



## **Appendix 1**

### **Main Issues Report and Additional Sites Report**

### **SUMMARY REPORT OF CONSULTATION**



## **Overview**

This report sets out a summary of the formal consultation responses firstly by towns and villages and then by the four identified key areas of change.

The LIVE Park public consultation was held for 11 weeks from 28 April until 14 July 2014. The subsequent LIVE Park Additional Sites Report consultation was held for 6 weeks from 14 November until 19 December 2014.

We wanted to encourage as many people as possible to get involved in the process and we welcomed comments and feedback in a variety of ways:

- Through our website either as quick comments or formal consultation responses
- Through hard copy forms emailed or posted, or electronically via our online system
- At our events focused on working with Young People
- Through comments on our Facebook, Blog and Twitter pages
- At community or stakeholder events/meetings

## **What is this Report?**

This report provides a brief summary of the main comments received via our website and some of the main points that form our draft response and recommendation. We have not responded to each comment received, only by grouping. You should read this report with the Main Issues Report or the Additional Sites Report both are able to view on [www.ourlivepark/downloads](http://www.ourlivepark/downloads) and the Proposed Plan. You can also view all the comments received on the [www.ourlivepark.com](http://www.ourlivepark.com) website – these are the ‘verbatim’ reports. This website also provides a range of information on the events or meetings we attended and the feedback we received through our blogs.

## **Town and Village Development Opportunities**

### **Aberfoyle including Port of Menteith:**

Consultation response(s): General support for affordable housing and employment generated by the proposed business and industry site in the ownership of the Forestry Commission at Aberfoyle yard.

A total of 31 objections were received in regard to the Option to develop the site at Braeval, Aberfoyle / Port of Menteith for 40 – 50 self-catering lodges. Concerns were raised in regard to environmental impact on the Lake of Menteith - Site of Special Scientific Interest, nearby protected species, and the impact of the scale of the proposal on businesses in the locality amongst other points.

Officer response: Aberfoyle will benefit from potential regeneration of the High Street through inclusion as a Placemaking Priority. The Forestry Commission site at Aberfoyle yard has also been retained.

The proposed visitor accommodation site at Braeval is not included as a development site in the Proposed Plan although the Plan's policy offers support for tourism accommodation in the Aberfoyle / Port of Menteith area pending a future review of opportunities with partner organisations and communities. It is intended that the National Park Authority with Forestry Commission Scotland will work with local communities in the area to consider again options for the future. Tourism Development Framework for Scotland *...role of the planning system in delivering the visitor economy (July 2013) section 2.167 states in relation to both National Parks:* 'There are opportunities for further resort development within each Park, the need to provide more quality accommodation and develop and expand visitor attractions...'

### **Ardentinny:**

Consultation Response(s): Support given to the potential of the beach at Ardentinnny to have a higher profile within the National Park.

Officer Response: The response relating to the beach at Ardentinnny is noted and welcomed. The opportunity for the village, noted in the MIR, will be carried forward to the proposed plan in regard to supporting development within the village and general improvements to footpaths and signage.

### **Arrochar and Succoth:**

Consultation Response(s): There was general support for the vision and recognition of the unrealised potential in Arrochar and Succoth. Option 1, the preferred option, was supported.

Concerns were expressed in an objection to the inclusion of the longer term site at Succoth.

Officer Response: Given the longer term nature of the potential to develop to the north of Succoth the option for this site has not been included. As a main area of change with Taret the preferred option for Arrochar and Succoth will support ambitious proposals for placemaking (enhancing the village centre), new housing (a total of 60 units on four sites) including 26 units at Succoth, enhanced tourist development opportunities to complement the Ben Arthur Resort and allocation of the site at Church Road for Economic Development.

## **Balloch:**

Consultation Responses: There was general support for the preferred option, the placemaking priority and the importance of the town in support of Loch based tourism.

Objections were raised to the impact that development at ST8 and ST4 would have on Moss O' Balloch Plantation Woodlands.

The investment in the facilities at Balloch were regarded to be critical to the future of any cross loch water based transport system and objection was raised to the vision for Balloch on the basis of the exclusion of Balloch Pier as a specific designation in the proposed plan with the Maid of the Loch restoration making an important contribution to the services and facilities on the Loch.

Support was also given to all piers on the Loch being taken into public ownership.

It was also requested that H3 should not be developed for housing but retained for car / coach parking.

