



**LIVE PARK**

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE OF OUR NATIONAL PARK



Summary of engagement undertaken to inform the preparation of  
the Main Issues Report

## Introduction

This report provides a short overview of our engagement with communities and partner organisations from December 2012 until February 2014. This was undertaken to inform the preparation of LIVEPark: Main Issues Report.

## Background

The Scottish Government requires that local planning authorities employ a range of innovative methods to meaningfully engage with their stakeholders and communities when preparing a Local Development Plan (as set out in Circular 6/2013 Development Planning).

Our Local Development Plan Scheme explains the range of opportunities for people to get involved in the preparation of the Local Development Plan, particularly the Participation Statement section. This shows when, how and with whom consultation on the plan will take place. This is tailored to local circumstances and the issues being dealt with in the plan.

First published in December 2012, the Development Plan Scheme outlines:

- The process and timescales for progressing the Local Development Plan through to adoption and thereafter;
- What is involved at each stage of the process; and
- Opportunities for consultation and involvement in the Local Development Plan preparation process and the methods we will use to involve interested individuals and organisations.

The central means of participation for 2013 was through a year-long initiative called '*Your Park Your Plan*' that started in December 2012. This focussed on engagement and participation with everyone with an interest in the National Park. Key elements of the initiative included:

1. Call for Sites & Issues – from December 2012 until April 2013.
2. '*Your Community Your Say*' Workshops - a series of design-led charrette workshops took place during March and April 2013 in four areas.
3. Workshops with young people – as part of the charrettes.
4. Focussed topic or area based workshops – on housing, transport, economic development, tourism and for Callander and Blairmore, Strone, Kilmun and Ardentenny.
5. Briefings and discussions with individual communities
6. Increased use of social and digital media – Twitter, Facebook and a dedicated Blog site.

These are explained further below. Links to relevant reports are included, where applicable.

## **Engagement**

### **Community Councils and Community Development Trusts Briefing and Workshop: January 2013**

Staff presented a briefing on the Development Plan Scheme and focussed workshops were used to discuss how best to engage with communities during the preparation of the Local Development Plan.

Key suggestions and recommendations included:

- Use of Community Area Networking events
- Increase presence of National Park Authority staff where possible
- Use of web/online forums
- Local papers
- Focus on young people
- More clarity on roles between Local Authorities, Government Agencies and the National Park Authority
- Callander Charrette was felt to have worked well and was considered a good example of effective engagement.

### **Call for Sites and Issues: December 2012 to February 2013**

This was the main drive for any potential new development sites and an opportunity to raise any issues at the very start of the process to prepare a new plan. Responses to this generated over 80 sites for consideration and raised 12 general comments or issues.

The Site Assessment Report available [here](#) provides more information and the Summary Report of the Issues raised are attached as an appendix to this report.

### **Charrette Workshops: March and April 2013**

The Charrettes were launched in February 2013 and community consultation was undertaken via a series of workshops were held during March and April 2013 in Aberfoyle, Arrochar, Drymen, and Tyndrum to find out how local people think their community could be improved and develop a shared vision for its future with partners and other stakeholders.

These charrettes were part funded by the Scottish Government and brought together residents with design consultants to talk about the future of each village, everything from employment to housing, attracting tourism businesses and public transport. It was undertaken with the review of Community Actions Plans in two of the areas.

Building on work already carried out by communities, the aim was to create a masterplan that will help guide local development in that area through the preparation of a new Local Development Plan for the National Park.

Two rounds of workshops were held – the first was a fact finding session and the second allowed discussion and input on some initial draft ideas developed by the design team.

The final event was run as a public display of the design team's results and included the opportunity for informal discussion between the community and members of both the design team and National Park Authority staff. The design team's results included the follow up of discussions with agencies, landowners and other relevant interests to ensure that the options presented are realistic and viable as far as could be established at the time.

The charrette report is available [here](#).

### **Callander Charrette: November 2011**

The Callander Charrette was a 5-day design led workshop in November 2011, which involved members of the local community, community organisations, and public sector organisations working in the town.

The Charrette was part of the Scottish Government's Charrette Mainstreaming Programme, designed to assist in the adoption and delivery of design-led approaches to development, and to help embed Charrette style working in the Scottish planning system.

