport	X
Smaller Settlements in A96		Agricultural Land	
Caithness and North Sutherland		Subdivision of Existing Crofts	
Easter Ross and Nigg	X	Allocation of Inbye Land	
Development of Local Centres	X	New Crofting Township	
Wider Countryside and Fragile Areas		Small Scale New Crofts	
Population and Housing		Coastal Development	
Housing in the Countryside	X	Forestry and Woodland	
Affordable Housing		Minerals	
Planning for an Ageing Population	X	Open Space and Physical Activity	X
Gypsies/Travellers	X	Access to the Outdoors	
Retailing	X	Comments on Consultation Process (+ve)	
Developer Contributions	X	Comments on Consultation Process (-ve)	
Natural, Built and Cultural Heritage	X		

### Key:

<b>Background</b>	<b>Spatial Strategy</b>	<b>Policy Options</b>	<b>Consultation</b>
-------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

### Notes:

Development in Countryside should be sensible and blend into our countryside  
Should be a push toward creation of new leisure centres  
Improved infrastructure for those working in the area and to improve business growth  
Provide housing and amenities that cater for a growth in the population

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

**Kirsty McCreath**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 November 2009 15:36  
**To:** devplans  
**Subject:** Highland Wide Local Development Plan



John Waring's  
Questionnaire Ans...

Dear Sir,

Please find attached my response to your Plan and Questionnaire. Yours sincerely, John Waring

Play games at no cost with Tiscali Play - <http://www.tiscali.co.uk/play>

---

This email has been scanned by Netintelligence  
<http://www.netintelligence.com/email>

## HIGHLAND WIDE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN MAIN ISSUES REPORT

### Questionnaire

Name: John Waring  
Address: The Old Post Office House,  
Pitcalnie, Nigg by Tain  
Ross-shire  
Postcode: IV19 1QP  
Phone: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]

#### SPATIAL STRATEGY

Q1. Selected - Alternatives to be considered

Comments: Refer to my overall comments.

Q2. Selected - Prefer the stated alternative

Comments: I prefer the Dispersed Growth Option within my overall comments.

Q3. Selected - Prefer the stated alternative

Comments: Again within the framework of my overall comments

Q4. Selected - Prefer the stated alternative

Comments: Within the framework of my overall comments

Q5. Selected - Prefer the stated alternative

Comments: Within the framework of my overall comments

Q6. Selected - Agree with your Preferred Option but with my comments

Comments: Within my overall comments especially ensuring that there are the jobs and infrastructure in place to cater for this massive increase in population.

Q7. Selected - Agree with your Preferred Option but with my comments

Comments: Subject to whether or not the Tornagrain site can go ahead. If the jobs are not there to cater for the Tornagrain site then this approach may be the better for limited employment being available.

Q8. This is not a matter for my area.

Q9. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: This is a major 'development of the day', as identified in my overall comments. The Master Plan for Nigg Yard must be fully consulted upon with major consideration given to the requirements of the local community identified through the local community council.

Q10. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: This should be the normal continuing practise for any County Council and it's councillors. Goes without saying.

Q11. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: As per Q.10

Q12. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: As per Q.10

Q13. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: The countryside is one of our greatest (if not our greatest) asset and must be protected by sensible development which blends into the countryside and enhances it's interest/attractiveness to tourist.

Q14. Selected - Preferred option.

Comments: In principle I agree, but the reduction from 10 to 4 is drastic. Why not say a threshold of 6?

Cont./.....2

Cont.....

Q15. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: I believe all houses should have the minimum requirements for older and disabled people

and some should be identified for the severely disabled where there is an obvious requirement.

Q16. Selected - Stated alternative

Comments: Proper policing should take care of unauthorised sites and by using this approach the local considerations will be properly taken into account.

Q17. Selected - Preferred option.

Comments: Care must be taken to provide basic facilities for those who are housebound or have limited travel options eg. Local shopping for basic weekly provisions where there is a lot of new housing.

Q18. Selected - Stated alternative

Comments: This would ensure that the right amount of contribution will be received in accordance with the development site. I cannot see why this should 'slow down the planning system and future development'.

Q19. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: Need to make sure all organisations involved in the protection of these features are consulted.

Q20. Selected - Preferred option.

Comments: Some never developed land which has still got viable long term planning permission would be best returned to green field status which it is in all but name.

Q21. Selected - Preferred option

No comment.

Q22. Selected - Preferred option

No comment.

Q23. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: I notice you show a less than 20 MW operational and approved wind farm on the Hill of Nigg. This is not the case. There was a proposal which was 100% rejected by the local community and was sent back to the developers by the Highland Council. I understand the developers are considering a further application - please correct this error. Why is there no protection anywhere against wind farms under 20 MW being built?

Q24. Selected - Preferred option

No comments.

Q25. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: Must ensure that local communities are totally protected from any air borne emissions from these sites.

Q26. Selected - Alternative

Comments: If any negative impact on air quality, however slight, is identified then the application must be rejected.

Q27. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: Within the framework of my overall comments

Q28A. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: Within the framework of my overall comments.

Q28B. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: This should be a priority objective in opening the Highlands for business and industrial growth - see my overall comments.

Q29, Q30, Q31, Q32 and Q33 Not applicable to my area.

Q34., Q35 and Q36 Selected - Preferred options

No Comments:

Cont./.....3

Cont.....

Q37. Selected - Preferred option

Comments: Open spaces are fine, but this means that people, especially youngsters, are left to organise/create their own entertainment, and we all know how this can go wrong. I feel there should also be an effort to create leisure centres and controlled sporting/activity facilities/clubs staffed by volunteers and paid coaches etc. I have great experience in this area and know that the feedback, especially from youngsters and their families, is very rewarding and helps to build a healthy and sound future generation.

Q38. Selected - Preferred option.

Comments: Good access to the outdoors is essential and will aid both the local community and the tourism trade.

## EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES QUESTIONNAIRE



### MY OVERALL COMMENTS

Local Plans once written quickly become 'out of date'. In this world things move at a colossal rate. The previous Local Plan which was supposed to cover '10 years and beyond' with a 5 year review was adopted in February 2007 after over 2 years of consultation and is now, after 2 years, to be superseded by a lesser number of Local Plans covering much larger areas (only 3 for the whole of the Highlands). Has nobody yet realised that these plans are out of date when produced and a total waste of time, money and effort which could be so much better employed dealing with the issues of the day? Long term planning which is written down and followed for a period of years can only ever be 'broad guidelines' not bibles to religiously be followed. I believe that the resources being put into these Local Development Plans could be better put into making sure current developments are properly implemented for the good of the whole community. These are fast moving times and will only get faster and there is no longer any place for long term planning except on very major issues which fall within the governments orbit. Let the local government look after the day to day and short term developments and implement the larger term projects under the umbrella of national government directives.

It seems straight forward to me that, within the framework of ensuring that the beauty and National Heritage of the area is not spoilt, one should:-

- (a) Improve the infrastructure to meet the needs of those living in the area together with a sizeable increase to cater for introduction of new business and industrial growth.
- (b) Direct resources to attracting business and industry to the area.
- (c) Provide housing and amenities to cater for the growth in population.

We do not require an overall Local Plan. Planning resources should be directed towards the development of the day within the above. **Less Planning more Action.**