Officer Response: The support given to the preferred option is welcomed. The proposed plan will give protection to Moss O' Balloch Plantation Woodlands through the policies for protecting the natural environment with particular reference to NEP8 and NEP9.

The comments in regard to Balloch Pier are noted. The proposed plan will highlight the opportunity to enhance activity at Balloch Pier and will support the improvements to services and related infrastructure across the Loch. Site H3 includes the need for some car or coach parking.

## **Balmaha:**

Consultation Responses: There was support for the preferred option and for the preparation of a masterplan framework for Balmaha.

Objections were also raised to the potential for development to be inappropriate for the size of the village and in particular to the proposed development of the Forestry Commission site to the west of Fir Tree Cottage. Concerns were also raised in respect to the impact of development on protected sites and species.

There was recognition for the need for more investment in roads infrastructure and enhancement of improved infrastructure to support water transport at Balmaha Pier.

Officer Response: A Rural Development Framework (RDF) has been prepared for the South Buchanan area which includes Balmaha. Balmaha is regarded as a small rural community and is differentiated in the plan from Towns or Villages, such as nearby Drymen, due to their size and/or their more rural nature and characteristics, limited development opportunities and the need to protect their development pattern, individual sense of place and special landscape qualities. The concerns raised in objections regarding the scale and appropriateness of development are being addressed through the Rural Development Framework. It is also intended to publish a Masterplan for Balmaha as Planning Guidance. While the concerns over the proposed housing site in Balmaha, there has been support for

this proposal and feasibility work undertaken by Rural Stirling Housing Association with guidance from the Community Council. The Proposed Plan retains this site.

**Callander:**

Consultation Responses: Support was expressed for development south of the River Teith as in Option 1. Concerns were expressed for the longer term option as it would need to be supported by a new bridge and no indication of the impact on high school capacity. Support for Option 1 was also conditional in that existing businesses on the High Street should be protected. An objection was raised to redevelopment of Station Road Car Park as part of a mixed use development. Some considered the site should be retained as car parking to allow the Meadows to revert back from car parking to open space with play facilities and to function as improved open space. Objections were also raised in regard to the scale of the allocation ED3 and MIR39 and that they should be included as mixed use. Further, objections were submitted in regard to the impact of development on woodland at RA1, ST9, PMIR1 and PMIR2. It was also noted that as required by Scottish Planning Policy, the scale and location of land for housing should be expressed in the plan but it is not clear how the major proposals for Callander relate to the targets for affordable and market housing. There were also objections raised to additional sites at; Gart Farm (PMIR1) due to scale, and Balgibbon Drive (PMIR2) primarily due to road access/safety and flooding. There were mix of support and objection for the additional Claish Farm site (PMIR3) due to adequate housing already provided, impact on schools capacity and local archaeology, and limitations of road network, compared to - improved settlement approach from south and effectiveness of site.

Officer Response: The support given to preferred Option 1 is welcomed. As noted in the Main Issues Report, a Masterplan framework document is being prepared for Callander South to consider the potential for a mixed use development to support the growth of the town and its community, to sustain the vitality of businesses and to complement and the role and function of the town centre. The Callander South Development Framework includes options for 90 homes, 60-bed hotel, riverside park and walk, community events space, outdoor recreational centre, and a longer term vision for a bridge link across the River Teith. The additional Claish Farm site (PMIR3) to the west of the A81 requires a masterplan to be produced, is for low scale development, will improve approach to settlement from south, will mitigate impact on local archaeology, and will address road constraints. Integral to the framework will be a full assessment of the development potential of the sites to the south of Callander taking into account a wide range of constraints and infrastructure requirements including impact on the natural, cultural, landscape and historic environment; infrastructure (schools, roads and transportation, flood risk).

In regard to the potential for the Meadows car park to be reverted back to formal public open space, this is something that would be considered by Stirling Council's review of car parking. Timescales for this are not known at the time of writing. The inclusion of a Placemaking Priority for central Callander means there will be opportunities to bring forward public realm improvements and enhance the potential for recreation on the riverside frontage.

In regard to the allocations at ED3 and MIR39, although site ED3 area has been reduced from what is shown in the current Adopted Local Plan settlement map, the remainder is identified as business and industrial land. Redefining the site for mixed use is unrealistic as

there would be land use conflict in terms of noise and air pollution and road safety. While there is potential vehicle access to this site, the suitability for mixed use has not been demonstrated. In terms of removing the option for road access for potential road bridge, the final location has yet to be determined and would be considered further in future planning applications at Claish Farm.

