

## **TC report – September 2021.**

### **IoT**

Shaun Marley has responded to my request for action on air quality monitoring. SC have offered a handful on communities a basic particulate monitoring system. Not perfect, but a start. I had asked for NOx detectors. The application has been approved verbally and there will be a 4–6-week lead time for the sensors. The contractor will be in touch to discuss location and permissions for installation, and I have suggested 55 Main St as a possible site.

### **LPP**

Most data are now uploaded, and I hope to beta test the website this week. I have asked David Moore to compile an overview of of CCC's vision for Callander in the future as I think this will help focus minds on some of the problems we face. I will inform CCC when the website goes live and am now trying to catch up on my schedule so that I can run 3 focus groups and initiate a high school survey this month.

There is more information on the site than I had originally anticipated but as I started discussing infrastructure issues with SC it became clear why key community demands (from 2008 onwards) had failed to materialise.

I addressed unresolved issues from the last CAP because it's probable that these matters will appear in the LPP. I have had lengthy conversations with SC around parking and improved pedestrian access over the Teith. I would describe their approach as intransigent.

They have no intention of providing Callander with a footbridge and are focussing on a road bridge. Importantly, Paul Prescott told the Partnership meeting that Callander would fail to meet Transport Scotland's criteria for a road bridge on the grounds of population size and traffic flow – ours are too small.

The funding for the bridge would come (in SC and the Park's mind) from planning gain on developments along the A81. Given the number of houses planned in this area (140 remaining) housing alone will not provide the estimated £10.8+m cost of a road bridge. The logical suggestion is that the bulk of planning gain would come from visitor attractions earmarked in the Park's LDP. Common sense suggests that only a very significant development could produce the required funding and that if Callander wants an additional river crossing Callander must tolerate a very large tourist resort. The impacts of this potentially decimate existing tourist-focussed businesses and deter those who come to Callander to enjoy our landscapes, walks and sense of place.

It is unlikely that any attraction on this scale, or the proposed 140 homes, will be built within the next 10 years, and so there will be no incentive for parents living in Vorlich Crescent to walk their children to school. The current return trip is around 3 miles. With a footbridge at Camp place, this would be reduced to 2 miles.

The LLTTNP Callander South Masterplan states that the capacity of the existing A81/A84 junction could only accommodate an additional 120 homes and a 60-bed hotel. Since that report was produced 50 homes along the A81 have been built and the increase in self-catering accommodation along Invertrossachs Road and the A81 has created the equivalent of 41 additional bedrooms. This leaves the remaining capacity at 70 homes and a 19-bedroom hotel (or self-catering equivalent).

There also appears to be further construction at Balvalachlan (possibly of additional holiday accommodation) although I can't find any planning applications on the Park site. This piecemeal and apparently unauthorised construction of holiday lets further whittles away the red bridge capacity. Another key point is that developing holiday lets in tranches of 1 or 2 units bypasses the need to contribute to planning gain.

A pedestrian bridge would align with Government policy around 20-minute neighbourhoods and active travel – cutting the pedestrian commute between the east of town, to the McLaren campus by 33%.

I put in an FOI request to access these reports and was sent redacted copies. Apparently there has been another request to see this report under FOI recently but SC are not obliged to tell me who the other party is. I found this odd, to say the least, and can't imagine who else might be interested in the report outside CCC/CLP.

This exchange highlights the problem I have identified previously – Under the current LPP guidelines the Park might support our proposals, but SC can ignore, or refuse, them without the need to explain their reasoning to the community.

I continue to press the case for a review of LPP guidelines so that communities in LLTTNP have their LPPs approved by both the Park and their local authority. I fear that unless this is addressed our LPPs will merely allow the Park to tick all the right environmental boxes while SC can take decisions on our future without any legal requirement to consult or explain why they continue to disregard our community's aspirations. I feel there is a drafting problem with the LPP guidelines and Alyn Smith agrees with this conclusion. The addition of one line which clarifies that LPP sign off should come from any authority with agency over planning *and* infrastructure would fix the problem.

I am working with LLTNP development team and presented an overview of our approach on 1<sup>st</sup> September. I have offered to host an informal support group to other communities, along with community representatives from Aberfoyle, Killin and Crainlarich.

It was interesting to note that several community representatives present at the meeting have no confidence in the Park's planning department and expressed this forcefully. Kilmahog CCC were particularly concerned about the volume of Air B&B properties in the area – claiming that this currently stands at 50% of all residences.

