

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

|                          |                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Reference Number:        | HWLDP-MIR-216   |
| Organisation/Individual: | Joyce Wilkinson |

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

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

**Key:**

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

**Notes:**

Consistency of planning of fragile areas  
 Look at lower population projections  
 Siting and design importance in Housing in the Countryside  
 Tourism should be considered when assessing renewable energy projects  
 Closer working with Crofters Commission  
 Prime land must be set in a local context

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

Simon Hindson

Sent: 08 November 2009 15:23  
Subject: Fields from form

Submit Submit

q01a\_comments  
q01b\_comments  
q01c\_comments  
q02a\_comments  
q02b\_comments  
q02c\_comments  
q03a\_comments  
q03b\_comments  
q03c\_comments  
q04a\_comments  
q04b\_comments  
q04c\_comments  
q05a\_comments  
q05b\_comments  
q05c\_comments  
q06\_comments  
q07\_comments  
q08\_comments  
q09\_comments  
q10\_comments

q11\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q11\_comments There needs to be a consistency in fragile area planning throughout the Highlands, at the moment the effect of this inconsistency is obvious to the onlooker and detrimental to the public benefit and benefit to the tourist industry and environment. An example would be the cluster of badly designed, large scale ,second homes, which were built at Cross Farm, Morar, on the only agricultural ground left in the area. This would never have been allowed in the National park area. If possible have consistency, using the Cairngorm national Park's planning constraints as a phased in method of keeping the countryside and fragile areas throughout the Highlands under the same policy umbrella.

q12a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption no

q12a\_comments Target land allocation to lower end of the expected population expansion figure; Allocating agricultural land and in by croft land for housing those who are of no benefit to the community and who drain the public purse should never be an option. Land will hold a far greater importance in the future as a means of producing local food as the world food crisis becomes a bigger issue.

q12b\_agree\_with\_alternative yes

q12b\_comments as above

q12c\_comments

q13a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q13a\_comments 'This approach supports the development of more houses in the countryside within

existing groups of houses, particularly where the siting and design of these does not lead to an unacceptable impact on the landscape or infrastructure needed to support them.' I sincerely hope that this statement reflects reality in the future. The approach to planning in the Hinterland areas around Fort William and extending throughout Lochaber has shocked almost every passer by who has arrived here in the last few years. If I had a £1 for the number of times this comment has been passed 'What on earth have the planners done to the place' I could afford to move somewhere where planning constraints echo the natural beauty and cultural significance of the area. Large scale houses of a design that bears no resemblance to the traditional design of houses in the area and out of all proportion to houses around it, all of differing style and type, scattered in areas that were never zoned for planning until that first house appeared and set a precedent that meant planners then had to allow further new builds. The Area of Lochaber depends greatly on tourism and the effects of the random placing of houses that would look more in place on the outskirts of Glasgow, with no consideration being taken by planners for the uniqueness and beauty of our own Crofting Cultural heritage, has caused disquiet and disturbance among the crofting community and left many a visitor to the area questioning why in some parts of the Highlands great care is taken at preserving and encouraging sympathetically designed countryside housing, yet in other areas, anything goes. Sad and shocking, please implement changes.

q13b\_agree\_with\_alternative no

q13b\_comments Housing in the countryside is needed for the reasons given in the main report. your preferred option takes the sensible position and can only bring good to the benefit. However it must be done in consultation with the crofting community and others who understand the countryside.

q13c\_comments  
q14a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q14a\_comments

q14b\_comments

q14c\_comments

q15a\_comments

q15b\_comments

q15c\_comments

q16a\_comments

q16b\_comments

q16c\_comments

q17a\_comments

q17b\_comments

q17c\_comments

q18a\_comments

q18b\_comments

q18c\_comments

q19a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q19a\_comments

q19b\_comments

q19c\_comments

q20a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q20a\_comments

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

I agree only because you have in the option a statement that says you will protect some areas from renewable energy development. I presume that areas that rely heavily on tourism and large areas of carbon trapping peatland would be protected for this reason. Sustainable crofting should be considered in line with the reports from High nature Value farming groups who have evidence that HNV farming produces less emissions from farming than intensive farming practises.

