

**STATEMENT UNDER REGULATION 35
OF THE
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING
(STRUCTURE AND LOCAL PLANS)
(SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 1983**

Inverness Local Plan

Strategy	p1
The City of Inverness	p11
Hinterland	p29
Rural Development Area	p43

At its meeting on 25th May 2005, the Planning, Development, Europe and Tourism Committee considered the Report of Public Local Inquiry (March 2005) held to consider certain objections to the Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft and Deposit Draft with Modifications.
The following decisions were made in response to the to the Reporter's recommendations.

STRATEGY

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
------------------	----------	--------

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Introduction J. I. Ballantyne	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Timescale of the Plan Beauly Community Council Mr J Russell	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
CHAPTER 1 STRATEGY Para. 1.23 Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Background Policies Health & Safety Executive	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) ADD Analysis Map (to include major hazards, public safety zones and notifiable installations, and consultation distances). ADD these features to the Proposals Map.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Eurus Energy (UK) Ltd per Shepherd & Wedderburn	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) As above. Analysis Map to include the Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) identified indicatively on Figure 12 of the Structure Plan, adjusted according to the representation of the criteria on which they are based in local circumstances, and incorporating matters agreed by Planning Development Europe and Tourism Committee 19 th March 2003). Such modifications will underpin any consequential adjustment to the Proposals Map. ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly. (2) ADD in para. 1.21 after "There are parts of the landward area which offer potential for more productive uses along these lines." ... "Potential areas for wind farms arise on high or exposed ground with no significant constraints".	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
B.T. Plc per RPS Consultants	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADD before Policy GP1 after "The following policies and proposals, which relate	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
	to the Local Plan area as a whole, will be applied.”...“Where a development proposal raises an issue that is not covered by a general policy, Structure Plan Policy G2, and any other relevant Structure Plan policies, will apply.”	
Woodland Trust Scotland	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): As above. Analysis Map to include the best available data on the extent of ancient and long established semi-natural origin woodland. Such modifications will underpin any consequential adjustment to the Proposals Map. ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
SEPA	See BT plc above.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Background Policies BP 2 Highlands and Islands Airports Ltd	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly. DELETE from APPENDIX: POLICY DEFINITION under Infrastructure “CAA safeguards”; “Civil Aviation Authority” and “G2” and REPLACE with Safeguarding of Aerodromes/Circular 2/2003 Highlands and Islands Airports Ltd and TC 14. ADD to Forward to 2011 A Competitive Place after “A 24-hour operating regime”...”due consideration of safeguarding requirements,”. As above. Analysis Map to include LEGEND footnote as follows: “SEDD Circular 2/2003 confirms the transfer of responsibility for safeguarding of civil aerodromes and technical sites from the CAA to site operators. The Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas)(Scotland) Direction 2003 obliges a planning authority, before granting planning permission for the development of land forming the site or in the neighbourhood of an aerodrome, to consult the airport operator.”	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Background Policies BP2 Scottish Natural Heritage	DELETE policy “The Council will favour development unless this would significantly affect important features” and REPLACE with “The Council will permit development unless this would be likely to have a significantly adverse effect on, or be significantly adversely affected by, the features for which the area has been designated. Where it is concluded that any such adverse effects are likely to arise, development will only be permitted where it is considered that these would	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
	be outweighed by social or economic benefits”.	
	As above. Analysis Map to include natural heritage designations and all other BP features that are capable of being accurately represented. ADJUST Proposals Map (to identify such features).	
Background Policies BP2 Scottish Natural Heritage	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADD after “wetlands”... “riparian woodlands”	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
GENERAL POLICIES Policy GP 1 Design Principles Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy GP 2 Urban Structure The Robertson Group per G L Hearn Muirtown Community Council	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): FACTUAL CHANGE: ADD to DISTRICTS FACTFILE: NESS, SOUTH and MILLBURN under Service Deficiencies “Playing Fields”. FOR CLARIFICATION: DELETE from GP2 under Density/Capacity – City/District/.Neighbourhood ...”<40; 20-25; and >10” and REPLACE respectively with “20/25-40; 10-20/25; up to 10”.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy GP 3 Designed Sustainable Construction The Robertson Group per G L Hearn	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE “The Council will prepare...Development Plan Policy Guidelines.” and REPLACE with “The Council has prepared draft supplementary guidance on the aspects of design and sustainable construction listed in the policy in the form of a Development Plan Policy Guideline: Design for Sustainability in the Highlands.”	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy GP 4 Affordable Housing Scotia Homes per Bruce & Partners Homes for Scotland Tulloch Homes Ltd per Farningham McCreadie Partnership Ltd	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) DELETE from para. 1.5 “Ideally about 300 affordable houses, including for varying needs, require to be provided initially each year to address the current backlog as care facilities are increasingly delivered to people in their own homes” and REPLACE with “Further to a needs assessment carried out in 2003, the Council has identified a requirement for 330-415 affordable homes per annum in the period to 2008.”	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>Barratt Construction per Halliday, Fraser, Munro The Robertson Group per Hargest and Wallace MacRae Homes Limited per Paull & Williamsons Strathnairn Community Council Mr J. Robertson</p>	<p>(2) DELETE policy GP4 “Where housing land is being allocated...home ownership and discounted serviced plots” and REPLACE with “In the City of Inverness, Beauly, Drumnadrochit, Ardersier, Croy, Kirkhill, Kiltarlity, Dores, and Fort Augustus, where housing land is being allocated for the first time or allocation is reaffirmed from an earlier local plan and a planning permission does not already exist, the Council will expect to secure, through a section 75 agreement with the landowner/s and other interested parties, or by other appropriate mechanisms, an affordable housing contribution. This will apply to proposals for 10 or more houses. Negotiations will be based on the sequential mechanisms set out in a Development Plan Policy Guideline (DPPG): Affordable Housing, and subject to market and site conditions, on an affordable housing target comprising a 25% proportion of the housing capacity of the proposal concerned.</p> <p>Outwith the settlements listed above, the Council will seek to secure affordable housing in suitable locations, through the mechanisms identified in Recommendation H6 of the Structure Plan”.</p> <p>(3) DELETE from STRATEGY, SUPPORTING COMMUNITIES para. 1.5 “by a standard planning obligation” and REPLACE with “in partnership with the private sector”.</p> <p>Matters requiring no further Modification are as follows:</p> <p>(4) APPEND a Glossary to the Local Plan.</p> <p>(5) The Council agrees to discuss the terms of current Development Plan Policy Guideline: Affordable Housing with representatives of the house-building industry, and other relevant interests, to consider the scope for adjustments in the light of experience. Suitable arrangements will be the subject of discussion with the Director of Housing Services in the first instance.</p>	
<p>Policy GP 5 Waste Management SEPA Eleanor Fairclough Strathnairn Community Council</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) UPDATE policy to reflect the latest factual circumstances.</p> <p>(2) DELETE from policy “The Development Plan will therefore...within the Highland Area Waste Plan” (3rd para.) and REPLACE with:</p> <p>“To assist the delivery of the Area Waste Plan, this local plan identifies existing sites and those with planning permission for the sorting, processing (except Energy</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
	<p>from Waste) and transfer of Municipal Solid Waste that are required to implement that Plan, and these will be safeguarded for this purpose. Proposals for other waste management facilities, including for commercial and industrial waste, will be assessed against policies in the Structure Plan, and in this local plan, guided by the Area Waste Plan.</p> <p>Unless facilities already exist or are to be made available by other means, and where consistent with Policy GP5 (Developer Contributions), proposals for new housing developments, will be expected to include household waste recycling facilities designed to achieve a level of provision equivalent to one recycling point/per 500 houses. Further guidance will be contained in the Development Plan Policy Guideline or protocol to be prepared in the context of Policy GP5”.</p> <p>(3) ADJUST Proposals Map (to indicate existing waste management sites and those with planning permission).</p>	
<p>Policy GP 7 Mineral Workings Strathnairn Action Group Petition (pro-forma) 153 signatories *</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p> <p>FACTUAL UPDATE: DELETE “5.1” and REPLACE with “10.7” DELETE “7-8” and REPLACE with “15” DELETE “3.3” and REPLACE with “8.9” DELETE “There are two outstanding planning applications at Mid Lairgs and Wester Lairgs which, if approved, may secure a supply of materials in excess of 10 years’ requirements.”</p> <p>NB. The Council agreed to forward non-timeous representations by the Strathnairn Action Group to the policy (GP7) Mineral Workings together with a supporting petition with 150 signatories, to the Public Inquiry. The Reporter recommends no modification to the Plan, although the Council is invited to update the policy in factual terms. The Inquiry Report contains an erroneous reference (Vol. 3 para. 4.7.4) to the petition having been withdrawn: there is no record that this is the case. An Erratum is inserted within the Inquiry Report. Notwithstanding, since matters raised in the petition and by the Action Group are the same, the Reporter has taken account of the relevant planning issues in reaching a conclusion.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Policy GP 8 Transport The Robertson Group per Hargest and Wallace</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>DELETE policy and REPLACE with “In accordance with the objectives of its Local Transport Strategy to improve road safety and promote sustainable transport, the Council will pursue a major package of integrated transport measures for which it will seek to assemble funding from appropriate sources, including in partnership</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
	<p>with the relevant agencies and private sector. Specifically, the Council will continue to encourage the SE to give priority to the allocation of resources for trunk road improvements. Where developer contributions are sought, these will accord with Policy GP5. Development proposals will require to demonstrate as necessary, through Green Transport Plans and in accordance with NPPG 17: Transport and Planning, commitment to increased accessibility to public and community transport, reductions in private car commuting, increased integration of transport facilities, and modal shift in freight haulage.”</p>	
<p>Policy GP 10 Traffic Management Scottish Association for Public Transport</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Policy GP 11 Water and Waste Water SEPA Scottish Water</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>DELETE policy and REPLACE with “The Council will encourage Scottish Water to improve infrastructure where necessary to implement the local plan strategy. Connection to the public sewer as defined in the Sewerage (Scotland) Act 1968 will be a pre-requisite of planning permission for all development proposals in the City of Inverness and in all the Local Centres and Key Villages identified in the plan. Elsewhere, connection to the public sewer will be required, unless the applicant can demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) connection is not feasible, for technical or economic reasons, or; (ii) the receiving WWTP is at capacity and Scottish Water has no programmed investment to increase that capacity, and; (iii) the proposal is not likely to result in significant environmental or health problems. <p>Planning permission for developments with private waste water systems will only be allowed where proposals satisfy (i) or (ii) above, <u>and</u> satisfy (iii). Any such systems within the River Nairn catchment, including all allocations within Strathnairn (see Chapter 14), Culloden Moor (20), and Clephanton (21) should discharge directly to land rather than water.</p> <p>Following discussion with SEPA, the following additional reference to foul drainage requirements are made as follows: Chapter 2, policy 1 (Hinterland - Housing in the Countryside), Chapter 3, policy 7 (Morayhill), Chapter 5, policy 1 (Lochside) and Chapter 27, policy 1 (Invermoriston).</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Policy GP 12 Flood Risk SEPA Homes for Scotland	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>DELETE policy and REPLACE with: “Development proposals in areas susceptible to flooding (defined using SPP 7’s Risk Framework) will require a developer funded Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>In all circumstances where flood risk occurs, developers will be required to demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the development can be adequately protected from flooding in terms of the Risk Framework and, where appropriate, that remedial measures to alleviate the flood risk will be taken; • that no adverse impact on the characteristics of the watercourse will arise; • use of best practice in the management and disposal of surface water; and • that suitable evacuation provisions are embodied in site/building layout and design. <p>The costs of flood protection works associated with development proposals will be met by developers whether on or off-site”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p> <p>The Council will recognise that different types of housing having differing vulnerability to flooding. Mainstream housing development will normally be assessed against a 200 year flood return period whereas sheltered and/or accommodation without upper storey access will be assessed against a longer period. A shorter return period may be appropriate for those parts of a housing site reserved for car parking and amenity space.</p> <p>The SEPA commissioned flood risk maps will not be available until September 2005 at the earliest. Therefore it will be impractical for the Council to comply with the Reporter’s final recommendation in terms of the content of the next draft of the Plan.</p>
Policy GP 13 Surface Water Drainage SEPA	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
Policy GP 15 Flood Appraisal Homes for Scotland SEPA	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
Policy GP 18 Orientation Centres National Trust for Scotland	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
Policy GP 22 Habitats and Species Scottish Natural Heritage	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>DELETE policy and REPLACE with “The Council will encourage the management and maintenance of areas supporting the following habitats and species, where these contribute to the coherence of the Natura network or are of major importance:</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • habitats and species listed in Annex I of the EC Habitats Directive; • habitats and species of community interest listed in Annexes II, IV, and V; and • habitats of naturally occurring wild birds, particularly those in Annex 1 of the EC Birds Directive and migratory species. <p>This policy will also apply to species listed in Schedules 1, 5 and 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended.</p> <p>All these resources will be given full consideration in the assessment of development proposals that may affect them, and developments that are judged likely to have significantly detrimental effects shall not accord with the plan. In respect of the animals and plants identified in Annex IV, planning permission will not be granted unless it is demonstrated that the proposal will either not impact adversely on any European Protected Species in the area, or that all 3 tests in Regulation 44 of the Habitats Regulations are satisfied”.</p>	

THE CITY OF INVERNESS

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
------------------	----------	--------