While this charrette took place in late 2011 with the final report published in 2012, it considered the long term development of the town and provided a clear consensus on the Vision for the future. The charrette report is available [here](#).

### **Stakeholder and Partners topic workshops: 2013**

A number of meetings and workshops were organised throughout 2013 with a range of partner organisations. These focussed on particular topics and/or issues. Their purpose was to ensure that we were fully informed of potential issues and solutions before finalising the Main Issues Report. This included:

- Transport Agencies Workshop with Local Authorities, Regional Transport Partnerships and Transport Scotland
- Regular meetings with Key Agencies : Scottish Natural Heritage, Scottish Water, Transport Scotland and Scottish Environment Protection Agency
- Economic Development Agencies Workshop with Local Authorities, Business Gateway, Stirling Development Agency and Scottish Enterprise
- Housing meetings and discussions with the local authorities, registered local landlords and the private sector, including developers, landowners and agents.
- Callander Main Issues Report working group – involving Stirling Council service departments, Transport Scotland and National Park staff.
- Tourism – briefing and discussion on the charrette recommendations with the National Park Destination Group.

## **Community workshops and briefings: 2013**

### **Kilmun, Strone and Blairmore: August and September 2013**

Two workshops were held for the communities of Kilmun, Strone and Blairmore. The first was held in August and incorporated a morning focus session with children at Strone Primary School, followed by an afternoon drop in session and a workshop session in the evening. The aim was to raise awareness within the community of the preparation of the new Local Development Plan and to provide an opportunity for people to share their views and opinions. A report detailing discussion generated at the workshops is available to view on [our blog site here](#).

The second workshop held in September incorporated a drop in session and evening meeting to report back on the issues that were raised at the first session and allow discussion on the possible options for addressing these.

### **Blairmore Green Charrette (November 2013 and January 2014)**

Over Winter 2013/2014, we worked in collaboration with The Blairmore Village Trust to consider options for Blairmore Green and organised charrette style community workshops to help facilitate discussion and move ideas forward. Partly funded by the Scottish Government's Charrette programme, a design team worked with the community to establish options for the site. A report of this work can be viewed [here](#).

### **Ardentinny Workshop: November 2013**

An informal drop in event was held in Ardentinnny in November 2013. This was arranged in partnership with the Community Council and members of the community were able to share their views by writing on maps using marker pens and post-it notes. National Park staff were able to assist as well as answer questions and discuss planning issues. A report of this workshop can be viewed [here](#).

### **Callander Briefing and Discussion with Community Organisations: September 2013**

A meeting was held with local community organisations to provide a briefing on the Local Development Plan process and stimulate discussion the possible themes that could be included in the Main Issues Report.

### **Kilmarnock Briefing and Discussion with Community Council: November 2013**

National Park Authority staff attended a Community Council meeting in November 2013. A briefing note that summarised the known issues and opportunities for the local area was circulated amongst Community Council members and placed on the Community Council website prior to the meeting. The meeting provided an opportunity to discuss this with the Community Council and members of the public present at the meeting.

### **Strathard Briefing and Discussion with Community Council**

Staff attended two Community Council meetings to provide a briefing on the Main Issues Report, seek views on how best to engage with the Strathard community and explore issues and options. This also provided an opportunity to share the submissions to the 'Call for Sites' consultation and to discuss potential development options for the area.

### **Liaison with Community Action Planning**

Several communities were updating their community action plans during 2013 and this provided an opportunity for community views to feed directly into the preparation of the Main Issues Report. Community Action Plans can be viewed on the National Park Community Partnership website [here](#).

## **Appendix 1 Issues Report**

### **Summary of the issues identified by respondents to the Call for Sites and Issues Consultation December 2012 to February 2013**

#### **Introduction**

This report summarises the responses to the Call for Proposed Sites and Issues consultation that was undertaken as part of the process to prepare the new Local Development Plan.

The consultation related primarily to suggestions for development sites but also invited comments on issues relating to the existing Local Plan and proposed Local Development Plan (*LDP*).