The objections raised in regard to the impact on woodland, any proposed development will require to be carefully assessed with impact on the natural environment key to the scale, range and types of uses that can be accommodated. There is a specific environmental policy protecting trees and woodland in the proposed plan which will ensure this.

PMIR1 Gart Farm site is considered too separated from Callander for housing, however the site continues to be proposed long term for visitor experience when mineral extractions are complete. This continues the existing long term designation in the Local Plan.

PMIR2 Balgibbon Drive site continues to be allocated from the Local Plan as a long term housing site. It has not been identified for short term development due to an outstanding road access land ownership constraint. This proposal received a number of objections from the Community Council and local residents to the site, with concerns over the capacity and safety of increasing traffic flows on Balgibbon Drive along with amenity and environmental impact. Objection was also raised to flooding concerns nearby. The scale of development has been reduced from Local Plan from 28 to 22 homes. In terms of road safety, no objection was received from Stirling Council Roads department or Transport Scotland. The site is retained as it is a relatively discreet edge of Town site with a natural boundary and is within reasonable walking and cycling distance of town centre services and facilities. In addition, the site has been included as there are relatively limited options for future housing land in Callander without significant infrastructure issues to work through. There is sufficient land to accommodate a design solution to address the flood risk concern during any future planning application. Plan policies and site guidance will safeguard against development exacerbating the current flood risk nearby.

As the proposed plan is not covered by a single Local Housing Strategy (LHS), it has been reliant on input from the four constituent local authorities'. The Population and Background Report has been prepared and updated with recent information on housing completions, land supply and assumptions based housing need and demand from the authorities Housing Needs and Demand Assessments. Scottish Planning Policy advises planning authorities to be flexible in their assumptions on demand and the associated allocations in development plans. The growth of Callander is a key element of the proposed plan's vision and strategy. There is a target of 75 homes to be built per year across the National Park and calculations have shown that with the scale and locations of the land supply over the next twenty years the ambitious target can be met.

### **Crianlarich:**

Consultation Responses: There was support for Option 1, the preferred option, and for the proposed housing development at Willowbrae. Clarification was sought as to whether land for a timber transfer facility would be protected in Crianlarich and for the continued support

for close involvement of Transport Scotland and future development opportunities that may have an impact on the Trunk Road.

Officer Response: Support for Option 1 is welcomed. The potential development in the proposed plan will include the retention of the site at Crianlarich Station ED4, to support economic development including potential rail haul facilities. Any future development opportunities to be realised by the formation of the by-pass will require to be fully assessed in accordance with regard to appropriateness and impact on the trunk road network.

#### **Croftamie:**

Consultation Responses: Support was given to Option 1 and respondents also supported alternatives, such as, the field site across from the Nursery school is as good an option as LH2 or the opposite side of the road from H15. Two objections were also received. Concerns were raised regarding the development of Pirniehall for housing development as it virtually creates a new village. Development on the site would be impossible to control.

Officer Response: The support given to Option 1 is welcomed. The alternative proposed sites would not form the preferred option for Croftamie, as the allocated sites would represent sufficient scale of development for the village over the plan period considering nearby approval in the Stirling Council planning area at Dalnair.

In terms of Pirniehall, it is on the Buildings at Risk Register and cross funding to assist in the regeneration of the building achieved through residential development of a moderate scale is supported. The Proposed Plan's policies can provide appropriate controls.

#### **Drymen:**

Consultation Responses: A total of 68 MIR representations were received comprising 45 objections and 23 letters of comment or support. The objections generally related to the inclusion of the site MIR62 Laurelfields for 16 units and focussed on the substantial addition the development would make to the village in addition to the existing allocation at Stirling Road. The main issues raised in objection were: the inadequate infrastructure in terms of the school capacity, traffic congestion, parking at the church and graveyard, the detrimental visual impact on the entrance to the village and conservation area, the loss of character and attractiveness to tourists. Some support for the development was noted but with a lower density. PMIR4 (LT1) Stirling Road site supported by the agent with design and access statement and recommends allocating site and reducing reliance on windfall sites.

There was however, support for Option 1 and particular mention was made to the retention of the current housing allocation at Stirling Road. Support was also given to the development of the Salmon Leap site and to the regeneration of the Drumbeg Quarry site for tourism / recreation development.