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>CHAPTER 2 THE CITY OF INVERNESS</p> <p>CITY CENTRE Policy 1 Mr M Burns Crown Community Council Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce Eleanor Fairclough Lochardil & Drummond Community Council Inverness Civic Trust Mrs A Ramsey Scottish Association for Public Transport</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) ADD after “as an Outstanding Conservation Area and place of archaeological interest.”....”Such designation provides a statutory basis for special attention to preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the City Centre where new developments are concerned, and further to completion of a Conservation Area Appraisal, such principles will also apply to additional areas so designated. This heritage is being enhanced under the auspices of a City Heritage Trust and the commitment of £250,000 per annum for three years from Historic Scotland for partner schemes.”</p> <p>(3) ADD to policy 6 after “major”...”high profile”. DELETE “could be” and REPLACE with “will be”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>REGENERATION Policies 7(i) and (v) Glenurquhart Rd Rail Yard/College Inverness College</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>ADD to policy 7(v): “The College is currently preparing an options appraisal which will guide its Development and Estates Strategy. The potential or redevelopment/reuse of any surplus property arising in this context may also be addressed in a Development Brief”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Policy 7(iv) Longman Bay Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce Mr G.Tuley Asda Stores per GVA Grimley Inverness Caledonian Thistle Properties per Jenkins & Marr Safeway Stores per Montagu Evans Eleanor Fairclough</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>The car parks at the Caledonian Stadium should be excluded from the BP3 policy. Assign Policy 7(iv) and Policy 41(iv) notations correctly.</p> <p>ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Policy 7(vi) Craig Dunain The Robertson Group per G L Hearn Inverness West Community Council Muirtown Community Council Scottish Water Policy 36(v) Charleston/ Mr B. Keddie and Ms. C. Hearn Mr P. MacDonald Mr & Mrs MacQueen Mr & Mrs P. Patterson & family Muirtown Community Council Scottish Water Rudkin Family	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) DELETE from Forward to 2011 “Craig Dunain has been restored as the centrepiece of a new ‘media’ campus involving major links with the UHI” (3) ADD to DISTRICTS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS para. 2.7 after “Protection of the Torvean SSSI, the”...“the most significant”. (5) ADD to 36(v) after “will be expected.”...”In this regard, development of brownfield land at Westercraigs with capacity for up to 140 houses could proceed prior to Phase V of the SDR.”	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 7(vii) Ashton H & K Munro per Graham & Sibbald	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADD after “parkland location.”...“These include amongst a range of possible uses, business, research and development, educational and related leisure activities. Development”. DELETE “These developments”.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
BUSINESS Policy 9 Carlton Clubs per Jones Lang LaSalle Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce	FACTUAL CORRECTION: ADJUST Proposals Map (to indicated the extent of land with planning permission).	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
BUSINESS/INDUSTRY Policy 10 Omnivale Ltd per Hillier Parker/ Upland Developments Ltd	As Policy 39 below	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Policy 11 Longman Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 12 Carse Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
SPECIAL USES Policy 18 Police HQ Culcabock & Drakies Community Council	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 20 District Centres Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce Moray Firth School	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 23 Harbour Scottish Natural Heritage RSPB SEPA	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE policy and REPLACE with "12.5 ha. of land comprising the harbour and adjoining service areas is allocated for expansion of the port and ancillary uses. The Harbour Authority is providing additional facilities and intends to pursue a further phase of reclamation for operational purposes to the north together with possible expansion of the yachting marina between 2002/5. Development in these areas will be subject to assessment of the effect on the Moray Firth cSAC and SPA and water quality, and safeguards for the integrity of these interests where required. Where it is concluded that this integrity would be likely to be adversely affected, planning permission will only be granted if there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest."	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 27 Southern Distributor Road Holm Community Council Mary Cameron	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly (to make clear that the route is a general alignment and includes a safeguarded <i>corridor</i> in the vicinity of the canal).	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce Westhill Community Council Lochardil and Drummond Community Council The Robertson Group per G L Hearn Inverness West Community Council Culcabock and Drakies Community Council Mr D. Kerr British Waterways Scotland Mrs C.M. Mackay Torvean Golf Club Inverness Civic Trust Muirtown Community Council Inverness Rowing Club David Thompson SNP Parliamentary Spokesperson for Ross and Inverness West Constituency Mr G.Tuley</p>	<p>(2) DELETE policy and REPLACE with: “A9-A82 TRUNK ROAD LINK The Council will safeguard land at Ness-side, Canal Parks and Torvean for the construction of Phase V of the A9-A82 Trunk Road Link Road to link Dores Road with the A82(T) at General Booth Road. This will enable the road to be constructed on the general alignment identified on the Proposals Map as one scheme, including a new canal crossing; and linkage to Glenurquhart Road/the Bught dependent on the means of construction, related traffic and technical considerations. The road will be designed to minimise the environmental impact on landscape features, and on open space and recreational activities towards the Bught. The highest standards of design and fit into the landscape will be required.</p> <p>The Council proposes to allocate funds after 2005/6 and will seek to secure contributions towards the cost of the route from developers of land at Ness-side, Charleston and Torvean in accordance with the provisions of this Local Plan. Provision will be made as part of the accommodation works for the road to relocate any displaced uses within Council land at Torvean, or on land the Council will seek to secure for such purposes, including for reconfiguration of an 18-hole golf course, the rugby pitches, clubhouse and ancillary facilities associated with these activities and the rowing club, see (2:43) below. The Council will also investigate the requirement for traffic management measures on General Booth Road.</p> <p>Given that Phase V will provide a continuous link between the A9 and A82 for trunk road traffic, the Council recommend that the Scottish Executive adopt and maintain the entirety of the route as part of the trunk road network.</p> <p>n respect of Phases III and IV, the Council will apply its Supplementary Policy: Southern Distributor Road in order to secure developer contributions in respect of proposals located within the Agreement Area”.</p>	
<p>Policy 28 Cross Rail Link Crown Community Council Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce Inverness Civic Trust Graham Tuley</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1), (2) and (3) DELETE policy and REPLACE with “CROSS RAIL LINK The Council propose to extend the inner relief road network with the construction of the Cross Rail Link between Millburn Road and Longman Raod/A82(T) during the Plan period, without prejudice to development of land for railway operations. This will include a traffic management scheme for Midmills Road/Kingsmills Road and adjoining routes, which will be put in place before the link road opens to traffic. Any impact on the wooded escarpment at Millburn Road will be minimised as far as possible and retained woodland will be the subject of a management scheme.”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Policy 30 Park and Ride Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 32 Urban Cycle Routes Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce A. Ramsay	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADJUST PROPOSALS MAP accordingly (to distinguish cycle routes, including those intended to comprise the Inverness Strategic Cycle Route Network).	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 33 Surface Water Drainage Tulloch Homes Ltd Eleanor Fairclough	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE "The Council will proceed with a Flood Prevention Order and will carry out site investigations and detailed design work." and REPLACE with "The Council is progressing a South West Inverness Flood Relief Channel Flood Prevention Order and parallel planning procedures."	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
EXPANSION Policy 36(iii) Westhill Mr S. Austin National Trust for Scotland Peter Black Highland Cycle Campaign Westhill Community Council John & Nicola Crews Laura Gunn Sandra Ian Waldon & Janice Mackay Cradlehall Playgroup Committee per Alix Mackay Mr J. Hay	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADD after "in accordance with the agreed Development Brief"... "which sets out requirements for affordable housing, community facilities and footpath and cycle links; together with developer contributions towards the provision of education facilities, playing fields, and distributor and other road improvements."	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 36(iv) Ness Castle/ Ness-side Holm Community Council Richard Tyser Trustees per	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADJUST Proposals Map Inset (to include the croft at 2 Ness-side in the Expansion Area at Ness-side, and with a Policy 2:36(iv) notation).	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
------------------	----------	--------

Farningham McCreadie
 Mr Michael Riggs per G.H. Johnston
 Mr Donald MacDonald per G.H. Johnston
 Tulloch Gray Ltd per G.H. Johnston
 Mr M. MacRae

Policy 37
Developer Contributions
 Scotia Homes
 Inverness and District Chamber of Commerce
 Tulloch Homes Ltd per Richard Tyser Trustees per Farningham McCreadie
 The Robertson Group per G L Hearn
 MacRae Homes Limited per Paull & Williamsons

The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):

(1) **DELETE** policy 2:37 and **REPLACE** with “GP4 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS The Council will seek developer contributions towards resolving deficiencies in infrastructure and services, including affordable housing, transport and roads, education, community facilities, recreation and other public infrastructure, where these are necessary for a development to proceed. Such contributions will be secured by a section 75 agreement compliant with the principles in SODD Circular 12/196, or by other appropriate means. These contributions will be distinguished from other planning obligations, such as works required by planning conditions, for which developers will be wholly responsible. Where more than one landowner/developer is involved, obligations will be expected to be met on a fair and equitable basis, and in proportion to the share of the overall development potential. This plan identifies locations where developer contributions will be expected, and the matters these are expected to cover. Where a Development Brief or Master Plan is identified as a requirement, this will provide greater detail on the level of contributions expected, and will be formulated in discussions with the prospective developer, where known.

The Council will prepare, in discussion with representatives of the development industry, and other relevant interests, a Development Plan Policy Guideline (DPPG), or a general protocol, setting out the principles that will be applied in assessing and calculating contributions.”

(2) **ADD** to policy GP2 after “Section 75 Agreement where necessary.”...“Developer contributions will be sought in accordance with the policy GP5”.

ADD to policy GP8 after “Developer Contributions”... “where developer contributions are sought, they will accord with Policy GP5”.

DELETE “(see 2:37)”.

The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
------------------	----------	--------

DELETE “NPPG” and **REPLACE** with “SPP17: Transport and Planning”.

DELETE from policy 2:36 after “see (37) below” and **REPLACE** with “such developer contributions will be sought in accordance with the policy GP4”.

<p>RETAILING Policy 39 Out-of Centre Retailing Aldi Stores Ltd ASDA Stores Ltd Focus Wickes Ltd Inverness Estates Ltd Inverness Caledonian Thistle Properties Ltd Kilmartin Property Group Klondyke Garden Centres Lidl UK GmbH MacDonald Estates Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc Royal & Sun Alliance/ISIS Property Asset Management Safeway Stores plc Teesmartin Inshes Ltd Tesco Stores Ltd</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) DELETE para. 2.2 and REPLACE with “A strategy based on the Structure Plan and NPPG 8 is required to maintain an efficient, competitive and innovative retail sector and consumer choice. The aim is to consolidate the structure of shopping facilities which support the functions of Inverness as the regional centre and its development as a sustainable City, and enhance the role of outlying centres in the sub-region. Within Inverness, this affords primacy to the City Centre for all comparison shopping and a role for Retail Parks and locations at the Railyard/Longman in this regard, together with provision for convenience facilities at a scale suitable for local needs in existing and proposed district and neighbourhood centres. A sequential approach will apply in locating new retail development, with preference for sites within the City Centre, followed by suitable edge-of-centre locations and only then by out of centre sites that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of means of transport. These provisions support a City Centre strategy which is intended to secure pedestrian priority of the traditional shopping “streets”, reaffirm retailing at ground floor level in the core of the Centre, maximize occupation of upper floor property for mixed uses, restore the built heritage and enhance the public realm; and further phases of commercial redevelopment, after 2006. In this context and further to the outcome of the Public Local Inquiry (2005), it is appropriate to make provision for an additional 5,000+ sq. m. of convenience floorspace and in the order of a further 19,000 sq. m. of bulky goods floorspace in the period to 2011.”</p> <p>ADD “2.3 Renaissance of the City Centre is vital to first impressions and an enduring image of Inverness. A major new shopping mall at Eastgate, opened in 2003, will be followed by an intensive programme of infrastructure and enhancement works as part of the City Vision approved by the Scottish Executive in 2004. These should be designed to extend the pedestrian priority area, enhance transport “gateways” and expose an outstanding urban fabric, represented by designation of the City’s core as an Outstanding Conservation Area and place of archaeological interest. Measures are needed to stimulate trade in the traditional shopping streets, bring vacant upper floor accommodation into use and repopulate the Centre. Prestigious redevelopment, exceptional architecture and a cultural</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
--	--	---

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
------------------	----------	--------

quarter would regenerate the riverfront, drawing on the Ness as the City’s greatest natural asset.

(3) **ADD** to policy 2:1 after “purposes” ...“The City Centre will be regarded as the town centre in Inverness in terms of NPPG 8 and sequential approach, and the Council will seek to direct all new general comparison retail floorspace there in the first instance” and after “and vitality.”... insert “Land and sites at Academy Street and Strothers Lane offer opportunities for redevelopment, including retailing, post-2006.”

(4) **DELETE** policy 2:39 and **REPLACE** with “7 RETAILING OUTWITH THE CITY CENTRE Provision for convenience shopping will be made within District and Neighbourhood Centres, as defined in the Proposals Map, in accordance with their functions and at a scale commensurate with local needs, and with the retail hierarchy described at paragraph 2.2. District Centres are intended to serve a district function, and will not be regarded as town centres in applying the sequential approach and the provisions of NPPG 8.

The Council also recognises that provision should be made for further growth in bulky goods/warehouse retail floorspace. This will be encouraged where opportunities arise within the established retail parks at Telford-Carse, Inshes and West Seafield.

In the absence of suitable edge-of-centre sites at these locations, the Council has identified additional sites for this purpose at the Rail Yard and within a defined area of the Longman/A82 core (see policies 2:7(v) and 2:11). Any planning permissions granted in these locations will be restricted to bulky goods only.

Proposals for retail development outwith the framework described above will be rigorously assessed against considerations (a)-(k) in paragraph 45 of NPPG 8.

All proposals for retail development over 2,500 sq m gross will require to be the subject of a RIA”.

(5) **ADJUST** Proposals Map (to identify A82/Longman core).

(6) **ADD** to policy GP2 URBAN STRUCTURE under “Facilities” in “District” before “superstore” ...“supermarket or”.

FACTFILE: DISTRICT NESS and SOUTH under Service Deficiencies **ADD** after

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
------------------	----------	--------

“supermarket...”or superstore”; and CULLODEN **ADD** “supermarket or superstore”.

ADJUST FACTFILE: DISTRICTS/FACTFILE: NEIGHBOURHOODS as necessary to identify Service Deficiencies.

(7) **DELETE** from policy 2:7(ii) TORVEAN “and retailing”.

(8) **DELETE** from policy 2:7(v) RAIL YARD/COLLEGE “Subject to maintaining rail-related freight uses, land should become available for prestigious office, leisure and service uses together with a stronger focus for the UHI/Inverness College, which could extend...” and **REPLACE** with “Subject to maintaining rail-related freight uses, land should become available post 2006 for office, leisure and service uses, and bulky goods retailing, together with a strong focus for the UHI/Inverness College, which could extend ...”.

(9) **DELETE** from policy 2:11 (second bullet) and **REPLACE** with “redevelopment of land adjoining the A82/Harbour Road axes for office/educational/service activities consistent with the adjoining college campus and future regeneration of the Rail Yard; and, within the A82/core area defined on the Proposals Map, retail use, restricted to bulky goods. Consideration will be given to the scope for land assembly where this is required to co-ordinate development in pursuit of the above objectives (see 7(v) above)”. **DELETE** “Further to (39) below, there will be a presumption against retailing other than activities ancillary to business/industrial uses and distributive trades” and **REPLACE** with “Outwith the defined A82/core area, retailing proposals other than those ancillary to business/industrial uses will require to be rigorously assessed against considerations (a)-(k) in paragraph 45 of NPPG 8”.