The responses focussed on issues including:

- National Park Aims
- Sustainable Development
- Rural Development
- Landscape and Natural Heritage
- Housing
- Tourism and Local Economy
- Outdoor Access & Recreation
- Transportation
- Developer Contributions
- Coastal Planning
- Renewable Energy
- Minerals
- Small Communities
- Miscellaneous

Respondents consisted of:

- 2 agencies (Tactran & Sport Scotland)
- 6 Residents (Gartocharn and Buchanan Castle Estate)
- 1 private business (Wild Biking Scotland)
- 1 planning/development consultancy (MBM Planning)
- 2 Community Councils (Kilmaronock and Drymen)

This report provides a general summary of the responses and also summarises these by topic/policy. It should be noted that a number of these issues are inter-connected and should not be read in isolation.

#### **Summary of Consultation Responses**

*In summary, representees raised the following issues to be considered/included within the Main Issues Report / Proposed Local Development Plan:*

- The National Park Aims and application of the "Sandford Principle" should be applied without relaxation and a more restrictive control on development in the National Park, which would serve these aims better.
- The principles of "sustainable development", as set out in Scottish Planning Policy are supported and should be incorporated in the LDP.
- Concerns raised in relation to the permitted development rights afforded to landowners and agricultural land and request that the National Park lobbies government to have these allowances restricted.
- Another representee supports the positive approach to rural development in order to encourage growth and diversification - which is also to the benefit of sport and recreation.
- Support for identifying and protecting areas of wild land and "Local Landscape Areas".
- Concerns that there is incompatibility with the aspiration of protecting the National Park's landscape and environment and the use of the word "appropriate" in policy wordings – which provides too much flexibility.
- A difference of opinions relating to affordable housing policy - some in favour, others feel that there should be allowance for open market housing outwith settlements in appropriate locations.
- A number of concerns raised in relation to perceived "loopholes" in existing Local Plan housing policy and suggestions provided for alterations to policy.
- Housing developments should promote and plan for sport and recreation and walking/cycle routes.
- A number of concerns raised in relation to the existing Local Plan tourism policies, namely, the allowances for new development that is afforded by these policies, the type of contribution to local economy from tourism, and that new tourism uses adjacent to existing residential areas is not appropriate.
- Planning for sport and recreation in policy and new development has been emphasised, as has the re-use of vacant and derelict land for such uses. Aberfoyle as a focus for mountain biking was highlighted for inclusion in the Local Development Plan.



- In relation to long distance routes, concerns were raised that these are not appropriate in areas of landscape designation, that they don't contribute to the local economy or health in the same way as smaller core path routes can. Continued protection of core paths and access rights to other important recreation areas as well as coastal and lochshore areas was highlighted.
- Further focus on improved and integrated walking/cycle routes and the interchange between these and other transport services was requested, as was the need to require agreements/bonds to ensure non-delivery of Travel Plans on larger developments are otherwise covered.
- Requests that Developer Contributions be extended to include "walking and cycling infrastructure".
- In relation to Renewable Energy and Minerals policy it was highlighted that new policy should plan for outdoor sport and recreation interests and that these should be taken into account and considered in new development.
- Planning issues relating to the Park's small communities were highlighted - in particular concentrating on concerns that further development in Balmaha should be curtailed until supporting infrastructure is significantly increased/ improved.
- The use of flexible wordings in existing policy was raised as an issue for a number of representees and they seek more precise/tighter wordings to be used.
- Concerns relating to the existing Locational Strategy which defines "countryside" but does not restrict development in these areas. A protection from development is requested in these areas.
- Comments on engagement with the Park's communities and the LDP Charrette were also raised.

### ***Summary of Consultation Responses – by topic***

#### **National Park Aims**

The following views on this topic were expressed (issues 59 & 60):

- The preservation of the National Park's first statutory aim and application of the "Sandford Principle" should be applied and that the current Local Plan provides too much relaxation with regard to countryside developments (with particular reference to an 'affordable housing loophole' – covered in section 5.5 HOUS1 below) and is thus in conflict with this principle.
- The use of the word "appropriate" and "small-scale development" in policy wordings, in the views of the representee, offers too much ambiguity and lead to difficulties in refusing planning applications - unless more tightly defined. A more restrictive control on development in the National Park, in the views of the representee, would serve the Park's Aims better.