Officer Response: While the sensitivity of the MIR62 (H2 in the Proposed Plan) site is recognised, as a gap site within the Village, it remains officer's view that appropriately designed and scaled housing development can be achieved without undermining the character of the Conservation Area or resulting in negative impacts on this part of the Village. It is recommended that the number of units is reduced, in light of community concerns, while still trying to ensure a viable scale of development. Additional advice on the



main planning considerations for this site is also included within the site map in the Proposed Plan.

The site is clearly at a sensitive and important location within the Conservation Area and will require to be well integrated into the streetscape in terms of scale, massing and materials. The size of the site has been reduced since the MIR stage. Infrastructure or service capacity issues have not been submitted by Stirling Council as the Roads or Education Authority. In terms of the question of need, the advice from the Council – as housing authority - there remains a need in the Village. This site is identified within Stirling Council's Strategic Housing Investment Plan and has funding allocated within the Council's programme. The site has also been included to offer flexibility of choice of development sites in Drymen.

As with all communities in the National Park, development proposals will require to be of a scale that can be accommodated but also support the future needs of the community by providing a range of housing opportunities. The affordable housing site at Laurelfields (MIR62) and the other housing allocations in the village will play an important role in supporting the needs of Drymen households as a whole, and in delivering the wider aims of National Park to build strong sustainable communities. LT1 South Stirling Road site is identified for long term housing as H1 and H2 sites should be developed first as they are within the Village boundary. A key recommendation from the 2013 charrette that informed the Main Issues Report was to focus on gap sites for short to medium development before expanding outwith the Village boundary.

The support for Option 1 is welcomed as is the support given to the regeneration of Drumbeg Quarry.

#### **Gartmore:**

Consultation Responses: A new site PMIR5 Land Northwest of Park Avenue of 0.6 hectares has been promoted by the landowner for housing development at Park Avenue, Gartmore and is located on the edge of the settlement. Concerns were expressed about potential for 'supporting small scale housing adjacent to settlement boundary, where access is possible', as this has potential to spoil the original historic linear form of the village with its tremendous views all round. There was agreement with the MIR issue that opportunities remain limited.

Officer Response: Park Avenue site PMIR 5 has not been identified as a development site in the Proposed Plan due to road access constraints and could be considered under housing policies as windfall in future should access be resolved.

Due to the scale and nature of the village and its setting there are limited opportunities for appropriate development on the edge of the settlement. Future potential housing sites will be considered on a case by case basis.

#### **Gartocharn:**

Consultation Responses: Two objections were received to the Burnbrae Farm site (MIR73b) in relation to the site perpetuating the linear form of the village and that the field behind the Millennium Hall would be a better site. Concerns were also raised that the infrastructure requirements of developing the site (MIR73b) would make the development unviable. The France Farm site was also a preferred option.

Officer Responses: The concerns regarding Burnbrae Farm are noted. Whilst the site sits at the western end of the village some development can be accommodated in landscape terms. The development costs and infrastructure implications will be an important factor in the decision of any developer to progress. However in terms of scale and location the Burnbrae Farm site is a welcome addition to the housing land supply for this area of the National Park. This site and the France Farm site present an opportunity to sustain the community of Gartocharn and provide a range and choice of housing.

#### **Killin:**

Consultation Responses: It is vital that the Site at ED6 is retained to serve as a bus interchange to support Killin's role in the Regional Buses Strategy and Action Plan. If the site is not retained for a bus interchange an alternative site should be found in Killin for this use.

An objection was raised to the development of MIR80 on the basis of impact on and loss of ancient woodland. The protection of the ancient woodland should be guaranteed.

Officer Response: The potential for the bus interchange to be retained is recognised. Any development of the site would be in consultation with the Transportation Authorities and impact on or the loss of the bus interchange opportunity would be a material issue in any future planning decision.

In regard to the impact on the ancient woodlands at MIR80, planning permission on part of the site exists for a wood fired combined heat and power plant. An Environmental Statement was prepared in accordance the Environmental Impact regulations and at that time Scottish Natural Heritage was content that species and habitat issues were adequately addressed. Structural native woodland plantings have been proposed as mitigation which will provide biodiversity benefit as well as mitigation against landscape impact. Further development of the site will similarly be assessed and only approved with satisfactory mitigation measures factored in to minimise disturbance and impact on the natural environment.