(10) **DELETE** from policy 2:20 “In accordance with NPPG 8 and their functions these are defined as District Centres”.

(11) **ADD** to policy 2:38 “The above provisions relate to community facilities other than retailing”.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
AMENITY AREAS Policy 41 Green Wedges Mr D Mackenzie Robertson Residential Deveron Homes MacRae Homes Crofters Commission on behalf of the Scottish Executive Mr & Mrs Matheson Mr D C Munro William Gray Construction Ltd (75) - in relation to Balloch.	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADD APPENDIX: HOUSING LAND ALLOCATIONS.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Balloch Moray Estates Development Company	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Viewhill Mr H. Kiestra per GH Johnston Tulloch Homes Ltd	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Easter Muckovie John Marr Architects	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Milton of Leys Mr. D.C. Munro	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Policy 41 Green Wedges Lower Muckovie Mr. D.C. Munro Deveron Homes per Halliday, Fraser, Munro	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Inshes House Mr and Mrs Matheson per Graham and Sibbald	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Easterfield of Inshes W. Young & H. Young per Mr D. Young	FACTUAL CORRECTION: DELETE "B8971" and REPLACE with "B971".	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Ashton Farm H & K Munro per Graham & Sibbald	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Beechwood Farm Crofters Commission per Graham and Sibbald	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) ADD 10 WEST SEAFIELD (BEECHWOOD) "7.0 ha. of land at West Seafield is allocated for business use, subject to development being laid out to facilitate access to the adjoining major campus site at Ashton (see 7(vii))." (2) DELETE from policy 41 "No development will be permitted within defined areas." and REPLACE with "There will be a presumption against development likely to prejudice the intended purpose and function of these defined areas".	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Druid Temple Dereck Mackenzie per Graham & Sibbald	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Policy 41 Green Wedges Torbreck Mrs F. Rapson per G.H. Johnston	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 41 Green Wedges Cradlehall Fraser Hutcheson per G.H. Johnston	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
DISTRICTS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS DISTRICT: WEST HOUSING Policy 47(iii) Leachkin Brae Bickley Family Mr J. Innes Mr B Keddie & Ms C Hearns Mr W.A. MacDonald Mr P MacDonald Mr F. Mackenzie Mr & Mrs MacQueen MacRae Homes Ltd per Paull & Williamsons Mr & Mrs Patterson & Family Rudkin Family Mr R. Soutar	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE Policy 2:47(iii) and REPLACE with “(iii) 5.5 ha Leachkin Brae subject to traffic monitoring to establish the timing of development relative to Phase V of the SDR, and the provision of a footpath link through the site from Leachkin Road to Leachkin Brae”.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
DISTRICT: SOUTH HOUSING Policy 71(v) Slacknamarnock Quarry The MacDonald Trust per Atkins	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE “0.8” and REPLACE with “2.0”. ADD after “Development” ... “of 15-18 houses”. ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report. However it was agreed to make a further Modification in order to encourage investigation of alternative access. ADD “Consideration should be given to alternative access from the east.”
DISTRICT: MILLBURN HOUSING Policy 79 Primary Schools Tulloch Homes Ltd Culcabock and Drakies Community Council	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
SPECIAL USES Policy 87 Diriebught Crown Community Council	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 88 Culcabock Culcabock Village Association	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) DELETE second sentence of para 2.1 and REPLACE with “Local facilities have evolved at Perth Road/Culcabock Road. There is scope for limited redevelopment on land adjoining Drakies House, provided that local housing and traffic considerations are taken into account, and the part of the policies that remains undeveloped is safeguarded”. (2) DELETE from policy “Notwithstanding (79(iv)) above...improved access.” ADD to policy 79(iv) after “subject to access”... “improvements.” ADJUST Proposals Map (to reflect the extent of the Action Area).	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
AMENITY AREAS Policy 93 Drakies Culcabock & Drakies Community Council	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Residents of 121-151 Drumossie Avenue Richard Allsop Graeme Anderson Judith Anderson Mr A.D. Breau Mrs M. Breau D. Fraser W. Fraser C. Lockhart D. Lockhart G. Lockhart R. Lockhart S. Lockhart B. MacKenzie S. MacKenzie Donald MacLeod Pauline Simpson Neil Simpson Fiona Stuart John Stuart Jonathan Stuart Selina Stuart W.W. Wilson		
DISTRICT: CULLODEN HOUSING Policy 95 Balloch Mrs Jane Mackintosh	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 95 (i) and (ii) Balloch Alistair and Marion Bennie Mr J Brown Mr. & Mrs S M Card William Gray Construction per Farningham McCreddie A and R MacKinnon Mr & Mrs L. Robertson	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADD to policy 97 "(x) 0.6 ha Upper Cullernie, Balloch Suitable for varying needs." AMEND Proposals Map (to apply <i>Amenity</i> policy on adjoining land within the District).	The Planning Authority considers that these sites should be considered independently of one another. Given the limited choice in the mix of accommodation in Balloch, policy 95 should identify 0.6 ha. of land at Upper Cullernie, Balloch for housing and the <i>Amenity</i> policy should apply to remaining land. The availability of site 95(i) for residential purposes has been investigated and the landowner has confirmed the site not to be available for housing. Therefore, the Reporter's recommendations

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Mrs Shaw & A Shaw Mr & Mrs A MacCrae		(1), (2) and (3) are not applicable.
Policy 95(iv) Culloden House The Garden History Society	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification. FACTUAL CORRECTION: Such that “requirements” reads “development should be contained within the walled garden and should respect the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed building”	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 104 Housing/Open Space Mr & Mrs R. Bones Mr & Mrs T Bryers Mr & Mrs S. Card Mr & Mrs R.M. Fraser Mr & Mrs Logue Mr & Mrs S. Moss Tulloch Homes Ltd	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE “1.0 ha. of landtogether with play facilities” and REPLACE with “1.0 ha of land at Upper Cullernie is allocated for a mix of housing and community/open space: 0.5 ha for low density dwellings; and 0.5 ha for community open space, which could comprise a bowling green and play facilities.”	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
------------------	----------	--------

HINTERLAND

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
------------------	----------	--------

