

SUBMISSION FROM HILLHEAD COMMUNITY COUNCIL

RESPONSE TO NPF2

Concerns:-

1. We agree with Clare Symonds' criticisms that the NPF2 discussions are not sufficiently known outside those members who attended the panels.

I was attended panels for my community council but did not succeed in disseminating the discussion to the community at large or to make other communities aware of the importance of these discussions.

(This is not a criticism of the officers, who were all helpful)

2. Feedback on the discussions was inadequate as concerns raised did not get specific responses. This leaves communities wondering whether their input was worth the effort or has been ignored.

3. The nature of NPF2:-

- a) when first mooted NPF was to give equal weight to economic, environmental and social aspects. It no longer does so.
- b) In the drive to provide housing insufficient attention is paid to flood plains
- c) In the drive to encourage the otherwise necessary spine of electricity transfer to the grid, consideration of the least damaging route seems to be ignored
- d) Windfarms are now shown to produce a large carbon footprint and to be constructed without regard for their connections to the grid (e.g. Moffat)
- e) The human rights of the individuals affected by the developments are not necessarily to be considered i.e. their input to the discussions is minimised

4. Environment.

We agree with the evidence from Renfrew.

In our discussions with the council on flooding (city plan hearings, public enquiries etc) and with the Scottish Executive on the input of river authorities into planning (SPP3 dissemination meetings), it became clear:-

- a) that flood levels will reach higher levels than was first thought
- b) that the essential linked measures to counter these and to consider the impact on housing, transport links, emergency access and hospitals, are not in place. (There is even disagreement on what they should be.)

We have regularly raised our concerns about access to emergency services in the event of an expected flood, when the river spreads overland.

- c) It also appears that the river authorities have little say in where development is inappropriate. River systems are as important as sea surges.
- d) EU regulations governing Environmental Assessments are not

fully considered.

5. AIRPORTS should be excluded from the NPF2
They should only be considered when there is a more integrated NPF (NPF3 or 4?) which takes environmental matters into consideration.
Transport has not been given sufficient public consideration.
6. **There is insufficient articulation with regional and local plans,**
some of
which have not been completed
7. **UNDUE HASTE.** We are extremely concerned that the NPF will proceed too hastily without full consideration of the interconnected matters, particularly the environment.
Better social and scientific evidence is becoming available since the NPOF was first conceived.. Why not involve the teams of academics in the universities who can provide a broad range of interconnected expertise?
8. We are also concerned that informed local opinion will be ignored since there is little place for it to be considered in this NPF2.

We would ask the committee to reconsider the NPF, particularly in the light of changing investment circumstances and increased awareness of social and environmental problems.

It would be a pity for it to proceed in its current form when so many have voiced valid concerns and better scientific evidence is becoming available,. We are not just planning for the immediate future but for decades ahead.

Environmental matters are of increasing importance and we cannot afford to get them wrong.

Hillhead Community Council
12 January 2009