#### **Kilmun/Strone/Blairmore:**

Consultation Responses: One objection was received in regard to site H21 at Kilmun as it is adjacent to ancient woodland. It is recommend that, if any protected species are present on the development site or adjacent to the development site, the appropriate survey work is carried out to determine the impacts that the development may have on the populations. A total of 23 homes have been identified but none developed. This must raise the issue of whether housing on this scale can be justified even if it was restricted to local needs/affordable housing.

Officer Response: The site identified as H21 is under construction with eleven homes to be built. It is anticipated that all remaining 22 homes in both sites in Kilmun and Strone will be developed over the period of the Local Development Plan.

The development at High Road Strone (H22) will require to fit sympathetically into the landscape and be supported by adequate access and roads infrastructure. The Proposed Plan policies provide suitable safeguards.

**Lochgailhead:**

Consultation Responses: Concerns were raised about the level of services and facilities in the village, sewage pollution, the condition of Inverlounin Road, and landslip risk.

Officer Response: The comments are noted. The development of the allocated site to the north east of Donich Park will complement the recent affordable housing development on the adjacent site. The provision and retention of local services for the community is an important part of the strategy and vision for the Proposed Plan. Similarly, an adequate level of infrastructure is required to support the community and its growth. Issues of water quality, power supplies and the commercial operation of retail facilities are outwith the remit of the planning system; however the National Park Authority works with its planning partners at a community and national level to highlight and encourage improvement to vital facilities and infrastructure.

**Luss:**

Consultation Responses: Comments were received in regard to the congestion in the village at peak visitor times, the need for accommodation for young families, any development will need to pay regard to sympathetic layout and design of the conservation area, and that the proposed site MIR92 is remote from the village. PMIR6 Luss Car Park was proposed for housing with no representations other than no objection from Transport Scotland due to separation of site from trunk road.

Officer Response: Luss is a key destination in the National Park and managing the influx of visitors is vital to maintaining the attractiveness as a destination but also as a place to live and work in. The Proposed Plan aims to support the creation of a village square, enhanced and sympathetic public realm improvements including car parking and signage. At the same time, the Proposed Plan will support new housing opportunities for the needs of the community to be progressed via the Rural Development Framework approach as outlined in the Proposed Plan. MIR92 has been allocated as H1 for 10 homes. PMIR6 Luss Car Park has not been taken forward as not considered effective due to small size of site, impacts on woodland and conservation area. Any future small scale housing on site PMIR6 would require careful design which could be considered under housing policy as windfall development.

**St Fillans:**

Consultation Responses: Site 00103/1/002 The Girran proposed for housing. Single representation from Perth and Kinross Council highlighting that no requirement for additional housing land given site lies out with the settlement boundary.

Officer Response: Site has not been taken forward as not required for additional housing in St Fillans.

**Tarbet:**

Consultation Responses: A number of responses supported the preparation of a masterplan for Tarbet and for the housing site at MIR106b, it was noted that any design should fit the local context.

An objection was also raised to the inclusion of the proposed housing site.

It was noted that junction improvements are required for the A82 / A83.

General comments were made regarding recreation on the Loch and difficulties accessing the Loch, litter and wild camping.

Officer Response: The comments are noted and support for the preparation of a Tarbet masterplan welcomed. Whilst there is objection to the new housing site MIR106b, it presents an opportunity to sustain the community of Tarbet and provide a range and choice of housing and assist in meeting the housing land supply for this area of the National Park.

In regard to access to the loch and recreation matters these are outwith the control of the planning system, however in regard to wild camping and care of Loch Lomond for visitors and the environment, the National Park Authority is undertaking a review of visitor management across the Park in the initiative 'Your Park'.

### **Tyndrum:**

Consultation Responses: Concerns were expressed about the potential flood risk at site ED8. SEPA have noted a flood risk assessment would be required with the potential to limit to the developable area.

Support is given to the public realm improvements however with the design of a safe and convenient pedestrian crossing on the A82 highlighted.

It was also noted that there is no need for more affordable housing in Tyndrum.

Officer Response: Any development of ED8 (Clifton) will require to be assessed at the planning application stage. Pre application discussions with Scottish Environment Protection Agency will require an assessment to be undertaken to scope out the scale of flood risk. Links across the A82 and safe pedestrian crossing are vital to allow access to facilities. This will be an integral part of taking forward the Placemaking Priority for the village. Consultation with the transportation authorities at an early stage is vital.

## **Policy Opportunities**

### **Rural Economy:**

Consultation Responses: Landowners/businesses were generally supportive of preferred options.

