

# AVIEMORE AND VICINITY COMMUNITY COUNCIL

## MINUTE of the SPECIAL MEETING OF AVIEMORE & VICINITY COMMUNITY COUNCIL held in AVIEMORE COMMUNITY CENTRE, on WEDNESDAY 12<sup>th</sup> June 2013 at 7.30pm.

**Present:**

John Grierson (AVCC Chair)	Karen Major (CNPA)
Ray Sefton (AVCC Secretary)	Murray Ferguson (CNPA)
Karen Lawrie (AVCC)	Eleanor Mackintosh (CNPA)
Kathleen Cameron (AVCC)	Willie McKenna (CNPA)
Alistair Dargie (AVCC)	John Grant (Rothiemurchus Estate)
Lorna McGibbon (AVCC)	Tom Ramage (Press)
Ray Sefton (AVCC)	Dave Brown (Kincraig AVCC)
Mark Allan (AVCC)	Myra Francis (GNL – <i>left at 8.10pm</i> )
	Ian Forrester (GNL – <i>arrived 8.05pm left 8.10pm</i> )
	Kirsty Bruce (Minute taker)

**Apologies:** Yvonne Birnie (AVCC) and Audrey MacKenzie (AVCC)

### 1. OPENING REMARKS

John Grierson welcomed all present for attending the open meeting to discuss the Cairngorm National Park's Local Development Plan and to ask and have answered questions that would allow AVCC to make and proper and informed response to the consultation of the proposed Local Development Plan. He reminded everyone present that it was a extra Community Council meeting and would be run under normal Community Council Standing Orders.

### 2. BUSINESS

#### 2.1 DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Karen Major of CNPA said that the Local Development Plan document would replace the current adopted plan. She added, AVCC are invited to make comment and CNPA will then go through all comments made and if there is something fundamental that we think should be changed there is an opportunity to do that.

There then followed extensive discussion on the proposed plan and in particular the following;

**An Camus Mòr** - John Grierson said that there is an application at an advanced stage which is being held up at the moment and only developments which have existing permissions will be exempt. There is no mention of there being a current application. He further added that as he saw it, the effect of having An Camus Mòr in the LDP will be to put a further burden on the applicant as the applicant will again have to satisfy the requirements of the new LDP. John Grierson asked, why does this have to be in the LDP?

Karen Major replied that there isn't any planning permission as yet and there is kind of an allocation as such obviously it's bigger scale than a housing allocation and it does deliver development for the next 5 years, which counts towards the housing numbers. She said that if it wasn't included, it wouldn't give the full picture.

**Aviemore** - Maps - John Grierson advised that the map of Aviemore was inaccurate as it did not show the new primary school and community building and asked what else might be missing. He further added that he believed this to be inexcusable.

Old Primary School Site - John Grierson asked why the old school site is not included on the plan. He further added that in the pre-consultation exercise it was asked that the site be included. Karen Major responded that the school site was not allocated because at the time of drawing up these maps it seemed that there were issues to do with compensation work on part of that site and a variety of options that were being discussed.

Dalfaber Drive - John Grierson asked why the area of ground on the south side of Dalfaber Drive from the Bowling Green to railway has no designation when it is known that there are plans to do something with it. John Grierson stated this site was a good piece of community land and we wouldn't like to see anything else on it. He further said that the Head of Planning at CNPA had already acknowledged that a drill hall and other projects such as a skate park would be a good use of the site.

Strathspey Lawns and Gardens - John Grierson said, the Strathspey Lawns and Gardens are not shown as "protected" in the plan and asked why not. Karen Major responded and directed AVCC to page 67 of the document which states *"A number of open spaces and land which contribute to the setting of Aviemore are identified and will be protected from development. In addition, proposals for new development at Aviemore Highland Resort include the retention of a number of key areas of open space. This includes land fronting Grampian Road between the entrance to Aviemore Highland Resort and Grampian Court. These areas, which form part of the wider masterplanned site, should be retained as open space, enhanced with landscaping and tree planting as required by the existing planning consent"* John Grierson responded by saying he did not feel the text was strong enough and the "should" must be changed to "must be retained as open space".

Aviemore Design Framework - John Grierson asked what has happened to the Aviemore Design Framework. Karen Major replied that the work has been going on for so long and its not been included within the supplementary item.

A9 Dual Carriageway Proposals - John Grierson asked what provision has been made for the dual carriagewaying of the A9? Karen Major said the short answer is none, to which John Grierson asked if that is something that should be included in a five year plan. Murray Ferguson stated that the A9 works partly happens under different legislation. Karen Major said that obviously the A9 development is something the Scottish government is committed to as a national development and there may be opportunities to from development to do other things. John Grierson agreed but did state he felt that it was a glaring omission not to mention the A9 in this LDP.

**Inverdrue and Coylumbridge** - John Grierson asked what is the rationale for both these areas having settlement boundaries? Karen Major replied that these came up as a suggestion but she was unable to remember at this point by whom or by how many but that is the reason.

John Grierson asked if anyone else had any further questions and John Grant asked for some clarification of where the boundaries actually are on this plan, as he found it difficult to actually see the boundaries. It was noted that the boundary line for Coylumbridge did not take in the entire caravan park. Karen Major stated that she had asked someone to check that boundary but if it was wrong she asked that it be commented on the reply to this consultation.