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>CHAPTER 3 A96 CORRIDOR</p> <p>INVERNESS AIRPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE Policy 3 Special Uses Highlands & Islands Enterprise Inverness & Nairn Enterprise Scottish Natural Heritage Moray Estates Development Company Highlands and Islands Airports Ltd Croy Community Council Mr J.S. Brennan Andrew Wade D. Gerrard Sheila Pledger Eleanor Ross Thorsten Fret Patsy Richardson A. Ramsay Mr I Kane Mrs J Bryson</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(2) and (4) DELETE from policy 3.3 (iii) “together with a further 8.5 ha. for industry south west of the Airport terminal”. DELETE policy 3.3 (v) “8.0 ha. for warehousing west of the Airport terminal” and REPLACE with “16.5 ha for industry and warehousing south-west of the Airport terminal subject, in respect of proposals for warehousing, to the suitability and availability of land within Dalcross Industrial Estate [see (iii) above].”</p> <p>(3) DELETE from policy 3.3 (i) “50 ha.” and REPLACE with “36 ha.”. Planning permission for these uses and activities will be subject to a Masterplan (see 5 below) and supporting Transport Assessment which will require satisfy the Council that proposals are compatible with sustainable transport objectives (and include as necessary, Green Transport Plans) Consideration may be given in future to expansion of business uses in this locality to the south west”.</p> <p>(5) ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly.</p> <p>(1) and (6) These matters require no further Modification and are as follows or as advertised as part of the Deposit Draft with Modifications (agreed by Planning Development Europe and Tourism Committee 13th March 2003).</p> <p>(7) FACTUAL UPDATE: ADD to INTRODUCTION “NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK FOR SCOTLAND The National Planning Framework for Scotland (2004) is a non-statutory, planning policy document prepared by the Scottish Executive which looks at Scotland from a spatial perspective and sets out an achievable long-term vision. This refers “Inverness and the Inner Moray Firth is an economic development zone with considerable potential. To the east of the City, the A96 corridor and the Airport offer opportunities for future expansion”.</p> <p>The economic development initiative is part of a long term planning framework for the corridor, with potential to make a major contribution to the regional economy over the long term. This is a unique location for inter-modal transport facilities which are dependent on national transport commitments, significant resources and a critical mass of development and activities. It is appropriate to remind Members that matters have evolved significantly over the 12 months since the PLI commenced, notably several important planning initiatives provide a framework for addressing concerns i.e.;</p>	<p>Accept the Reporter’s recommendations for the reasons given in the Report of Public Local Inquiry and agree respective further modifications as follows:</p> <p>As regards recommendation (1) discussion has been held with Network Rail and the Council’s Rail Development Officer. Whilst there is some capacity to create freight sidings between Inverness and Nairn, the viability of facilities is dependent on a major operator to generate sufficient custom. In this regard, the feasibility of re-opening a freight siding to serve the Nexfor site is under investigation. The lack of a direct rail link with markets in the central belt and the unlikely rail-to-air transfer of goods appear to militate against further rail freight infrastructure in this location within the Plan period. It would be unwise however, to discount the prospect that opportunities might arise in the context of major development in the corridor over many years. A passenger halt serving the Airport, business park and park and ride facilities remains a realistic and desirable component of the development package promoted in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The policy refers to a “road/rail/air cargo distribution centre” and the allocation of 5.0 ha. of land for related purposes. The sustainable transport objectives set out in SPP17 (Planning for Transport) promote integrated land use and transport through development that reduces the need to travel; facilitates movement by public transport, freight services by rail or water, access to local facilities by walking and cycling; and for high-quality public transport to encourage modal shift away from car use. Given that policy allows for the development of trans-shipment facilities - though not necessarily involving rail - within the confines of the Airport; that some measure of the scale of possible activities is essential for the proper planning of infrastructural networks supporting the development package as a whole, and that the land allocations arise as part of an earlier feasibility study, the Deposit Draft Local Plan with Modifications should be confirmed in respect of this allocation.</p> <p>As regards recommendation (3), in light of this and the Reporter’s invitation to the Council to reassess the nature and scale of</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Scottish Executive’s National Planning Framework recognising opportunities for future expansion in the A96 corridor/airport; • a major Consultants study setting large scale, long term urban growth in the corridor in the context of sustainable transport options; • a draft Inner Moray Firth Ports and Sites strategy currently nearing completion, substantiating the airport as a major economic growth point and regional development hub meshed with strategic infrastructure networks; • a Joint Venture agreement to develop a business park, transport interchange facilities/rail halt and imminent construction of the A96-airport road link, with capacity to deliver some 250,000 sq. m. of accommodation and 5000 jobs by 2035. <p>A Masterplan planning application embracing these proposals, supported by strategic environmental and traffic assessment and awaiting determination, offers the opportunity to assess comprehensively, the compatibility of the development package as a whole with sustainable transport objectives.</p> <p>As regards recommendation (7) the Local Plan makes no allocation of land for development or land use change within the area which would accommodate an (1000m) eastern extension to the main runway nor within the adjoining land which would fall within a corresponding Public Safety Zone as conferred in SEDD Circular 8/2002. Notwithstanding, any planning applications within these areas require consultation with HIAL in terms of the Town and Country Planning (Safeguard Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Storage Areas) (Scotland) Direction 2003.</p>	<p>industrial and business land allocations, it would be appropriate – to delete some 14 ha. of 50 ha. of land allocated between the A96 and the railway for business. However, again, in order to amortise the costs of up-front infrastructure, it would be appropriate for the Plan to recognise the scope to reconsider the potential to expand business in this direction in future.</p> <p>As regards recommendation (2), the City of Inverness and Area Planning Committee approved proposals for development of warehousing south west of the airport subject to Section 75 Agreement, although this application was subsequently withdrawn. However, in view of discussions subsequent to the Inquiry in relation to proprietorial interests at Dalcross Industrial Estate and uncertainty about the availability of adjoining land to the north-east for warehousing, it is important – given the shortfall identified in the Industrial and Business Land Supply Study (Halcrow 2000) – that the option of providing distribution facilities south-west of the Airport remains. The Reporter’s recommendation to the contrary appears based on the over-provision of land against the Structure Plan requirements, albeit that opportunities at Dalcross are endorsed. In these terms, the spirit of the Inquiry outcome would be acknowledged were policy to continue to promote warehousing south-west of the Airport, subject to the non-availability of alternative land adjoining Dalcross Industrial Estate or that land having been developed.</p>
<p>Policy 3(iii) Land at Dalcross PDG Helicopters Ltd. per Munro & Noble</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>INDUSTRY Policy 6 Fabrication Yard Mr J S Brennan Croy Community Council Thorsten Fret S.A. Lowe Sheila Pledger</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(2) DELETE “whilst at the same time...Whiteness Head SSSI” and REPLACE with “Development will be subject to assessment of the effect on the Moray Firth cSAC and SPA and safeguards for the integrity of these interests where required. Where it is concluded that this integrity would be likely to be adversely affected, planning permission will only be granted if there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Eleanor Ross Scottish Natural Heritage		
Policy 7 Morayhill Croy Community Council SEPA	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) and (2) ADD after “subject to adequate drainage” ...”Any large scale industrial user will require public drainage”. See GP11 above.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
CHAPTER 5 LOCHSIDE HOUSING Policy 1 SEPA	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE from policy “drainage” and ADD after “site clearance.”... “Prior investigation of drainage arrangements will be required in consultation with SEPA, subject to which there will be a preference for individual septic tank/soakaway arrangements.” See also policy GP11 above.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 2 Mrs Margaret Carr	ADJUST Proposals Map (to include land at Lochside House and its grounds in the settlement boundary).	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
CHAPTER 6 HINTERLAND HOUSING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE Policy 1 Kiltality Community Council Strathnairn Community Council	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) DELETE “Limited development of additional dwellings...in particular G2 Design for Sustainability.” and REPLACE with “In addition to the settlements that are the subject of Chapters 7-22, some residential development that would consolidate or round-off the following housing groups may be acceptable, always provided this is in keeping with the existing settlement pattern. An indicative maximum additional capacity, equivalent to a 25% proportion of the number of existing houses, or houses with planning permission at September 2002 when the Deposit Draft Local Plan was placed on deposit, is given in brackets: Ardendrain (4), Balblair (5), Balnafoich (4), Beauly Braes (26), Cabrich (6), Cantray (north) (2), Cantraywood (6), Culburnie (7), Daviot East (7), Foxhole (5), Inchberry (3), Leanach (3), Lentrans House* (4), Lentrans Station (3), Moy (3), Moy Hall (3), Nairnside* (5), Newtonhill (4), Ruilick (3), Scaniport (3), Torness (2), Upper Myrtlefield (3). (* denotes groups where extant planning permissions will be regarded as fulfilling the indicative maximum additional capacity, and where further permissions will only be granted in substitution for any of these extant permissions that lapse). Outwith these locations (ie. in the open countryside or in the locations not listed	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
	<p>above) there will be a presumption against the development of new dwellings and conversion of non-traditional buildings for housing purposes unless the proposal either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relates to the management of land; • is required for family purposes related to the management of land; • comprises conversion of a building of traditional design; or • is to be developed by a social housing agency to meet demonstrated local affordable housing need. <p>All proposals within the Hinterland must also comply with the terms of the Structure Plan General Strategic Policies, in particular Policy G2: Design for Sustainability”.</p> <p>Further to GP11 above ADD “Foul drainage arrangements for development associated with the groups listed above, which fall within the River Nairn catchment, should discharge directly to land rather than water.”</p> <p>(2) ADJUST Proposals Map (to delete defined settlements).</p> <p>(3) Further to (2) above, this recommendation is not applicable.</p> <p>The above proposed modifications also apply to Chapter 3, A96 Corridor policy 2, HOUSING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE.</p>	
<p>Cabrich David & Veronica Tervet Mr West Mr & Mrs Maclellan & Family</p>	<p>See Policy 1 (Housing in the Countryside) above.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Daviot East Iain Christie Mr AJ Horne SEPA</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>DELETE after “Daviot East”....” (8)” and REPLACE with “(7)”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Nairnside Robert & Morven Boardman John Callum</p>	<p>See Policy 1 (Housing in the Countryside) above.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Alasdair and Pamela Chambers D. Lawrie Iain and Pamela MacInnes A&J MacLeod Kenneth MacQueen & Marion MacIsaac Strathnairn Community Council J.W. & M.L. Robertson Ewan Snedden Mr & Mrs Thomson		
Lentran House Richard Wright	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADD after “Lentran Station”...”Lentran House (4*).”	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Ardendrain Allan & Pamela Lemon Lorna Campbell	See Policy 1 (Housing in the Countryside) above.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Balnafoich Derek & Barbara Chilton N, K and J Fuller R. Evans & Mrs M Evans SEPA	See Policy 1 (Housing in the Countryside) above.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Leanach National Trust for Scotland Norma Duncan SEPA Mr I Mackay Margo Murray	See Policy 1 (Housing in the Countryside) above.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Culburnie Mr Hamish MacLennan	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Scaniport James Baillie per Bowlts	See Policy 1 (Housing in the Countryside) above.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Upper Myrtlefield Mr Cargill Mr Coull Mr & Mrs Duncan Mr Johnston Mr & Mrs MacDonald Mr & Mrs Lee	See Policy 1 (Housing in the Countryside) above.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Drumbuie, Bunloit, Achmony, Balchraggan, Balmacaan, Strone R.K. Barrow Kathryn Hunt AD & VM MacDonald-Haig Glenurquhart Community Council	See Policy 1 (Housing in the Countryside) above and Chapter 8 policies 19 and 21 below.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Beaully Barnyards Mr R.H. Macdonald	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Blackpark Farm Mr I. Alexander per G.H. Johnston	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Easter Clunes Mr C Swift Mr K Summers	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE from policy 1 "Easter Clunes (3)"	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 2 Settlement Expansion Homes for Scotland Kiltarlity Community Council	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE from policy "Accordingly, for development ... exceeding 5 years." and REPLACE with, "Accordingly, for development proposals involving land identified under the Settlement Policy E: Expansion, the Council will seek to limit, pro rata with the total capacity of such land in any settlement, the number of houses granted planning permission in any 5 year period to 50% of the 10 year figure". ADD "The base date from which the 10 year period in the policy will apply is the date of publication of the Deposit Draft (13 th September 2002)." 	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>CHAPTER 7 BEAULY</p> <p>Expansion Policy 12 Croyard Road Mr H. Black Lovat Estate Beauly Community Council Mr & Mrs MacKay Mr D. MacLennan Mrs C MacLennan Mr J. Russell Mr P. Wortham Mrs D. Wortham Scotia Homes per Bruce & Partners</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) DELETE from policy “Capacity 30 houses subject to...development commencing” and REPLACE with “30 houses, subject to assembly with (11) above, a developer funded Flood Risk Assessment, and phasing of development from the east. Completion of a distributor road between Croyard Road and the High Street (A862) and traffic calming on the lower section of Croyard Road will be a prerequisite to development commencing on this site”.</p> <p>(2) DELETE from policy “Section 75 Agreement will be sought...incorporate affordable housing.” and REPLACE with “Section 75 agreement will be sought to ensure a rate and scale of building compatible with the terms of policy 6:2 Settlement Expansion. Development Briefs including comprehensive layout and servicing, footpath links, open space and landscaping will be expected. Development will also be expected to incorporate a range of house types and tenures, including affordable housing”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 8 DRUMNADROCHIT</p> <p>Policy 1 Village Centre Glenurquhart Community Council Kathryn Hunt R.K. Barrow A. Lumsden</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(2) DELETE policy and REPLACE with “The Council wishes to investigate the scope to strengthen the Village Centre as a focus for commercial/social activity and the potential for further mixed uses where these are compatible with local business prospects. Further investigation of additional retailing, business premises, visitor accommodation and facilities, residential uses (possibly in upper floor properties) and extension of the car park will be the subject of a Development Brief for the area identified on the Proposals Map. Within this area, any development will be expected to reflect the form and character of established buildings and their setting around the "Green" and to take account of residential amenity. Development will be subject to a flood risk assessment and any necessary and suitable flood protection measures which may require to be carried out on or off-site either at developer(s) expense or subject to their contribution.”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>HOUSING Policies 3 and 4 Kilmore/Balmacaan Donald S. Fraser John Cameron (Jnr)</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>Policies 8 and 11 Infill Mr D. Skinner per G. H. Johnston Mr and Mrs Morritt</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) DELETE policy 11 and REPLACE with “Further infill housing at Lewiston and Milton, where compatible with the flood protection and other site requirements, should be of plot size, orientation, height, form and finishes, building line and curtilage treatment compatible with its surroundings.”</p> <p>DELETE from policy 8 “flats” and “planning permission, conversion” and REPLACE with “8 plots or conversion to flats”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>SPECIAL USES Policies 19 and 21 Traffic/Pedestrian Glenurquhart Community Council</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Policy 22 Visitor Accommodation AD and VM MacDonald-Haig</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>DELETE policy and REPLACE with “Subject to details, including adequate servicing and flood safeguards, the Council will support development of visitor and recreational facilities at Borlum, including on land south of the River Coiltie, and conversion of farm steadings. The 1.5 ha of land allocated for camping and caravan facilities may offer scope for expansion subject also to adequate servicing and compatibility with conservation interests.”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>AMENITY AREAS Policy 28 John Cameron (Jnr) R.K. Barrow</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>The Drumnadrochit Inset Proposals Map should identify Blairbeg Wood in its entirety as a Policy BP3 feature. ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 11 KIRKHILL HOUSING Ian McCook</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>ADD “HOUSING The following land is allocated for housing: 1.3 ha. Achnagairn, up to 5 houses, Section 75 Agreement requiring some of the proceeds from development to be devoted to the repair of Achnagairn House”. ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly.</p> <p>ADD after “link to the school”... “and subject to consideration of the TPO.”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report. However, it agreed to make a further Modification since an existing Tree Preservation Order, as an important local factor, could influence the capacity of the site.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
AMENITY AREAS Policy 9 Mr C MacMillan per G.H. Johnston	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
CHAPTER 12 KILTARLITY HOUSING Kiltarlity Community Council Howard Paton Carolyn Roy Mr & Mrs Wallis	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification. FACTUAL CORRECTION: ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly. DELETE from policy 2 "Any relocation." and REPLACE with "and relocation".	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Village Hall Mrs A. Gloag per Cooper Design Associates	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Post Office John Fraser Donald Fraser	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
EXPANSION Glebe Farm Mr H. Paton Carolyn Roy Mr & Mrs Wallis	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) DELETE "including 0.4 ha. of open space" and REPLACE with "very high standard of design, layout and landscaping; housing being set back from Allarburn Drive beyond open space and oriented to retain a view across the site to the south; the widening of the access road at least as far as the site entrance and the provision of a footpath link to the school."	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 7 Sawmill/Bruiach Mill John Fraser Donald Fraser	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
CHAPTER 13 DORES HOUSING/SPECIAL	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) DELETE policies 1, 3 and 6 and REPLACE with "EXPANSION 3.0 ha. of land between Dores Parish Church and Ness View Cottage is safeguarded for	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report. However, it agreed to make the further Modifications to ensure the policy affords a measure of flexibility with regard to the availability of land for housing, given an urgent

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>USES Policies 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8 Iain Cameron Dr A & Dr H Campbell Iain & Fiona King Rev J Christie Dores and Boleskine Church Congregational Board Ms J Mackinnon</p>	<p>relocation of the primary school, a cemetery extension, subject to further investigation of ground conditions, and housing. Access will be taken from the B862 and/or Torr Gardens. A Development Brief will be prepared to guide such uses and safeguards for the listed church, burial ground and woodland.”</p> <p>ADD after “is safeguarded for”... “possible” ADD after “burial ground and woodland”... “The mix of uses will take account of the effectiveness of other allocated land within Dores.”</p> <p>(2) DELETE “8 EXPANSION Subject to discussion with the community and landowner, 0.7 ha. of land west of the B862 is allocated for a mix of community/visitor uses in the longer term. This is centrally located and close to facilities, and development would be dependent on the release of land from agriculture. Uses could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocation of the Primary School. Whilst not within the current capital programme, the Council recognises the desirability of relocating the school within the village in future. This site offers an alternative to land previously reserved at the Glebe, which could help meet local housing needs if released earlier (see 3); • extension of amenities to form a community focal point. This could include a recreational ground attaching to the existing small park together with a small visitor/tourist information centre and car parking at the “gateway” to the village; • a shop together with a caravan and camping site. <p>The Council will prepare a Development Brief. This will address the siting of low profile buildings held tightly to the eastern side of this area to preserve the open outlook to Loch Ness and any ground works necessary to achieve connections to utility services. Access improvements/traffic calming on the B862; retention of trees and footpaths associated with the loch margins and remnants of the military road will be essential.”</p> <p>(4) DELETE “5 0.2 ha. of land south of the village is allocated for a new Waste Water Treatment Plant. Scottish Water intends to provide this facility in 2003.”</p>	<p>need for affordable housing.</p>
<p>Policy 2 Scottish Natural Heritage</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADD to policy after “access”... “planting”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>CHAPTER 14 STRATHNAIRN</p> <p>HOUSING Inverarnie/Farr Strathnairn Petition of 45 signatures per Mr W E Campbell Mrs Chalmers, Mr & Mrs Chilton Mrs M Evans Mr & Mrs D Henderson SEPA Mr & Mrs Maybee (Strathnairn Community Council regarding affordable housing) Mr & Mrs Rowley Mr D Scott</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p> <p>(3) Further to discussion with SEPA, a further modification is proposed at GP11 above. This requires that any approved private drainage systems discharge effluent directly to land rather than water. This would enable the allocations at Strathnairn to be confirmed.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 17 ABRIACHAN</p> <p>BUSINESS Mr J. Cumming per ATIS REAL Weatheralls</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>HOUSING Policy 1 Infill Inverness West Community Council Charles Webster D.E. MacDonald</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>ADJUST Proposals Map (to extend land subject to Policy 1 to the east).</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 19 INCHMORE</p> <p>HOUSING former Primary School</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>DELETE from policy 1 “0.1 ha.” and REPLACE with “0.3 ha., 3 houses”. ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Mr and Mrs MacMillan per G.H. Johnston Mrs R. Duns		
CHAPTER 20 CULLODEN MOOR HOUSING/ACTION Ben View/B9006 SEPA Croy Community Council	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
CHAPTER 22 DAVIOT HOUSING Infill The Church of Scotland General Trustees	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.

THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREA

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
------------------	----------	--------

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
CHAPTER 23 RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREA HOUSING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE Policy 2 Kinneras Mrs D Bjerland Mrs M Butcher Mr I Fraser Mr & Mrs T Gibson Mrs F H Greenlaw Mr & Mrs J Jeorrett Mr & Mrs A Johnston MacDonald Family Mr & Mrs D Ramsay	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): DELETE from para. 1.47(e) “permissive” and REPLACE with “more flexible”.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 2 Ault-na-Goire Alex Sutherland	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 2 R.C. Tinsley Ltd.	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>CHAPTER 24 FORT AUGUSTUS</p> <p>Village Centre Policy 1 Car Park/Mixed Use Mr E.M. Stewardson Lovat Estates per Mr G. Foster Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(4) ADD policy “3 1.2 ha. of land adjoining the village centre could have potential for housing, business and community uses subject to removal of part of the embankment, site levelling/upfilling, extension of services and any necessary river defence works. The bridge abutments and adjoining ground will be retained to enable public access, and vegetation around the edges of the site reinforced. A full feasibility study should be pursued to explore the cost/engineering implications of development and the options for access, after which the Council will prepare a Development Brief.”</p> <p>(4) ADD policy “8 0.2 ha. of land adjoining the car park at the Village Centre is allocated for business use, subject to a feasibility study (see 3 above). This will involve reconfiguration of access through the car park and removal of part of the disused embankment.”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report. However, it agreed to make a Modification to policy 3 (as stated within the Local Plan Deposit Draft), to ensure that a feasibility study should take account of access arrangements:</p> <p>This required deletion of “Access will be safeguarded from the car park and any necessary reconfiguration of parking undertaken by the developer” and the addition of, “implications of development”... “and the options for access, after which...”.</p>
<p>HOUSING/SPECIAL USES Policies 4, 7, 11, and 12 Bunoich, Jenkins Park/Auchteraw Mr E. M. Stewardson</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Policy 4 Scottish Natural Heritage</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): ADD to policy “and edge planting.”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Policy 5 Market Hill (south) Brian Clark</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>BUSINESS/ACTION Policies 7 and 18 Canalside British Waterways Scotland</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(9) DELETE “on 0.1 ha. of land” and REPLACE with “0.1 ha. of land is allocated for these activities which are supported as part of an economic development strategy for the village (see 24 below).”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Policy 14 Bowling Green Mr E. M. Stewardson</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>EXPANSION Policies 14 and 15 E M Stewardson Mr Stuart Findlay Lesley Findlay Mrs Veronica Hargreaves Adrian Varwell</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) DELETE from <i>Panel</i> “300” and REPLACE with “325”. DELETE from para. 24.1 “600” and REPLACE with “500”.</p> <p>(10) DELETE policy 14 and REPLACE with “The following land is allocated for housing and community uses in the medium-longer term. The Council will prepare Development Briefs to guide the comprehensive layout and servicing of these areas together with footpath links, related amenities and Landscaping: 2.0 ha. rear of the Old Convent access will be taken from the A82 and will involve upgrading/reconfiguration of the junction and road serving the Cemetery/sub-station, including consideration of a roundabout as part of a wider traffic management initiative. Development will be limited to the southern most fields. The Council will expect to enter Section 75 Agreement with the land/owner developer to secure the higher ground and mature woodland together with local cultural features in the community’s interest. Development will be set well back from the river margins to enable public access to be promoted and a new pedestrian link will be sought through to the trunk road/Abertarff Place north west of the site.”</p> <p>(11) DELETE from policy “8.5 ha. between ... servicing and established village footpaths” and REPLACE with “8.5 ha. between the Academy and the Golf Course development could comprise a mix of housing types and tenure reflecting the range of local needs; business, community and recreation uses together with tree planting and safeguards for amenities, phased from the east. Particular attention should be paid to maintaining views. Access should be taken from the A82(T) opposite Abertarff Place with links through to the school, adjoining land identified for recreation, canal related servicing and established village footpaths.”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>Policy 12 Blaes Pitch Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>ADD “0.2 ha. of land comprising the blaes pitch south of the Abbey is suitable for development for business purposes”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>ACTION Policy 21 Economic Development Strategy</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p> <p>FOR CLARIFICATION: DELETE policy 21 “Further to ...to be accommodated.” and REPLACE with “Further to the allocation of alternative sites, the Council will investigate with Inverness and Nairn Enterprise and community interests the implementation of an economic development strategy for Fort Augustus. This</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
	should take account of demand for premises, land availability and the types of activity to be accommodated.”	
CHAPTER 25 TOMATIN Policies/General Mr J.W. Robertson Mr & Mrs J. Simpson Mr & Mrs D. Anderson Mr & Mrs Robertson Mr D Simpson Mr & Mrs Purves Iain D.G. MacAskill SEPA	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (1) DELETE from header table “SETTLEMENT” and REPLACE with “KEY VILLAGE”. (7) DELETE from Policy 13 “0.2 ha of land...2002” and REPLACE with “The Waste Water Treatment Plant off Balvraid Road has recently been upgraded.” FACTUAL CORRECTION: ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly. ADD to Development Factors “and should be prioritised to improve infrastructure and assist development of the village.” DELETE “in 2002 and”. DELETE from Policy 13 “0.2 ha of land...2002” and REPLACE with “The Waste Water Treatment Plant off Balvraid Road has recently been upgraded.”	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report. However, it agreed to make a further Modification in order to encourage action by Scottish Water to improve infrastructure to assist development of the village.
Affordable Housing Mr J.W. Robertson	See Policy GP 4 above.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Housing Tomatin Distillery	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (6) ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly (to DELETE annotation “A” on housing at Tomatin Distillery and REPLACE with “H”).	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
HOUSING Policy 3 Old Mill Road Mr C.D. Glynne-Percy	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 6 South of Tomatin Mr & Mrs Robertson	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 7 Allt Dubhag BM Developments per Iain Christie	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (4) DELETE “0.8 ha...access and drainage”.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
Iain D.G. MacAskill Mr J.W. Robertson		
BUSINESS Policy 10 Little Chef Mr J.W. Robertson Mr & Mrs J. Simpson Mr C.D. Glynne-Percy Mr & Mrs D. Anderson	The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
SPECIAL USES/ EXPANSION Policy 15 and 18 East of Distillery/ Playing Field Mr C.D. Glynne-Percy Mr & Mrs D. Anderson Mr J.W. Robertson Mr & Mrs J. Simpson Mr & Mrs Purves Mr D.J. Simpson Scottish Natural Heritage	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (8) DELETE from policy 15 "1.0 ha. of land...playing field" and REPLACE with "The Council will seek to secure and safeguard 1.0 ha. of land east of the Distillery or nearby for a community playing field (see policy 18)". (9) DELETE from policy 18 "dependent on 13 above...ultimately" and REPLACE with "dependent on 13 above. Development will be subject to a Development Brief specifying design and layout, the identification and safeguarding of 1.0 ha of land at this location or nearby for a community playing field (see 15 above), drainage connections to a new sewage treatment works, and management/retention of existing woodlands, together with provision for a pedestrian link to Station Road before any houses on the site are occupied, and vehicular access through to Station Road ultimately". (10) ADJUST Proposals Map (to identify the approximate line of the link road from the C34 to Station Road). ADD to policy after "existing woodlands"... "and new planting".	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
ACTION Policy 20 Enhancement Tomatin Distillery	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (11) ADD after "context of the Distillery." ... "This could take place in association with a suitable business/tourism development on the site."	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.
Policy 23 Traffic/Pedestrian Mr & Mrs D. Anderson Mr & Mrs Robertson Mr & Mrs J. Simpson	The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s): (12) DELETE policy and REPLACE with "The Council will investigate the scope for measures to improve pedestrian safety through the village, and to address other safety and amenity concerns."	The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter's recommendation as stated in her Report.

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>Policy 24 A9 Mr & Mrs D. Anderson Mr & Mrs Robertson Mr & Mrs J. Simpson</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make no further Modification.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 26 BALNAIN Policy 1 SPECIAL USES Neil & Elizabeth Lyon Peter MacDonald Louise MacDonald Miss C. MacDonald Mary MacDonald SEPA Christine M. Munro Miss M.A. Munro Malcolm G. Munro Glenurquhart Community Council Dr U. Urquhart</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) DELETE policy “The Council will consider development proposals in accordance with the General Policies contained in the Local Plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area; consistent with the settlement pattern at Balnain, existing land uses and amenity.” and REPLACE with “SETTLEMENT POLICY Within the settlement boundary at Balnain, the Council will consider development proposals sympathetically where these accord with the General Policies contained in the local plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area, and are consistent with the settlement pattern, existing land uses and amenity”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 27 INVERMORISTON</p> <p>SPECIAL USES/ AMENITY AREAS SEPA Errol & Clare Levings Invermoriston Holiday Chalets</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly.</p> <p>(2) Further to discussions, SEPA has confirmed that it would not oppose development at Invermoriston provided that any private drainage arrangements discharge to land rather than water (see GP11 above). ADD to policy 2 after “at Invermoriston.”...“Private drainage arrangements will require to discharge directly to land rather than water.”</p> <p>(3) DELETE from para. 1 “likely to be recognised as part of the Natura 2000 network of conservation assets”. ADD after “and falls”...“comprise a candidate SAC and”.</p> <p>FACTUAL UPDATE: DELETE from policy 2 “NOSWA” and REPLACE with “Scottish Water”</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

Para/Objector(s)	Decision	Reason
<p>CHAPTER 28 DALCHREICHART</p> <p>SPECIAL USES Mr & Mrs Barnes Mr & Mrs Bostock Mr & Mrs Elliot Mr & Mrs Hampson Mr & Mrs Morris SEPA</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) Further to discussions, SEPA has confirmed that it would not oppose development at Dalchreichart provided that any private drainage arrangements discharge to land rather than water (see GP11 above).</p> <p>(2) DELETE policy 1 “The Council will consider development proposals in accordance with the General Policies contained in the Local Plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area; consistent with the settlement pattern at Dalchreichart, existing land uses and amenity.” and REPLACE with “SETTLEMENT POLICY Within the settlement boundary at Dalchreichart, the Council will consider development proposals sympathetically where these accord with the General Policies contained in the local plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area, and are consistent with the settlement pattern, existing land uses and amenity. Private drainage arrangements will require to discharge directly to land rather than water”.</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>
<p>FURTHER FORWARD: BEYOND 2011 The Garden History Society</p>	<p>The Planning Authority agreed to make the following Modification(s):</p> <p>(1) DELETE BP2 Policy “The Council will favour development unless this would significantly affect important features” and REPLACE with “The Council will permit development unless this would be likely to have a significantly adverse effect on, or be significantly adversely affected by, the features for which the area has been designated. Where it is concluded that any such adverse effects are likely to arise, development will only be permitted where it is considered that these would be outweighed by social or economic benefits”.</p> <p>(2) As above. Analysis Map to include historic gardens and designed landscapes identified in the <i>Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland</i> and those in the Inventory Interim list. ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly (to identify such features).</p>	<p>The Planning Authority accepted the Reporter’s recommendation as stated in her Report.</p>

* The Council agreed to the non-timeous representations by the Strathnairn Action Group to the policy (GP7) Mineral Workings together with the supporting petition to the Public Local Inquiry. The Reporter recommends no modification to the Plan, although the Council is invited to update the policy in factual terms. Members noted that the inquiry Report contained an erroneous reference to the petition having being withdrawn: there was no record that this was the case. An Erratum will accompany deposit of the Inquiry Report in due course. Notwithstanding, since matters raised in the petition and by the Action Group are the same, the Reporter has taken account of the relevant planning issues in reaching a conclusion.

NB Further factual, technical or consequential changes to the Local Plan arising from the above modifications will be made as necessary.

STATEMENT UNDER REGULATION 36 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (STRUCTURE AND LOCAL PLANS) SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 1983

Inverness Local Plan

Part 1	Deposit Draft with Modifications (2)	
	Strategy	p2
	The City of Inverness	p12
	Hinterland	p32
	Rural Development Area	p46
Part 2	Deposit Draft with Modifications	
	Strategy	p56
	The City of Inverness	p60
	Rural Development Area	p64

PART 1: Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft with Modifications (2)

The following objections to the Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft and Deposit Draft with Modifications have not been considered at a Public Local Inquiry.

STRATEGY

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

* denotes late objection/representation

<p>Introduction Inverness Civic Trust</p>	<p>On page 1, 3rd. para, it is stated, “Decisions on individual planning applications must accord with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise “What is ‘material’? A much more explicit undertaking should be given about what considerations would permit departures from the Development Plan. In the Trust’s experience, these departures have been the main reason for the failure of good planning in too many cases, notably when Councillors have yielded to the persuasion of incoming developers - and often against the recommendation of their own planners. The purpose of the Local Plan is to: “ensure effective participation by everyone. We think too many major proposals, such as Glebe Street recently, are discussed to an advanced stage in private, without public consultation. The solution to this would be to adopt the first principle of the Scottish Executive’s recent Consultation on “Getting involved in Planning”, which states, “We think councils should consider setting up local planning policy forums to consider planning issues and build up local Interest and expertise.” 72% of their respondents agreed with this. Such an arrangement would be particularly important in proposing “An Urban Design Strategy” - page 18 (c).</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. “Material considerations” are defined in legislation and elaborated in NPPG1. There is no requirement for the Local Plan to be more explicit. The Planning Authority is required to register “departures”. The Council supports the principle of community involvement. It is not a function of the Local Plan to determine the means by which this public participation should be embraced in particular projects.</p>
<p>FORWARD TO 2011 Highland Cycle Campaign</p>	<p>We welcome the references that already exist in the Brief which suggest that cyclists and pedestrians are not being forgotten. As well as the environmental, health and congestion benefits associated with walking and cycling they are socially inclusive - being available to many people of different income levels and different ages. It is therefore encouraging that the Brief contains section entitled "Pedestrians/Cyclists". However there are also various omissions that I outline in more detail.</p>	<p>DELETE “Most are now connected to Inverness by safe and segregated commuter cycle routes.” The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>
<p>Forward to 2011 Inverness Civic Trust</p>	<p>This statement on page 5 and the later “Forward to 2021” would read more convincingly if they were written as “Vision for the Future’ and not as if it had already happened.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. This is a matter of style. It appears broadly supported.</p>
<p>STRATEGY Para 1.5 Moray Estates Development Company</p>	<p>Recognise value of private sector landlords who provide an increasing amount of good quality, often affordable accommodation. We don't necessarily feel this is reflected in Local Housing Action Plan. For instance extension of renovation grants will allow more properties to be let at an acceptable return on an affordable basis.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. The Plan reflects a role for the private sector. The specific mechanisms are for consideration in the context of the Local Area Housing Plan.</p>
<p>Para. 1.5 Crofters Commission</p>	<p>We ask that, where crofting need is determined, planning for crofter housing and associate offices will be considered favourably. Likewise, where diversification/development proposals to augment crofting income are presented, then there should be a presumption to support these projects in the Local Plan. Where croftland is proposed for development, the Commission advise full consultation with the occupiers prior to final designation. This should facilitate the release of the land from crofting. The Crofters Commission has made separate representation through their agents Graham & Sib bald relating to Beechwood, Farm Inverness.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. Crofter housing is embraced within the principles of the Council’s Housing in the Countryside policy.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

Crafting may not manifest itself as a major land use in the area covered by the Plan; however it does contain some important areas of croft land adjoining villages and small settlements in the hinterland. While the plan provides for the protection of croft land and imparts sustainable land use, it must permit the occupation of crofts by granting permission for any housing that is required for the working of crofts or accommodation for their families. We request that this should be made explicit In the Local Plan.

This response will, therefore, be restricted to the effect the Draft Plan may have on crafting and croft land. While the amount of croft land affected by the plan is small, it is clear that where it exists it forms the core of the community and consequently its survival is essential to the development and keeping of traditional values inherent in rural crofting communities. We are in general supportive of development initiatives that enhance and further the Commission’s policy statement of achieving a Thriving Crofting Community.

For the most part, the Draft Plan provides protection for inbye croftland and safeguards the continuation of crofting in the hinterland, where the main crofting interests lie. Overall effect on croft land is of little significance. This is welcomed as there remains a very high, and unsatisfied, demand for croftland throughout the area covered by the plan. We are therefore content that, as presented, the Draft Plan will not adversely impact on crofting. However, there are some areas of concern and I will address these in turn.