Some concern from communities and individuals over increased flexibility for new business development in the countryside, some respondents sought more detail on what this might entail.

Buchanan Community Council, Luss and Montrose Estates supportive of exploring the Rural Development Framework Areas proposed.

Officer Response: Support from the business community is welcomed. A number of concerns were raised by flexibility in the policy framework allowing inappropriate development to spoil the special qualities of the National Park. The policy framework directs development to towns, villages and existing sites. Economic development in the wider countryside will have to comply with the criteria in policy EDP3 which allows development only when they are able to meet specific criteria.

### **Visitor Experience**

Consultation Responses: More detail on the application of the tourism strategy in National Park Partnership Plan – particularly why areas for small scale tourism identified. There was general agreement on areas for focus of new development.

Careful balance needed when considering development in the rural area.

Officer Response: Visitor Experience is a vital part of the economy of the National Park and good quality and range of tourism facilities are vital to provide an attractive offer that matches experiencing the natural beauty of the National Park. The Visitor Experience Policies aim to balance providing facilities for visitors that complement the needs of local communities and conserving the National Park's Special Qualities. Further guidance on the Visitor Experience Policies, their implementation and delivery, can be found in the Draft Visitor Experience Planning Guidance.

### **Housing:**

Consultation Responses: A range of opinions on the amount of housing land required over the plan period were received. The Scottish Government, Argyll and Bute Council, Stirling Council and West Dunbartonshire Council all generally supported the preferred option of a target of 75 new homes per year for the National Park. Others, mainly individual residents, supported a lower target whilst some landowners and developers argued for a higher target.

A range of views were also received on how best to deliver affordable housing including the appropriate percentage contribution required on housing sites, the retention of affordable housing in perpetuity (or not) and whether open market housing should be supported on sites that are not located within settlement boundaries to act as enabling development.

No comments were received regarding the proposal to remove the Local Housing Needs Policy in the Loch Lomondside settlements.

Scottish Government highlighted the Scottish Planning Policy's statement that the level of affordable housing should generally be no more than 25% of total number of homes. Kilmaronock Community Council suggests contributions should be not less than 5% of build cost. Rural Stirling Housing Association agreed with 50% requirement for Loch Lomondside area due to high development pressures, 33% in Stirling Council area of the Park and for housing sites of up to 3 units that either an affordable or smaller house is built or that a financial contribution is made to help fund affordable housing provision on other local sites. An objection was raised to lower developer contributions requirement elsewhere in the Park. Luss Estates asked for the 50% requirement to be reduced to 25% and for contributions from small scale housing to be dropped as will make small scale developments unviable.

Feedback on whether to introduce a requirement for affordable housing or a financial contribution for sites of up to 3 units was divided generally into support from housing organisations and concern from the house builders. The level of contribution should reflect the affordability requirement prevailing in that area and be conscious of viability.

Officer Response: The support for the preferred option target of 75 homes per annum is welcomed. Open market housing is supported within town villages and small rural communities; however a requirement for a percentage of affordable housing is included in the Proposed Plan which ranges from 25% to 50% depending on the pressure on the area. This may be in the form of a financial contribution where on site provision is not feasible, and includes a requirement within accessible rural areas for sites up to 3 units. Given the significant contribution of small sites of less than 4 units to housing in the National Park this is considered an important policy to support a range of housing in the future more flexibly. Open market housing will generally not be supported in the wider countryside. The details of how affordable housing will be delivered is set out in the accompanying Housing Supplementary Guidance with further background in our Population and Housing Background Report.

#### **Infrastructure:**

Consultation Responses: General agreement on the issues and opportunities. It was suggested that Lochside piers should be included.

Seek opportunities to better align local authority planned investment.

Developer contributions need to be balanced with economic viability. Partnership working with landowners and local authorities is important.

Officer Response: Comments of support are welcomed. The provision of adequate infrastructure is essential for the economic, social and environmental well being of the National Park. The strategy for the Proposed Plan to focus development within towns and villages will optimise the use and ongoing investment in existing infrastructure; roads, drainage, sewerage, schools, healthcare and community facilities. The delivery of infrastructure projects is within the remit of our planning partners, other government agencies such as local authorities, statutory bodies and the private sector. The local

development plan will have an important role in coordinating the delivery of development and infrastructure, aligning with investment plans of both developers and infrastructure providers and in being responsive to the needs expressed by local communities.