John Grant went on to say that it seemed to him to be a very tight boundary line for the sort of things that arise that cannot be predicted in an area with busy recreation numbers but the general policies do allow for things to happen outside the boundaries if people agree they should. He went on to say that maybe it wasn't so critical and the proposals for affordable housing on this location would still be considered and not

ruled out by this line. Karen Major replied, that if an application came in, it would be dealt with under the policy to do with having development outside settlements, so it would have to be affordable.

**Glenmore** - John Grierson asked what the rationale is for Glenmore having a settlement boundary. Karen Major stated that CNPA were aware of pressure in the area for ad-hoc developments and had a look in some detail and it was flagged up in a report as an area that needed special attention. She advised that CNPA are trying to set the parameters that development should fall into, rather than just getting random applications which would have to be applied to against the general policies. She said it was to add an additional layer of guidance so that if an application does come forward they look at those objectives and think does my application fit within these.

John Grierson asked if it would it not be better just to have it has a rural housing group. Karen Major replied we don't have rural housing groups. John Grierson said but it is one, there are only 7 houses. Karen Major said that if you didn't identify it as settlement, then there would be written method to say what Glenmore should be doing in the future.

John Grierson said you also have another policy about ribbon development and sprawl and he went on to say that from a small hamlet its suddenly sprawled out. Karen Major stated that there is nothing to imply that the land within the settlement boundary would be up for development.

Karen Lawrie said that the general design guidance for both Inverdrue and Glenmore states that all new development will, where appropriate consolidate the existing settlement and at Glenmore . Did that mean that you wouldn't be able to build outside the settlement but at Inverdrue, John Grants affordable housing is out with the settlement boundary. Karen Major said if you look at the principles at the beginning of the plan they set out the policy for things that are outwith and within the settlement boundaries. People are at liberty to put in planning applications for whatever they want and CNPA have to deal with them and what the plan tries to do is to set the framework .

John Grant asked if the meeting could look at the strategy diagram on page 12 of the plan and asked could Karen Major explain it. She replied that the diagram in the most general terms shows the key area where we would expect to see growth happen such as in Badenoch and Strathspey and Upper Deeside. John Grierson pointed out that the colours in the key were not correct.

## **2.2 CORE PATHS**

Ray Sefton asked who has the responsibility of ensuring rights of responsible access. Murray Ferguson replied that CNPA do. Ray Sefton asked if it correct there is no standard for core paths and Murray Ferguson replied that that is correct and broadly speaking that was a good thing. There was then discussion on two specific paths;

**Burnside to Craigellachie path** - Murray Ferguson said that LS124 was the path that goes from High Burnside to Craigellachie and that it is a designated core path but there is no path on the actual ground. The reason for this is that there is still opposition from the estate. CNPA went through a public enquiry that found in favour of CNPA, so the path got designated but CNPA have not gone ahead with all of the path as the estate concerned are still unenthusiastic. He added that CNPA could have forced the issue but have chosen not to and then we got into quite a big discussion with AVCC whether you wanted that path or not. John Grierson stated we did not support it has a core path because we are not going to support a landowner being forced into it and AVCC were not going to be used as a lever. Murray Ferguson responded by saying that just to make sure the minutes are correct AVCC did support it as a designated core path. John Grierson replied I don't think we did, I think what AVCC said was that we would prefer the path through the centre of Aviemore, which you have now designated. Murray Ferguson said whatever we said

historically it is however designated as a core path. He then said, the only question in our mind is do you want to see a path built between High Burnside and Craigellachie, if you don't want the one shown on the map, what do you want because now is the time to tell us. John Grierson said that there has already been a suggestion that it should run from the top of High Burnside because there is already a path there and that would then tie in with the upper part of the Craigellachie path. Murray Ferguson said CNPA would certainly look at that.

**Thieves Road** – Murray Ferguson stated that this is one of the new core paths that clearly meets criteria but has some more sensitivities. CNPA think it's a very important path and quite an omission. John Grierson asked how did the landowner feel about it. John Grant replied that the landowner had not be asked and we would like to much more involved in that. John Grant went on to say that he found it very difficult to understand how you would designate something as a core path when the legislation is completely clear to allow more people use it and be more comfortable using it with all sorts of contraptions and at the same time say that is not going to change its level of use. He found it difficult to understand and couldn't see how it could be assessed successfully and he would like to see further discussion about this.

**Proposed link over River Spey** - John Grierson asked Murray Ferguson what are the other new paths and Murray Ferguson replied that the other new one he particularly wanted to bring to AVCC attention was the proposed link path 147 across the river Spey and proposed new foot bridge which would link to the future new An Camus Mòr. John Grant stated his comment with regards to this path is that it does not link to anywhere at the moment. John Grierson asked should it be designated now or should it wait until it's got somewhere to go to.

### **3 AOCB**

#### **3.1 UPDATE ON NORTH DALFABER**

Murray Ferguson gave a very brief update on the North Dalfaber Development advising that CNPA had written back to the applicant a strongly worded letter on how far of the mark there application was in terms supplying information to CNPA. CNPA will be sitting down with the applicant sitting to thrash out with them what information we need to have from them in order to process the application. John Grierson asked whether this would come in a separate application. Murray Ferguson replied no, this application stays live until we have resolved. John Grierson asked if the applicant comes back with the information, will you come back to us for consultation and Murray Ferguson said yes CNPA would come back for comment. John Grierson made comment on the difficulties and consistency of documents being presented for comment on the Highland Council site and on the CNPA.

#### **8. CLOSE OF MEETING AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

John Grierson thank all those for present for attending this meeting and Murray Ferguson of CNPA thanked AVCC for inviting them along and stated that it was a testament to how seriously AVCC take planning issues and future development of the local area.