### **Sustainable Development**

*The following views on this topic were expressed (issues 20):*

- Sport Scotland supports a planning system that makes decisions for a more economically, socially and environmentally sustainable society, as outlined in paragraph 37 of Scottish Planning Policy.

### **Rural Development**

*The following views on this topic were expressed (issues 5; 14; 15 & 25):*

- Residents of the National Park expressed concern over the current allowances afforded landowners to carry out works without the need for planning permission and suggested that the National Park Authority should lobby government to seek more powers over uses of land and development in rural areas.
- Sport Scotland support the positive approach advocated by Scottish Planning Policy (in paragraph 93) to rural development in order to encourage growth and diversification and enhance an area's environmental quality. They highlight that outdoor sport and recreation development often requires a rural location.

### **Landscape and Natural Heritage**

*The following views on this topic were expressed (issues 29;49):*

- Sport Scotland supports the need for planning authorities to identify and protect areas of wild land (using the definition used in the SPP) as these areas are important for sport and outdoor recreation.
- Sport Scotland supports advice in paragraph 139 of the SPP which encourages planning authorities to limit non statutory landscape designations to Local Landscape Areas (LLA) and encourage the designation and promotion of LLAs.
- In assessing the impact of development on recreational interests within LLAs Sport Scotland emphasise the importance to appreciate that this is not just about impacts on the scenic or aesthetic qualities that recreational users benefit from, but also that recreation can also be affected by impacts on the physical qualities of the landscape that are integral to sport and recreation participation.

- A resident of the National Park stated that there is an incompatibility between the aspiration to maintain the NP landscape and environment and the unlimited potential for development afforded by the word “appropriate” when referring to developments. This word needs to be clarified.

### **Housing Context and Policies**

The following views on this topic were expressed (issues 9; 10, 11; 16; 17; 21; 44; 45; 55; 56; 61):

#### **Context**

- A resident has stated that the commitment to ‘affordable housing’ is welcomed and they would like to see this continued into the Local Development Plan.
- A planning consultant has stated that the current Local Plan housing policies are too restrictive towards proposals for new housing in the countryside (either justified for business needs or for affordable housing). A less restrictive approach should be taken forward in the Local Development Plan to allow limited opportunities for new open-market housing in the countryside outwith environmental and landscape designation constraints or within defined building groups which are well linked to existing settlements. This approach, it is stated, would support the overall objectives of Scottish Planning Policy and should be considered for inclusion in the Local Development Plan.
- A resident stated that any proposed site submitted under the "Call-for-Sites" should be rejected if it does not comply with the Table set out in Section 2 of the submission form.
- Sport Scotland have stated that housing which is promoted through the LDP should encourage sport and physical recreation and should plan for the demands placed on existing sports facilities. New developments should incorporate Designing Places & Designing Streets Guidance and provide for new walking/cycling routes.

#### **HOUS1**

- A resident states that the following sentence, contained in HOUS1, appears to provide a loophole which should be closed. *“Relaxations or exemptions from the affordable housing requirements of this policy will only be allowed where it is demonstrated that development would otherwise be unviable due to abnormal site costs that could not reasonably have been foreseen, or would deliver desirable community benefits”*. It is stated that this provides a loophole for developers to do inadequate research into site development costs and then subsequently claim “unforeseen circumstances”. I suspect that the Park is ill equipped to ensure the integrity and viability of development proposals prior to submission.

#### **HOUS2**

- A resident has stated that current time limits for holiday housing and affordable housing occupancy (*read local housing needs occupancy*) should be increased to

20yrs to ensure that potential developers do not see these applications as short term investment opportunities. A 20 year restriction would make such a strategy less attractive and would help avoid the inevitable loss of affordable housing in the Park.

### HOUS3

- A resident/community council representative stated that the exceptional conditions for affordable housing outwith settlements should be clear and emphasised and that the Park Authority, in consultation with the local community, should play a more proactive role in identifying effective housing land supply by progressing allocated sites or finding another acceptable location.

### HOUS4

- A resident requests that the definition of “*defined building group*” be clarified further to ensure that it such groupings apply where it is “*compact*” in nature and also similar to a “*farm complex or farmtoun*”.

