

Respondent Information Form

Please complete the two forms below and return with your consultation response. Your contact details are held solely for the purpose of the consultation.

Name or Organisation

Title Mr

Forename Jonathan

Surname Binny

Address

Postcode

Email

Release of information contained in consultation responses

SNH will normally publish all consultation responses we receive, although personal data or other sensitive information will be redacted.

Please complete this form.

I am responding as an individual. Yes

I am responding on behalf of a group or organisation. No

Do you agree to your name being made available when we publish your consultation response?

Yes

The name of your organisation will be published along with your consultation response.

In response to Q1

NPF3 and SPP support the right development in the right place and also recognise wild land needs protecting because of its special qualities. Therefore it follows that wild land areas are not the right place for developments as any will change the character of the area.

It also follows that any proposal requires an assessment whatever the size of the development or whether it is in the core or on the edge of the mapped area.

Perceptual responses cannot be made by one person. They require a number of people from different backgrounds to arrive at an informed decision. However the obvious point is that any development will change the perceptual response of some/all visitors.

Developments outside wild land areas need to be assessed on their influence on the wild land area.

Any development that, had it existed prior to the mapping of wild land, would have changed the map cannot be allowed. Equally small developments will slowly eat away at the perceptual responses until there is no sense of wildness.

In response to Q2

The examples are unhelpful as they are contradictory (tracks good or bad?) and assume mitigation and restoration are the solution. Recent developments show they either do not work or are being ignored.

Conclusion

The technical guidance is flawed and not fit for purpose.