

SUBMISSION FROM ARIANE LOENING

I am mailing you some of my views about the proposed NPF2 and hope that you will remember them in your presentation to Parliament in early March.

1. The very recent addition of 3 plans to the 9 given in the NPF for Scotland 2 and the lack of time to consider these and submit evidence due to the Christmas and New Year holidays are underhand and undemocratic and fly in the face of the Government's own declared aim to involve communities. The Planning Act of Scotland (2006) may even make these measures illegal.
2. I do not agree with the assessment made by the NPF team about the effectiveness with which the Participation Statement was implemented. Apart from being informed about what the developers and politicians want, the communities were not meaningfully involved in the NPF2 consultation process at all.
3. Amongst various Strategies, one of the Government's key aims for the development of Scotland to 2030 is set out in the Sustainable Development Strategy. I am concerned that, while preparing for economic growth, the national plans do not acknowledge that economic growth (unless fuelled by energies which do not produce Greenhouse Gases) has always been and will always be contradictory to sustainability.
4. You have asked for views on 'Whether the correct balance has been struck between economic development and environmental protection.' My view is that such a balance has not been struck. Out of the 12 national plans, only one seeks to promote 'renewable energy' and, given that economic growth causes environmental ruin, the NPF2, if implemented, will only aggravate environmental problems – in particular, climate change.
5. Environmental Impact Assessments are undertaken by the developer (private or state) which means that, apart from the views of statutory consultees and planning law, there is nothing to prevent developers from drawing up EIAs which are glowing and persuasive even though the development, when implemented, proves to be ruinous to the environment, the locality and the economy. If MSPs wish to control climate change effectively, they should ensure that EIAs are not undertaken by developers but by organisations whose interest is in sustainability and environmental protection at the local/community level.
6. Having been to Edinburgh Airport and its surrounding areas on several occasions, I cannot understand how anyone could see the 'need' for any 'enhancement' here. Roads and roundabouts have been widened and public transport is more than adequate with the LRT 100 bus plying from the city

every 10 minutes. There is a vast park-and-ride area as well as proposals to take trams to the airport.

7. This obsession (and it is an obsession) with enhancement and growth stems from politicians' need to be seen to be doing something for the electorate, but comes primarily from property and land developers and the obsession of people in commerce to make huge profits. It is an obsession and a system that can destroy the world as we know it as it already has destroyed so much. It makes me angry to see that my elected representatives are making it happen again in the NPF2 plans.
8. My greatest concern is with the underlying attitude of the NPF2. Now, when we need radical ideas and investment in non-GHG economic development, the Scottish Government seems to be only capable of regurgitating plans for more of the high-greenhouse gas economy which we have already. We could have investment in local food-growing, small-scale commerce and renewables, more support for rural development; a completely new meaning for 'development'. However, reading the NPF2 plans, I am clear that, while there will be economic development for some, it won't be sustainable. And that is just another wasted opportunity, coming at a time when we just haven't got the time or resources to waste.

Ariane Loening

11 January 2009