### HOUS5

- A resident suggests that the existing HOUS5 policy has opportunity for abuse, as the “*established rural business*” could cease operating or an agricultural building could be erected on land which could then help present a case for a new house in the countryside. The Local Development Plan policy should tighten controls on such potential opportunities.

## 5.6 **Tourism and Local Economy**

The following views on this topic were expressed (issues 6; 7; 38; 43; 46; 50;51; 53; 54; 62; 64; 66 ):

### Context

- A resident has stated that growth in local economy does not equate to growth in tourism, that the negative impacts of tourism (i.e. seasonal jobs, long hours and low pay, litter and vandalism) should not be ignored and that the LDP should refer to this issue.
- A resident states that there should be a stronger presumption against such tourism development. The impact of additional traffic, noise and hours should also be a factor with regard to applications for tourist and recreation developments in settlements and small rural communities.
- A resident states that the Park should seek to create positive initiatives that foster other local economic activity. The benefits being: provision of “year round” employment; opportunities for higher paid jobs; opportunities for those with enhanced skill sets.

- A resident states that, currently the National Park Authority appears to only be interested in tourism without any consideration of the effects on the communities – e.g. poorly repaired roads and lack of parking to name but two items.
- Furthermore, a resident questioned the relationship between economic development and planning's role in encouraging tourism. Without the evidence to prove a need for further holiday accommodation, the Park is in danger of promoting unnecessary development which will have a detrimental effect on the local communities. The representee acknowledges the need for development, but only if it is long term and sustainable and of benefit to the Community as a whole.
- Another resident questioned the National Park's use of data for planning purposes from 2005.
- A resident made a representation that although Scottish Government targets for increasing visitor numbers by 20% and spend by 50% are voiced it is important the National Park remember they are in place to protect the environment and to stand up to Government and advise them what is realistically possible.
- A resident states that the Park Authority needs to get a handle on occupancy rates as well as numbers of bed spaces – that the data used currently is inaccurate and not sufficiently specific to destination areas within The Park. They state that Visit Scotland reports that tourist visits in Scotland have dropped, rather than increasing towards to the government's target of a 20% rise by 2015. Increasing accommodation provision is likely to damage existing established businesses and drive standards down.
- A resident raises question over the National Park's adherence to the principles of European Charter for Sustainable Tourism status when determining proposals (e.g. recent consultation on the John Muir Way proposals) and requests that a summary and affirmation of these principles is referred to clearly in determining such proposals.
- A resident states that the National Park seeks to support longer tourism stays and spending through TOUR2, however, the promotion and expansion of Great Trails and Long Distance Routes (LDR) does not achieve this - instead, this is passing trade. Promoting (through more guides to cover more of the Core Paths, natural and cultural heritage) shorter, more circular, walks will better serve accommodation/service centres and also enable local residents to partake of such exercise facilities with associated health benefits. This better meets these aims than any LDR.
- With regard to siting of tourism developments, a resident stated that policy needs to be created and adhered to that prevents multi-unit tourist developments situated in, or adjacent to, existing established residential areas. This is crucial since the behaviour profile of a transient population is quite different from that of permanent residents. There is a basic conflict here that the Park needs to recognise and address in line with the Park's 4 primary aims.

## 5.7 **Outdoor Access & Recreation**

*The following views on this topic were expressed (issues 8; 12; 13; 22; 23;24; 26; 30; 34 ):*

### **Context**

- Sport Scotland request that the LDP should have a policy which protects playing fields and sports pitches and facilities (unless within garden or hotel grounds) and golf courses, and these should be protected from development. Also the policies should be informed by the pitch strategies referred to above, which will enable the Council to plan strategically for sport and recreation in its area. Thereafter, to fully reflect the recommendations and any action plan flowing from the Strategies in the Local Development Plan, ensure communities have access to quality sports facilities, identify sites for major new or replacement facilities flowing from the pitch or facility strategy or other Council programmes.
- Sport Scotland state that development plan policy should fully recognise all outdoor sport and recreation interests (such as cycling, angling, climbing, canoeing, walking, surfing and skiing etc.) and the need to protect and provide for these interests through the development plan.
- Sport Scotland state that it will be important for the Park to consider what the planning implications may be in relation to some of the recreational proposals in the park (eg. Five Lochs Plan; John Muir Way; as path route connecting Mugdock Park with the National Park; a Community Sports Hub between Lomond Shores and Cameron House; Visitor Experience Section in the Partnership Plan; and Callander Charrette outcomes.
- Sport Scotland emphasise the potential of vacant and derelict land to provide for sport and recreation uses which should be appreciated in the development of policy in this area.
- Sport Scotland emphasise the importance to appreciate that in rural areas development associated with sport and recreation can form a significant component of the local tourism product and this should be recognised in setting policy in this area.