Para. 1.21
Moray Estates
Development Company

We would challenge the assertion that the future for highland agriculture lies in "niche areas such as organic production". Highland Council need to recognise that scale of output of industry and consumer needs mean that for foreseeable future this will help only a minority of businesses. There is a need to support mainstream agriculture and production facilities as well as new niche facilities/enterprises.

ADD after “such as agriculture, where”...“ - as well as supporting mainstream production - ”.

The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.

Para. 1.28
Railtrack plc

The aspirations for increasing rail passenger services and freight use in the Moray Firth is known to Railtrack plc and supported in principle. The development proposals at the airport would be welcomed by Railtrack, but would need the full support and backing by the Scottish Executive and the SRA. The Highland Rail Partnership is in the process of making an application for RPP funding and is awaiting a decision from the Scottish Executive on the PTF bid already lodged for INVERNET. This is an initiative that will introduce commuter services from Inverness to Tain and Inverness to Kingussie. The services will require additional rolling stock and train crew resources, but there are no new stations planned as this stage. The proposal to build a rail link between the Inverness to Perth route and the Inverness to Aberdeen route on the east side of Inverness will require considerable earthworks and incur heavy rail infrastructure costs. It is very unlikely that this initiative would be taken forward and as before, the Scottish Executive and the SRA would need to endorse the proposal.

NO CHANGE.

These comments are substantially supportive of the Council’s objectives and those of the partner agencies.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
<p>Para. 1.31 The Garden History Society</p>	<p>The Society object to Chapter 1 of the Local Plan because it fails to acknowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the publication of the <i>Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland</i>; that Dalcross Castle is included within the <i>Inventory</i> and regarded as a site of national importance; that Beaufort Castle, Culloden House, Dochfour House and Tomnahurich Cemetery are considered as nationally important sites and are proposed as additions to the <i>Inventory</i>. <p>National planning policy guidance expects local plans to identify designated heritage assets worthy of conservation, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPPG 14: Natural Heritage in terms of the role of local plans in the protection of natural heritage (Para 12 and 71); and NPPG 18: Planning and the Historic Environment in terms of the role of local plans in the protection of the historic environment (Para 6 and 37). <p>The Council should recognise that gardens and designed landscapes make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the environment and quality of life enjoyed by local communities and they are worthy of conservation in their own right. The Society object to Chapter 1 of the Local Plan because it fails to acknowledge that the identification of historic gardens and designed landscapes of national importance is a continuous process and further examples may be identified in the future.</p> <p>National planning policy guidance expects local plans to identify heritage assets worthy of conservation, whether or not they have some form of statutory designation, particularly NPPG 18: Planning And The Historic Environment in terms of protecting locally significant buildings, townscape and landscape (Para 6 and 37).</p> <p>There are many gardens, parks and features of designed landscapes which contribute to the landscape character of Dundee and to the quality of life of local residents. This fact is recognised within the provisions of <i>NPPG 18</i> which states that "<i>locally significant ... landscape and other areas beyond the confines of formally designated areas are also important local resource and often merit protection on that basis</i>" (Para 6).</p> <p>Sites of local significance within the Inverness Local Plan area may include self contained gentlemen's estates, villa gardens and fragments of large estates, parks and cemeteries.</p> <p><i>A Preliminary List of Non-inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes around the Moray Firth</i> (March 1994) suggests that the undernoted sites may be worthy of conservation in their own right: Ballindarroch; Cantry House; Castle Stuart; Holme House; Inshes House; Laggan House; and Lentrane House.</p>	<p>AMEND Caring for Our Heritage accordingly. All the sites contained in the Inventory and those identified on the "Interim List" should be shown on the Caring for Our Heritage diagram. No additional policy reference is required.</p> <p>The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
	<p>Reword the section entitled, <i>Caring For Our Heritage</i> to highlight that gardens and designed landscapes make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the environment and quality of life enjoyed by local communities and they are worthy of conservation in their own right.</p> <p>National planning policy guidance expects local plans to seek to protect heritage assets of significance, particularly <i>NPPG 18: Planning And The Historic Environment</i> in terms of the role of local plans in the protection of the historic environment (Para 6 and 37). Amend the inset maps to designate the following sites as worthy of conservation in terms of Policy BP 3:Cantry House (Page 16 - Cantraywood); Holme House (Page 1 - City of Inverness - West); Laggan House (Page 21 - Scaniport); Lentrane House (Page 19 - Lentrane House).</p> <p>National planning policy guidance expects local plans to define built and natural heritage assets on proposals map with specific regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>NPPG 14: Natural Heritage</i> in terms of the role of local plans in the protection of natural heritage (Para 71); and • <i>NPPG 18: Planning and the Historic Environment (Para 6 and 37).</i> 	
<p>Para. 1.31 Graham Tuley</p>	<p>Creating Prosperity - map on page 10 shows no “Prime Land”, shows “Forestry/Woodland” over large areas which have no trees and shows no “Potential Forestry” in areas that are not already in the previous category. Significant native pine and birchwoods are not shown on page 10 but are shown as “Inventory Woodland” in the map (p.14). The road from Urquhart Castle alongside Loch Ness to Inverness is not shown as a tourist route.</p>	<p>AMEND Creating Prosperity accordingly.</p> <p>The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>
<p>Para. 1.32 Graham Tuley</p>	<p>Caring for our Heritage - 1.32 (p.16) says “A further 14,000 ha. in Glen Affric was recently designated as a National Nature Reserve. “but it is not shown as such in the map (p.14) and there must be a number of SSSI's that are not recorded.</p>	<p>AMEND Creating Prosperity accordingly.</p> <p>The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>
<p>Para. 1.48 (a) RSPB</p>	<p>We warmly welcome and support the statement in Section 1.48a (p22) as it covers both landscape and biodiversity issues: “The main policy thrust for such areas [Heritage/Natural Zone] should therefore to be to value their natural and semi-natural features... and to presume against intrusive developments which would detract from their intrinsic core qualities.”</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. Noted.</p>
<p>Para. 1.49 The Garden History Society</p>	<p>The Society object to the inset map - City of Inverness West (page 1) because it fails to designate Tomnahurich Cemetery as a historic landscape of national importance in terms of the background policies - Policy BP1 to BP4.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. Tomnahurich Cemetery is included as part of the “Interim List”. Playing fields and A Listed Buildings are BP3 features</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

The Council should recognise that Tomnahurich Cemetery is proposed for inclusion within the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland and is worthy of conservation in its own right.

The Council should seek to protect heritage assets worthy of conservation, whether or not they have some form of statutory designation in accordance with national planning policy guidance, particularly:

NPPG 18: Planning and the Historic Environment (para 6 and 37)

Para. 1.49
Scottish Executive
Environment and Rural
Affairs Department*

On 26 September 2001, the Scottish Executive issued a consultation paper on removing the special protection of prime quality agricultural land from development. After careful consideration of all the views received from respondents to the consultation exercise, the Executive concluded that there was no real purpose in retaining the Notification Direction in paragraph 1 of the schedule to Annex A of circular 4/1997. As you are aware, removing the Direction will not mean that prime quality land will not continue to be protected. Prime quality agricultural land will continue to be protected through relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Guidelines and Circulars (for example, Green Belt policies) and Ministers will still have an overview of prime land, given their role in approving structure plans and being informed of any significant proposals contrary to structure plans. For farming to continue it is vital, however, that farmers have sufficient scope to diversify into new enterprises and this needs to be re-examined to ensure that they do. This Department has therefore no further comments to make in regard to the Deposit Draft of the Inverness Local Plan.

NO CHANGE.
Noted.

Para. 1.49
RSPB

The map on pl0 and Sections 1.21 (p11) and 24.3 (p85) are the only mentions of Renewable Energy in the entire document. At present, the plan is of little value to either proponents or opponents of wind farms. The RSPB has two main concerns. Firstly, there is no explanation of the criteria used to choose the Potential Areas outlined on the map. Secondly, the policy towards wind farms outwith these areas are unclear. Whilst NPPG 6 (S47) states; "...the existence of such areas [broad areas of search] should not exclude development outwith these areas where they can be accommodated in a satisfactory manner.", it also states (548 and 49) that further guidance be provided in the Plan to allow developers to identify 'no go' areas or which criteria they would need to apply to consider moving outwith preferred areas. These are not provided. An explicit statement is needed from the Council on its policy on the potential location of wind farms in the area covered by this plan. If it includes areas not identified on the map then including Potential Areas is, at best, pointless and at worst, highly misleading.

AMEND Creating Prosperity diagram: **REPLACE** annotation "Potential area for Wind Farms" with "symbol".

ADD to 1.21 after "need to be balanced."..."There are parts of the landward area which offer potential for more productive uses along these lines. Harnessing and developing renewable resources could make a significant contribution to national energy objectives and through technological advancement, restore traditional economic links with communities founded on the major post-war hydro-schemes."

These references and the *Creating Prosperity* diagram do not contain the Development Plan policies. The policies governing the location of renewable energy proposals are set out in the Structure Plan (E1) and in the Local Plan BP1-4 provisions. The "potential area for Wind Farm" annotation reflects high/exposed ground with no significant constraints. The Plan is consistent with NPPG 6 in regard to the points raised. See above.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
GENERAL POLICIES GP 1 Design Principles Graham Tuley	The maps amongst the text of the “Written Statement” are still poor and there are still too many abbreviations used without explanations e.g. page 10 ADLS, page 14 SAM, NNR, SSSI, SAC, SPA etc. The promised explanations are not included in the Appendix to the Written Statement.	ADD to APPENDIX: ABBREVIATIONS The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.
GP 1 Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland	The Commission commented on the Consultation Draft in a letter dated 31st August 2001. It recommended that greater emphasis should be placed on the importance of good quality design. It also made site specific comments. The Commission would therefore welcome the greater emphasis that the Deposit Draft places on the need for good quality, sustainable architecture and landscape design. It would wish to be consulted further on the 'Draft Supplementary Development Plan Policy Guidelines' and the Urban Design Strategy for the regeneration of the City Centre.	NO CHANGE. Noted.
GP 3 Designed Sustainable Construction Homes for Scotland	Homes for Scotland welcome the commitment to prepare full policy guidance on design and sustainable construction. Many plans contain policy references to these issues without providing clear guidance and interpretation. Many of the issues highlighted in the Draft Plan are seen as desirable by Councils, but are not as yet covered in National Planning Policy or Building Regulations, and hence are seen by the industry as having undue cost implications. Homes for Scotland, through a technical working group, is working with the Scottish Executive on issues such as changes to Building Regulations, and would welcome the opportunity to comment on the detailed guidelines on design and sustainable construction to be produced by Highland Council through supplementary Development Plan Policy Guidelines.	NO CHANGE. This involvement is welcome.
GP 3 SEPA	SEPA strongly supports this policy which assists in delivering several of SEPA's environmental objectives. However, SEPA feels it could be strengthened further in order to assist delivery of the Highland Area Waste Plan, which sets out the future approach to waste management in the area generally. One important aspect is that there is to be source segregated kerbside collection of different fractions of waste. The Local Plan can assist by ensuring that new housing and other development are designed to facilitate this by provision of sufficient space at suitable locations within new housing and development. Supporting Policy GP3 Designed Sustainable Construction should be amended by inclusion of an additional criterion to the effect of: "provision of sufficient space at appropriate locations to facilitate source segregation of waste." SEPA objects to this policy unless the suggested wording or a suitable variation thereof is incorporated.	ADD after “re-use/recycling”...(including the separation/ collection of household, commercial or industrial waste)”. In recognition of the considerable changes proposed for waste management in Highland and the objectives of the Highland Waste Plan, these provisions should make reference to the point raised to draw attention for appropriate consideration in layouts. Policy GP3 also notes that the Council will prepare policy guidance on design and sustainable construction that will be contained in supplementary Development Plan Policy Guidelines. It is anticipated that the detailed aspects of design for waste management facilities in new developments will be set out within such a guideline. Work is currently being carried out to this effect, and will be the subject of widespread consultation which will include discussions with SEPA.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
GP 5 Waste Management Moray Estates Development Company	Accepted that future policy depends on Area Waste Plan but it is important that as a matter of principle facilities are not located in areas where this presence may prejudice future economic activity or residential expansion i.e. key sites in A96 corridor area.	NO CHANGE The location of any waste facilities will require to demonstrate consistency with the wider policy framework.
GP 6 Farm Diversification Moray Estates Development Company	Leisure activities such as golf should be supported, given the Plan's encouragement to recreational facilities and economic activity.	ADD after "business/visitor and "...leisure". The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.
GP 7 Mineral Workings Moray Estates Development Company	We notice the continued exclusion of sand and gravel deposits at Hillhead, Croy which are accessible and in a key area of demand. These reserves need to be included in the Plan.	NO CHANGE. The potential for mineral workings at Hillhead was identified in the existing Local Plan, adopted in 1994. An application for mineral workings at Hillhead has been considered and refused planning permission. This sought to extract 150,000 tonnes per year up to a total output of 1.5m tonnes. Given this background, and the terms of policy GP 7 which identifies sites with extant planning permission only, it would be appropriate to consider any future proposals for mineral workings at this location in the context of the provisions of the Local Plan and the policies which relate to the A96 Corridor. Whilst the latter seeks to safeguard the long term potential of the corridor for economic growth and urban expansion, it is acknowledged that the principle of mineral workings may contribute towards these objectives.
GP7 Mr & Mrs Smith	It has recently come to our attention that a policy statement on Mineral Workings has been removed from the proposed new Local Plan. We would like to raise an objection to the removal of this statement. The statement that has been removed stated '-... to make good any shortfall in the availability of materials, extensions of existing sites (operating with minimal environmental impact) will be given preference over new sites. ...' The deletion of this statement removes an important safeguard to residents in this area if further quarrying applications were to be submitted. As you are aware many parties have fought hard to try to ensure that Munro's application at Wester Lairgs is refused. Strathnaim already has two major quarries and we would support their right to expand in preference to the creation of new quarries. However any proposed expansion would also have to be carefully controlled. We would therefore request that: 1. The above statement be reinstated. 2. The following statement be added: 'The Council will not support any quarrying	See above.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
	operations which may cause detriment to the amenity and enjoyment of residential properties in proximity to such developments.'	
GP 9 Trunk Roads Inverness Civic Trust	On page 26, GP9: These measures are vital in all built-up areas, large and small, of the Plan, where the great majority of people live and work. It is not enough to say they “will be pursued as resources permit”. Will they or will they not have priority over other uses of the Council’s resources?	NO CHANGE. There are many schemes competing for limited resources. It is not appropriate for the Local Plan to give priority to traffic management ahead of other transport projects, unless the Council or other relevant partners have taken such a decision. In most cases, the Plan is promoting consideration of potential schemes which are prioritised when funding becomes available or is reviewed. This enables flexibility and the opportunity to adjust priorities according to changing circumstances.
GP 14 Contaminated Land SEPA	SEPA supports this policy generally as it assists in delivering several of SEPA's environmental objectives, but objects unless the following factors are incorporated within an amended policy. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Contamination may have also migrated onto a proposed development site from nearby land uses (for example, hazardous gases from an adjacent landfill site) so developers may need to be made aware that site investigations may become necessary even if the site of interest has had no previous contaminative use. b) SEPA's current interpretation of Part IIA requirements is that investigations relating to water receptors should consider <u>controlled waters</u>, not just <u>watercourses</u> as listed in the second bullet point. The booklet "Water pollution arising from land containing chemical contaminants" is enclosed for further information and explanation. c) It is suggested that "contaminant migration" is a more inclusive term than "leaching" given the various modes of fate and behaviour of materials, for example miscible in water (leaching), or immiscible (free product migration through strata). d) SEPA also objects to the form of words which refers to site survey and analysis but does not refer to the use of risk assessment, a key element in modern practice of dealing with land contamination issues. 	DELETE “water courses” and REPLACE with “controlled waters”. DELETE “detailed site survey and analysis” and REPLACE with “risk assessment”. DELETE “leaching” and REPLACE with “contaminant migration”. The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.
GP 15 Flood Appraisal SEPA	SEPA supports the preparation of an Integrated Catchment Management Plan for the River Ness, and supports (and is pleased to be part of) the Flood Appraisal Group which will cover the Area generally. However, SEPA considers that an important omission in that part of the important River Nairn Catchment Area falls within the Plan Area for which a similar Integrated Catchment Management Plan is essential. SEPA objects unless the policy is amended to incorporate reference to this.	ADD after “River Ness”... “and River Nairn”. The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
<p>GP 21 Bio-diversity Initiative SEPA</p>	<p>SEPA strongly supports this policy insofar as it goes. However, the Policy does not at all develop the land use planning implications of the need to protect and enhance biodiversity and the wider natural heritage (as requested by SEPA in its response to the Consultative Draft of the Local Plan). SEPA therefore objects unless the policy is amended, or a new policy is introduced, to identify how protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the wider natural heritage are to be achieved in land use planning terms.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. See above. There is protection in the terms sought embodied within the general policies in the Plan.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