q23b\_comments

q23c\_comments

q24a\_comments

q24b\_comments

q24c\_comments

q25a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q25a\_comments

q25b\_comments

q25c\_comments

q26a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q26a\_comments

q26b\_comments

q27a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q27a\_comments

q27b\_comments

q281a\_comments

q281b\_comments

q281c\_comments

q28a\_comments

q28b\_comments

q28c\_comments

q29a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption no

q29a\_comments

In the Highland context and particularly within the fragile areas, there is no such thing as Prime land and a great many crofts which may have once been nearly prime land, are of course, unused and rank, desperately in need of phosphate, lime and drainage to restore them. Land must be classed within a local context, if a piece of inbye land is the only piece available locally and it is to be

decrofted and used as a development for a 2nd home, then it must be protected. At present there is no working together between the Crofters Commission and their on the ground assessors and Grazing committee representatives, so valuable in-by-croft land is disappearing into the 2nd home and developers pockets. The stated alternative allows for land to be graded as valuable grazing land in the context of the local quality of other available land. The preferred option does not take this into account.

q29b\_comments

q29c\_agree\_with\_alternative yes

q29c\_comments There must be working together between Local representatives of the Crofting community and the Local planners, before it is too late, they have already damaged enough of our valuable food producing ground through unrestrictive planning policies. The idea that once an individual has obtained planning permission, the Crofter commission cannot refuse a de-crofting is a scandal, and has been responsible for the whole reason behind the Shucksmith report and the reform Bill needing to come into being in the first place anyway. The new reform Bill promises to end this, but it cannot do it without a framework in place from all sides that allows for working together at local level.

q30a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q30a\_comments In some cases there may be the need for more than one extra house on the croft, however in recent years this has only led to speculation and fragmentation of the community, as these houses are sold to 2nd homers or are speculated on, being resold many times, each time becoming further out of reach of local people. However it can bring money into a crofting community, initially, and it of course depends on the size of the croft. A better approach would be to allow only one extra house per a certain hectareage, and tie it to purposeful use of the croft. Encourage this assessment through the joint working of the Commission/Scot Gov/ Grazing committee/Area assessors appointed by the grazing committee. It is refreshing to read that there will hopefully be a change of approach and it will hopefully herald a new working together and an end to blatant speculation on croft land.

q30b\_comments

q30c\_comments

q31a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q31a\_comments In many ways the stated alternative is preferable here, but this will devalue croft land, as you rightly state, there are landowners estates and other land throughout the crofting counties and the end result could be a very fragmented approach which will only bring more disquiet amongst the crofting community. Consult with Grazing committees and try alternative methods such as preserving in-by-croft land in exchange for common grazing land for building. Consult Crofting communities for fresh ideas on other issues such as affordable housing.

q31b\_comments

q31c\_comments

q32a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q32a\_comments

q32b\_comments

q32c\_comments

q33a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q33a\_comments

q33b\_comments

q33c\_comments

q34a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q34a\_comments

q34b\_agree\_with\_alternative yes

q34b\_comments

q34c\_comments

q35a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q35a\_comments

q35b\_comments

q35c\_comments

q36a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q36a\_comments

q36b\_comments

q36c\_comments

q37a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q37a\_comments

q37b\_comments

q37c\_comments

q38a\_agree\_with\_preferredoption yes

q38a\_comments

q38b\_agree\_with\_alternative yes

q38b\_comments

q38c\_comments

q39 ~~general~~ comments I hope that the views of the Crofting community are taken into consideration especially relating to a new ~~working~~ together to protect Croft land ~~and~~ the development of township policies. A ~~showed~~ approach by the Highland Council to housing in the countryside is very welcome, but again there must be working together between Commission/ Crofting representatives and Local planners. Too much damage has already been done in some areas through the present policies, classing prime land as protected land when there is no prime land in most of the fragile areas of the crofting counties is one nonsense that has brought about a detrimental result to the public good.

[REDACTED]

qz1\_name Joyce Wilkinson  
qz2\_address Invercaimbe  
Arisaig  
Invernesshire  
qz3\_postcode ph39 4nt  
qz4\_phone [REDACTED]  
qz5\_email [REDACTED]  
zemailformto [REDACTED]

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud.

2. The second part of the document outlines the specific requirements for record-keeping, including the need to maintain original documents and to keep copies of all records for a minimum of seven years. It also discusses the importance of ensuring that records are accessible and retrievable.

3. The third part of the document discusses the role of the auditor in verifying the accuracy of the records. It emphasizes that the auditor must exercise due diligence and must be satisfied that the records are complete and accurate.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the consequences of failing to maintain accurate records. It notes that failure to do so can result in the disallowance of tax deductions and penalties.

5. The fifth part of the document discusses the importance of training and education for those responsible for maintaining records. It notes that ongoing education is necessary to ensure that record-keepers are up-to-date on the latest regulations and best practices.