#### TRAN7

- A resident requests that the Park Authority must comply with its own policy and European Community Directives and clearly state that they would not support any proposal to route a Great Trail or LDR through the Endrick Mouth part of the National Nature Reserve which would bring tens of thousands of walkers through the protected area. LDP and any other policy documents should be clear that they don't support such an extension through the NNR.
- Sport Scotland - planning authorities should protect core paths and other important routes and access rights when preparing development plans. In applying this advice it is important not just to protect core paths but all important routes and access rights and to appreciate that this extends to protection beyond just paths and could include, for example, access to and on water, climbing crags or launch points for air sports. new development should incorporate new and enhanced access opportunities linked to wider access opportunities. Planning authorities should be willing to refuse applications where there will be a negative impact on paths; where the path is important, the impact is significant or where impacts cannot be acceptably mitigated against. Green networks should be promoted and safeguarded for their recreational value.

### Outdoor Recreation Plan

- A resident/business person has requested that the development of a Mountain Biking Hub centred on Aberfoyle should be promoted and that this would fit with the National Strategic Framework of Developing Mountain Biking in Scotland. It should be centred on the village of Aberfoyle. Assistance is needed from the National Park to facilitate this development.

### Transportation

The following views on this topic were expressed (issues 2;3;31;52)

#### Context

- Tactran state that Transport & Infrastructure “Planning Context” section of the Local Plan should refer to improved facilities for walking and cycling - not just public transport.
- Sport Scotland supports the need to shift to more sustainable modes of transport, particularly walking and cycling. It supports the need for walking and cycling routes and cycle parking to be protected from and provided for in development and for development plans to identify walking and cycling provision and to aim to develop an integrated network that joins recreational and commuting routes up.
- A resident has quoted the text from the Local Plan - “Improved interchange between different transport modes will be key to facilitating better tailored transport services for visitors, residents and freight” and states that this is good but questions how the Nation Park is going to achieve this.

#### TRAN3

- Tactran suggest rewording TRAN3 “reason for policy” from “*agreements or bonds may be required*” to “*agreements or bonds will be required*”.

### Developer Contributions

The following views on this topic were expressed (issue 4)

#### DCON1

- Tactran request that the wording regarding developer contributions “may be required for transport infrastructure” should be extended to include walking and cycling infrastructure.

### Coastal Planning

The following views on this topic were expressed (issue 27 and 28)

- Sport Scotland requests that the LDP should promote public access to and along the coast; provide clarity on the integration between marine and terrestrial policy to

ensure that the terrestrial impacts of marine development are taken into account and development plan policy formulated as appropriate. In relation to sport this could include, for example, the need to protect coastal landscapes, including wild land, from marine development; or to consider the impact of marine development on coastal processes and how these could affect, for example, coastal erosion which could, in turn, impact on coastal access networks or on links golf courses.

- Sport Scotland highlights that recreational users of the inshore area should be taken into account when identifying potential development areas and sensitive areas in development plans. The main conflicts are likely to relate to navigation and sharing of recreational space, but safety issues may also exist. Access to and along the foreshore for recreational purposes should not be impeded by land based fish farm facilities and that established anchorages and harbours should be safeguarded.

### **Renewable Energy**

*The following views on this topic were expressed (issue 32)*

- It is crucial that outdoor sport and recreation interests are taken into consideration in renewables development (eg. Amenity impacts on sport and recreation, resulting from run-of-river hydro schemes). sportscotland urges planning authorities to look at provision that could be made for sport and recreation interests as part of planning gain that might result from renewable energy developments. Sportscotland does not see planning gain as a substitute for good planning, and does not support the approval of schemes where the impact on recreational interests will be greater than any benefit delivered through planning gain.