THE CITY OF INVERNESS

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
<p>CHAPTER 2 THE CITY OF INVERNESS Para. 2.1 Highland Archivist</p>	<p>Mention should be made within the Local Plan of the Council's main Archive Repository being sited within the Inverness area. Reference to the Highland Archive and Genealogy Centre could be added at the end of para. 1.38: "it would benefit from hosting a major cultural attraction, and consideration is being given to" establishing a Highland Council Archive and Genealogy Centre.</p> <p>In addition, reference to the Centre could be added to within the revitalization and regeneration objectives. The Highland Archive and Genealogy Centre in some form in the definitive Inverness Local Plan as this would help in the current drive toward building an Archive Repository in the Inverness area.</p>	<p>DELETE from 2.1 "Highland bid for European Capital of Culture 2008." and REPLACE with "the Highlands resurgent culture and heritage."</p> <p>The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>
<p>General Inverness Civic Trust</p>	<p>The Trust's main comment on this section is that this is a useful and comprehensive agenda for the Planning of the City. We actively support most of its Proposals</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. Noted.</p>
<p>Policy 5 Circulation Inverness Civic Trust</p>	<p>The same point as at GP9 above arises at page 30, 5, Pedestrian Priority in the City Centre and its approaches, and the related Urban Distributor Roads, in Proposal 29 on page 35; namely: is pedestrian priority truly to be given priority over other uses of the Council's resources?</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Policy 7(iii) Muirtown Basin Muirtown Community Council</p>	<p>This Council would welcome the development of this area. However it again brings to attention the inadequacy of the existing Muirtown Bridge canal crossing. The development of the basin would provide the opportunity for the building of an additional crossing at Muirtown to the benefit of the City in general.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. Regeneration of Muirtown Basin will be subject to Traffic Impact Assessment.</p>
<p>Policy 7(iii) British Waterways</p>	<p>For the avoidance of doubt, British Waterways would wish to be identified as one of the bodies involved in preparing the Development Brief/Masterplan, to ensure that the waterspace and related landbased development aspects of the regeneration scheme are fully considered and reflected.</p> <p>The extent of the Muirtown Basin regeneration area, although defined in the Written Statement as 13.5 ha., is not clearly identified on the Proposals Map. In any event, the masterplanning process should lead the determination of the site boundaries. The Local Plan should allow for the appropriate flexibility to ensure the maximum potential of Muirtown Basin as a focus for regeneration is realised.</p>	<p>ADD after "A feasibility study"...", to be pursued in partnership with British Waterways,".</p> <p>The Local Plan indicates the Muirtown Basin regeneration area on the Proposals Map. British Waterways requirements are met by the accompanying policy which refers to land assembly enables some flexibility by referring to "adjoining land" and the main "Regeneration" policy.</p>
<p>Policy 7(iv) Inverness Civic Trust</p>	<p>We object to Proposal 7 (iv) for an "urban village" (with or without a supermarket) on what should be a recreational green wedge as proposed in para. 2.6 on p.30 and 41 (vi) on p.38. "Inverness should make the most of its position adjoining the Firths, as the Longman area between the A9 and the sea is transformed into a nature reserve and recreational links, complementing the adjacent European conservation sites."</p>	<p>See above.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
Policy 7(v) Rail Yard/College Railtrack plc	The Council must ensure that nothing is done to compromise the current freight leases and it is understood that EWS are currently in the process of altering their lease of Millburn/Needlefield to accommodate Freightliner Heavy Haul who now handle the Lafarge/Blue Circle cement traffic.	NO CHANGE. The Plan indicates that any regeneration would be subject to maintaining rail freight operations.
Policy 7(vi) Craig Dunain Inverness West Community Council	While we are happy with the policy on the development of Craig Dunain, we feel the development brief should be incorporated into an Integrated Development Plan for the whole West side of the City.	NO CHANGE. The purpose of the Local Plan is to bring forward a land use framework within which development and other changes can progress. In this context, expansion at Charleston is predicated on a Development Brief which will relate the allocated land to other development opportunities including at Craig Dunain and Torvean; with major infrastructure investment including in the SDR and the mains water and drainage networks; and with the proposed management of the adjoining green wedges, notably any relocation of the golf course and rugby fields. The Brief will also examine the impact of development at the district and neighbourhood levels, identify deficiencies in community facilities and services including affordable housing, education, recreation, traffic and transportation and identify the scope for developer contributions in respect of these matters. The Brief will be the subject of local consultation.
Policy 7(vii) Ashton Railtrack plc	11, 19 and 23 Railtrack has noted these policies, however, whilst the Council may aspire to have new passenger stations created, re-locate the main railway station at Inverness and re-instate the rail link to the harbour, all of these initiatives will require support both in strategic and financial terms from the Scottish Executive and the SRA.	NO CHANGE. These points are noted. It is intended that the Local Plan should indicate the Council's long term aspirations for the urban rail network to assist such discussions.
Policy 11 Longman Alastair Owens	Errors have been made in the past with the siting of unsuitable developments on Stadium Road such as the football stadium, the store for road salt and the site for travelling people, all of which may now have to be removed. It is essential therefore that any future developments on this road will be appropriate to this unique setting which commands one of the finest waterfront views in Scotland and is a priceless asset to the city. I was surprised to hear that possible uses for the area of reclaimed land west of the Kessock Bridge will be for a bus depot and warehouses, which I consider to be totally unsuitable for this prime site and I submit that prestige office or residential development would be more appropriate. Well designed buildings of this type would present a much better appearance along the waterfront and enable a greater number of people to enjoy the remarkable views.	NO CHANGE. The Plan seeks to promote land uses according to a range of factors. In these circumstances, the requirement for land for economic development and the proximity of the reclaimed land to established business and industry and related infrastructure are overriding considerations.
Policy 11 Graham Tuley	Supports Millburn Road (Policy 19) "dedicated pedestrian/cycle tunnel" under the railway as mentioned in Policy 11 (p.33) and for a similar "tunnel" under the A9 and slip roads.	NO CHANGE. Noted.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
Policy 18 Police HQ Mr & Mrs Grant per Graham & Sibbald	Mr & Mrs Grant lodge an objection to the modifications proposed on the deposit draft.	See above.
Policy 28 Cross Rail Link Railtrack plc	<p>Railtrack are working closely with the development of this scheme, and are pleased to see the statement "without prejudice to development of land for railway operations" included in the policy.</p> <p>In addition, the rail yard north of the new road link must be included on the proposals map, allocated for rail freight and industrial use (as well as the commercial uses mentioned in the plan). The former Carriage Cleaning Sheds area should also be zoned for rail freight/industrial use.</p>	<p>AMEND Proposals Map accordingly.</p> <p>The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>
Policy 29 Urban Distributor Roads Muirtown Community Council	This Council welcomes any improvements to these roads that would bring greater safety to all users. The Council would like to see the provision of a safer crossing of Canal Road, near its junction with Clachnaharry Road, to give safer access to the South side of Muirtown Bridge.	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>Such actions are compatible with the policy.</p>
Policy 30 Park-n-Ride Muirtown Community Council	This Council would like to see the provision of a park-'n'-ride facility for those travelling from the Beauly area. The opening of a rail halt at Clachnaharry would partly serve this purpose.	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>Noted. However, the Plan is giving priority to the trunk road gateways and major development opportunities attaching to these locations.</p>
Policy 31 Park-n-Ride Railtrack plc	The provision of additional stations will need to be supported by the Scottish Executive and the SRA, there may be performance implications for Railtrack and the TOC that will require additional funding from the SRA. Therefore whilst Railtrack will cooperate with the Council on these initiatives, apart from the City Centre transport interchange, the rest are seen as very long-term aspirations.	<p>See related issue 7(vii) objections above.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Policy 32 Urban Cycle Routes British Waterways	Where cycle routes are proposed on BW land, BW seeks assurances of consultation and agreement on routing and specification.	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>These requirements are consistent with those of any landowner. Appropriate agreement will be necessary.</p>
Policy 32 Graham Tuley	Policy 32 Urban Cycle Routes (p.35) states the "ISCRN... as identified on the Proposals Map, ..." but there are no cycle routes on the large map called Inverness Local Plan Proposals Map and the book of maps are not call Proposals Maps and the Legend is for "Cycle Route/Footpath ". I support adequate provision of cycle routes but there must be separate provision for walkers and the two cannot be lumped together in all cases.	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The Local Plan is seeking to establish a link with the ISCRN as part of the statutory planning framework. These strategic routes are often shared. The ISCRN provides the basis for implementation.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
Policy 33 Surface Water Drainage SEPA	<p>SEPA strongly supports this policy which assists in delivering several of SEPA's environmental objectives. However it could be enhanced in several ways and hence SEPA objects unless the policy is amended to take these on board. Firstly, while SEPA supports the intention to retain sufficient flow in existing watercourses to maintain dilution, prevent stagnation and preserve amenity, there should also be an overt intention to also retain nature conservation interests. Secondly, the policy needs to refer to the need to avoid wherever possible culverting or channelising of existing watercourses and to seek wherever possible restoration of culverted or channelised watercourses. NPPG14 (Paragraph 56) states that developers "should generally be encouraged to seek alternatives to extensive culverting or canalisation, as these greatly reduce the ecological and amenity value of watercourses and culverting can also increase the risk of flooding. Opportunities should be taken to restore culverted or canalised watercourses in redevelopment and land rehabilitation schemes". It is understood that culverting in Inverness contributed to recent flooding and hence the inclusion of these elements in this policy relating to Inverness is particularly appropriate.</p>	<p>See above. The reference to culverting and channelising are technical and design matters which are dealt with by the reference to GP12.</p>
Policy 33 Inverness Civic Trust	<p>Proposals 33 and 34 to proceed with a Flood Prevention Order for the wider catchment area are strongly supported and should have priority. Major developers should be required to include a Flood Prevention Assessment with their planning applications, as is now mandatory for Transport Impact Assessments.</p>	<p>See above. Noted.</p>
Policy 33 Lochardil and Drummond Community Council	<p>Firstly, the Council is generally supportive of the various proposals for the Lochardil and Drummond area. The Council was particularly pleased to note that a number of amendments had been made to the Consultative Draft as a result of their representations. In relation to the local area, the main points raised by the Council were: Full support was expressed for policy 36(ii) in relation to the need for the Inverness Storm Water Relief Interceptor being constructed before further development can take place at Culduthel / Slackbuie. You will appreciate that this is a key issue for a number of residents in the light of recent events. The Council intends to keep a "watching brief" on this matter in the coming months and will be pressing for a resolution to the problem.</p>	<p>See above. Surface water drainage in the City's expansion areas will be addressed through the Council's proposal to create a surface water interceptor and a requirement on developers to demonstrate a SUDS package founded on the 200-year flood return period with 30% additional capacity. These circumstances must represent substantial betterment on the effect of flash flooding on the ground, in its present condition and use, consistent with the Council's wider flood objectives.</p>
EXPANSION Policy 36&37 Inverness Civic Trust	<p>Proposal 36 says that Development Briefs/Master Plans, as in proposal 37, are to be prepared in consultation with the public. We welcome this statement and think it should be strengthened as a firm commitment.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. Noted. The Plan indicates that Briefs/Masterplans will be a requirement.</p>
Policy 36(ii) Culduthel-Slackbuie SEPA	<p>SEPA strongly supports the principle that development in each of the major allocations will be subject to an agreed Development Brief/Master Plan to be prepared in consultation with inter alia agencies, and will be pleased to be consulted on these to ensure that its interests are reflected in the resulting development.</p>	<p>DELETE "interim". The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

However, SEPA objects to the sentence in the Culduthel-Slackbuie section which states that "Development phased ahead of the latter [the Storm Water Relief Interceptor] will be dependent on adequate interim surface water drainage measures by the developer acceptable to the Council" unless it is modified to make it clear that developers would be expected to demonstrate that the drainage arrangements were acceptable on a permanent basis and would be integrated with the proposed drainage development for the area in general. SEPA's experience has been that interim, piecemeal drainage measures can prove to be very difficult to integrate.