### **Minerals**

*The following views on this topic were expressed (issue 33)*

- Sportscotland request that LDP policy include consideration of impacts on sport and recreation uses from minerals proposals and that operators be encouraged to consider after uses of extraction sites that result in environmental improvement rather than simply restoring land to its previous state. Sport and recreation can form a particularly suitable and positive after use for former mineral extraction and potentially surface coal mining sites.

### **Small Communities**

*The following views on this topic were expressed (issues 39; 41; 42; 47;57; 58; 63 )*

#### **General**

- A resident states that much more weight should be given to the views of small communities in the planning process. This would safeguard against inappropriate developments being imposed on small communities and what the Park recognise as “groups of houses in the countryside”. In these environments, amenity issues are



paramount and are highly sensitive. The Park needs to place increased emphasis on protecting the amenity of these environments on behalf of those who live there.

- A community council representative stated that three Visions for Drymen can apply to other communities in the Park area, are as follows - An active community, with good recreation, cultural and business facilities; A range of housing and employment to meet local needs; and a hub for visitors and a gateway to east loch lomond.

#### Balmaha/ East Loch Lomond

- Residents agree with the existing approach of restricting the development on the East side of the Loch because of access but feel this should include Balmaha which is currently becoming a holiday village as a result of former residential housing being turned into Holiday chalets in all but name and development of Balmaha should be curtailed until facilities (roads/parking) are significantly improved.
- Another resident highlighted that affordable housing in the Buchanan Community area might ensure the retention of the local Primary School which would build up the Community and is good, but consideration should be given to how the children will get to school from Balmaha. (Buses/well maintained footpaths etc). Add more holiday chalets in Balmaha and you lose the community feel. It is a difficult balance.
- A resident highlights that the infrastructure, including but not exclusively, shops and public transport on the East side of the Loch is inadequate and unlikely to be capable of significant improvement in the foreseeable future and therefore I question whether it is a suitable place to build affordable housing. More effort must be taken by the National Park to investigate and discuss other options.

#### Miscellaneous

##### The following views on this topic were expressed

##### Local Development Plan (issue 35; 36; 65)

- A resident states that the Charette and Development Plan Schemes should clearly show that they are more than a paper exercise and ensure the “increased” quality of life for the residents in the future.
- Sportscotland is conscious that not all of the issues that they have commented on will necessarily be main issues to be dealt with in the Main Issues Report but they request that the areas they have commented on are addressed in the local development plan or in supplementary planning guidance.
- A resident questions the wordings of policy which increase ambiguity such as ‘small scale development...’, ‘most new development...’, “appropriate’ development in rural areas’, and ‘adjacent’. Such ambiguity devalues the LLTNP’s planning function.

##### Locational Strategy (issue 67)

- A resident states that there is not enough distinction between what is permissible in each category within the Locational Strategy. It appears that the Countryside is on an equal footing with Settlements with regards to affordable housing, tourism and

recreation and the scope and scale of projects. The Scottish Planning Policy does not insist that National Parks adopt this approach and would suggest that the strategy for the Countryside ensures that the special nature of this designation is protected and not eroded.

Engagement & Decision/Making (issue 19;37)

- Sportscotland highlight that in engaging with sport and recreation interests it is important to appreciate that such interests will not necessarily be local to the area or site that policy or a proposal is relevant to and to engage with these persons. Details of sports clubs and Scottish Governing Bodies of Sport are available on Sportscotland's web site.
- A resident stated that they consider that by producing the Development Plan and the Charrette at the same time without clearly advising the General Public of their differences is inexcusable. If the general public fail to understand the differences, they may fail to respond to the Development Plan thinking they can raise their concerns at the Charrette meeting.

**LIVE  
PARK**



**LOCH  
LOMOND  
& THE TROSSACHS  
NATIONAL PARK**



**[www.ourlivepark.com](http://www.ourlivepark.com)**



**[twitter.com/ourlivepark](https://twitter.com/ourlivepark)**



**[facebook.com/ourlivepark](https://facebook.com/ourlivepark)**



**[instagram.com/ourlivepark](https://instagram.com/ourlivepark)**

Published by: Loch Lomond  
& The Trossachs National  
Park Authority  
April 2014