Policy 36(v)
Charleston
 Inverness West
 Community Council

The reference to the Canal Crossing should also apply to this paragraph. We are also a bit puzzled by the reference to a distributor road linking General Booth Road and Leachkin Road, as these roads are already joined.

ADD after “dependent on”...”completion of”. **ADD** after “Phase V”...” (including a canal crossing”.
 A distributor road will be required through the development areas at Charleston. This will extend from General Booth Road through to Leachkin Road.

Policy 37
Developer
Contributions
 Scottish Executive
 Development
 Department Planning*

The policy on Developer Contributions was identified as being seriously flawed in relation to Circular 12/1996 and Section 75 of the Act and while it is noted that the wording of Policy 37 has been changed slightly from the draft, it is insufficient to make it comply with the Circular. The effect of the wording is to appear to impose a tax on the development value of land in anticipation of such land being identified as suitable for development. This is clearly outwith the intention of planning legislation and should be changed to reflect Circular 12/1996.

DELETE “DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS 37 Individual Expansion Areas... confirmed in the Local Plan.” and **REPLACE** with ”DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS 37

The principle points raised in respect of the Council’s expectations of Developer Contributions relate to the compatibility of policy with Circular 12/96 which deals with Planning Agreements, the need ensure that contributions relate in scale and kind to the development proposed, clarification of the method by which contributions will be delivered and acceptance that Section 75 Agreement may not be necessary in every case. These matters can be addressed by updating the policy in light of the Council’s experience in respect of expansion at Firthview-Woodside (Cradlehall-Westhill). However, there are matters of principle which the Council may wish not to concede at this point. First, the Executive is not explicit about the extent to which the Local Plan is incompatible with 12/96. The Council believes that the Development Plan is the basis on which to found Developer Contributions, that its responsibility in terms of NPPG3 is to ensure an effective supply of land for development; that the effectiveness of its land allocations is dependent upon infrastructure and service deficiencies being overcome; and that, set against diminishing public resources, this must derive in part through Developer Contributions. Provided that Developer Contributions do meet the terms of 12/96 (where they involve a Planning Agreement) its

policy is not out of keeping with the Circular which indicates that “Such agreements can be used to overcome obstacles to the grant of planning permission; in this way development can be allowed to proceed, the quality of development can be enhanced and potentially negative impacts on land use, the environment and infrastructure can be reduced, eliminated or compensated for...planning authorities should only require planning agreements to be entered into, if in land use planning terms it would be wrong to grant planning permission without them.” It is accepted nonetheless that the Local Plan is in its final stages and that it may not be practical to seek such agreements in relation to the City’s expansion areas prior to the land allocations being confirmed in the Plan. They may however be necessary to enable the grant of planning permission.

The Council will seek developer contributions towards resolving deficiencies in infrastructure and services, including affordable housing, transport and roads, education, community facilities, recreation and other public infrastructure, in order to facilitate development. Where necessary, these will be secured by Section 75 Agreement compliant with Circular 12/96, relate in scale and kind to the development proposed and be proportionate to the deficit or additional burden arising from the impact of the development proposed on the respective City district and neighbourhood. The timing of related works may be dependent upon the aggregation of resources, including where applicable, the allocation of funding by the Council or relevant agency. Insofar as these principles relate to the City’s Expansion areas and Regeneration sites, such requirements, where possible, will be set in the context of a Development Brief/Master Plan as identified. They will be accompanied by a Protocol identifying expected financial contributions and developer requirements. These provisions will apply to all land within the City of Inverness allocated for housing, business/industry, special and community uses in this Local Plan, and in other circumstances where the Council is minded to grant planning permission.

38 Such Developer Contributions will be distinguished from other planning obligations for which developers will be wholly and entirely responsible and which the Council will expect to be

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

		<p>fulfilled as an integral part of development proposals, whether on or off-site. Where a development proposal involves more than one landowner/developer, these obligations will be expected to be met by individual interests on a fair and equitable basis and in proportion to their share of the overall development potential. In these circumstances all parties will be expected to enter into an appropriate agreement transferring land and quantifying the extent of works or financial commitments. This will be accompanied by definitive plans relating to ground for roads and other public purposes which it is anticipated will be transferred at zero consideration to the Council or other agency as appropriate.”</p>
--	--	--

<p>Policy 37 Developer Contributions Graham Tuley</p>	<p>Developer Contribution for Action Areas (Policy 7 pp.31 & 32) should include: Glenurquhart Road - public toilets, improved paths and new long term tree planting; Muirtown Basin - improved foot and cycle routes; Longman Bay - grade separated interchange, tunnel under A9 for cyclists and walkers; Rail Yard/College - cross-rail link as a tunnel and space for combined bus/rail station; and Craig Dunain - Southern Distributor Road.</p>	<p>ADD to 6 after “cyclist improvements”...”possibly with public conveniences”. ADD to 7(iii) after “Traffic Assessment”...”and may require to address adjacent foot and cycle routes”. ADD to 7(iv) 6 after “trunk road junction”...” (possibly a grade separated interchange).</p> <p>There will be no requirement for developer contributions towards the SDR in association with Craig Dunain. See above.</p> <p>The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>
--	---	---

<p>Policy 37 Developer Contributions Inverness Civic Trust per Mr G.Tuley</p>	<p>The Trust supports the production of detailed Development Briefs/Master Plans and suggests that this should be strengthened as a firm commitment. The comment "NO CHANGE" we believe is misleading because there has been significant change to this paragraph and the Trust believes that it has been weakened rather than strengthened.</p>	<p>Noted. NO CHANGE.</p>
--	---	-------------------------------------

<p>Policy 39 Retailing Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd per Turley Associates</p>	<p>On behalf of our client, Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd, we wish to lodge the following representations to the Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft 2002.</p> <p>We seek clarification in Policy 1 ‘City Centre Uses’ of the wider city centre boundary and the mix of uses encouraged within this area. We seek clarification in Policy 1 of the extent of the city centre boundary. The boundary is not clearly defined in the plan. Policy 1 says that proposals which seek a significant increase in retail floor-space will be subject to Retail Impact Assessment. We seek clarification as to what a ‘significant’ increase in retail floor-space is.</p>	<p>See above. The term “significant increase in retail floor-space” is defined as 2,500 sq. m.</p>
--	---	--

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

We believe that flexibility should be built into policy guiding development in the various actions areas / expansion areas highlighted in the plan. For example, we believe that convenience food retailing in neighbourhood centres (e.g. the proposed new District Centre in Culduthel-Slackbuie) should be considered suitable as an integral part of a wider mix of uses, if sufficient justification can be provided.

**Policy 39
Retailing**
Graham Tuley

I object to the use of “sq. m. (gross)” in Policy 39 when “sq. ft.” is used in policy 1. It means that the proposal at 110, 000 sq. ft. is more than half the size of Eastgate II. I assume that “(7(ii) (v))” in the last bullet point of Policy 39 means “Torvean” and “Rail Yard/College”. I object to a “bulky-goods/warehouse” mentioned in Policy 39 at Torvean which is not indicated in the text associated with Action Area 7(ii) on p.31. I am concerned that this policy might be used to allow large “out of town” developments to be approved anywhere that a developer might propose including Asda at the Longman.

See above.
ADD to 7(ii) after “park-n-ride”...“retailing, in accordance with 39 below”.
ADD to 7(v) after “residential halls”...”and retailing, in accordance with 39 below”.
The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.

**Policy 41
Green Wedges**
Mr M.M. Cameron per
G.H. Johnston

The area of land owned by Mr Cameron and shown on the enclosed plan should be taken with the settlement boundary and be allocated for expansion. There would appear to be limited development potential in Balloch and this site, subject to vehicular, pedestrian and cycle route improvement, has we submit, potential for limited residential (paddock style) and major leisure developments.

The Council would wish to be assured that road improvements on Culloden Road could be brought up to a standard suitable to the Director of Roads and Transport. Following discussion with representatives of the Roads Director, we feel that it is possible to make the required improvements. Balloch, we feel lacks a major recreation area, and if houses in a paddock form are placed around the edge of this land, then the central area could be used for park, leisure and social activities, such as a cricket pitch, playground and children’s play park. As the road passing this land (Culloden road) is the main route into Balloch from Culloden Battlefield, an opportunity would exist to create a major gateway feature.

The land proposed for inclusion for expansion is of low agricultural value and will not detract from the viable working of any farm. The amenity currently enjoyed by the adjoining residential properties can be protected if new housing was to be placed round the south, east and west sides of the land and the central area for leisure and recreation left open to the north boundary. The Highland Council has already approved erosion onto this land with the granting of planning permission for housing.

On behalf of Mr M M Cameron we formally maintain an objection to the Highland Council adopting the Deposit Draft Local Plan in that the area of land owned by Mr Cameron and indicated in the enclosed plan should be removed from Para 6 Hinterland and included within the Balloch Neighbourhood Plan. Para 2.25 should be amended to include Mr Cameron’s land as stated above.

See above.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
<p>Policy 44 Public Access British Waterways</p>	<p>Where BW land and in particular the Caledonian Canal towpath is identified as part of the strategic multi-user route network, BW seeks assurances of consultation and agreement on route development.</p>	<p>ADD after “on the Proposals Map”...“for discussion with landowners”.</p> <p>These views are respected, subject to any access “rights”. See 32 above.</p>
<p>Policy 44 Public Access Graham Tuley</p>	<p>Public Access (Policy 44 p39) includes “A major “Paths A round Inverness” initiative which aims to open up the urban fringe ... These routes are identified on the Proposals map...” There are no paths around Inverness on the Proposals Map. A number of minor comments on paths are:</p> <p>Crown Road on Millburn District map (p.7) and City Centre map (p.9) is a “Cycle Route/Footpath” and hope that this will mean that the footpath is maintained in future. The path is on the east side of the road on the south side of the Eastgate Centre but on the west side before its junction with Millburn Road. Where is the crossing? Will someone coming down Crown Road have to use 4 sets of lights to reach Falcon Square?</p> <p>There is no footpath shown: from Millburn Road between the Superstore and Eastgate II to the Railway Station; from the end of Crown Road to the Railway Station across Falcon Square; between the Railway and Bus Stations; flight of steps down the east side of the Eastgate Centre is not shown as a footpath (maps on pp.7 & 9); path between Auldcastle Road and Millburn Road (map p.7).</p> <p>All of these must be accepted as paths and maintained by the Council as necessary.</p> <p>I am pleased to see that the footpath on the east bank of the River Ness does not divert up Bridge Street (as at present involving 4 sets of traffic lights) and wonder when this will be implemented and hope that only one set of lights will be needed to cross.</p> <p>I am pleased that Policy 5 (ii) (p.30) proposes improvements to Market Brae and the Raining Stairs but these are not shown as footpaths (map p.9). “Furniture” should be replaced by “seating and soft landscaping including trees and shrubs” so that we are in no doubt that these which have been removed from the High Street and Eastgate will be replaced.</p> <p>Does the last bullet point of Policy 6 (p.31) mean that a pavement will be constructed alongside the river at Ness Walk as shown on the display board by the Cathedral? Will there be a pavement from the Ness Islands right to the Swimming Pool?</p>	<p>AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly.</p> <p>These points relate largely to matters of detail and design or are for consideration in the implementation of proposals City Centre/Riverfront or Crown. Existing paths are not shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
DISTRICTS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS DISTRICT: WEST Para. 2.7 Inverness West Community Council	<p>We are concerned that this paragraph is misleading. The housing development potential in the area includes land at New Craigs and Craig Dunain, as well as at Charleston. The total is likely to be considerably greater than 700 new houses, and the plan should say so. In addition, the plan should state that these developments are dependent on the provision of a permanently open Canal crossing, as part of the completion of the Southern Distributor Road.</p>	<p>ADD to 2.7 after “Southern Distributor Road”...“Phase V (canal crossing)”.</p> <p>The land allocated for expansion embraces Charleston and Craig Phadrig. Applying average urban densities, 700 houses is a reasonable estimate of capacity.</p>
Policy 54 Alastair Owens	<p>I objected to Railtrack’s planning application for their strengthening works on the Clachnaharry railway bridge, on the grounds that their proposals would result in creating a dangerous and unacceptable situation for road users, and I suggested that a new bridge should be constructed further west, designed to comply with current standards for new roads and bridges. Unfortunately Railtrack’s plans were approved, although they were lacking in many important details and now that the work is virtually complete, road users are horrified at the inferior situation they now have to face. The leading article in to-day’s Inverness Courier sums up the situation well.</p> <p>I submit therefore that an item should be added to the Inverness Local Plan calling for a new railway bridge, designed to current standards for roads and bridges, to be constructed at Clachnaharry, west of the existing bridge.</p>	<p>ADD “The Council will keep under review the scope to carry out improvements at the railway bridge/B862 junction at Clachnaharry.”</p> <p>The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>
DISTRICT: MILLBURN Policy 87 Culcabock & Drakies Community Council	<p>We question the omission of the proposed primary school from this paragraph. We also feel that all future developments in this area should cease until a school is built at Inshes and a proper infrastructure in place.</p> <p>We question the date for 2003/4. We feel this is not realistic for this project 2005 – 2009 is a more realistic time and all further developments in Drakies School catchment area should be curtailed until Inshes School is up and running.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>Provision is made to build a new school at Inshes by 2004/5. This will require and be subject to acquisition of land and planning permission by the end of 2003 and a start of construction by mid 2004. The Council intends that this school be given priority as part of the PPP2 contract under which it will be built. It is acknowledged that the roll at Drakies Primary School is high, and that spare capacity exists at other primary schools in the vicinity. It is for the Council as Education Authority to take any necessary steps to accommodate pupils arising from new development at Inshes at appropriate locations.</p>
Policy 87 Dereck MacKenzie per Graham and Sibbald	<p>We act on behalf of Mr. Dereck MacKenzie the owner of the land identified in red on the attached copy of page 1 of the inset maps forming part of the Deposit Draft dated September 2002. This land is shown on the current Local Plan as Paragraph 4.3.17(c) and appears to be identified on the Deposit Draft as Paragraph 36 (i). On the inset maps the land appears to be identified as “5” namely Special Uses which is not specific to School Use and could include alternative uses within this category.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The Council is currently in negotiations with the landowner to acquire this land for development of a school (see above)..</p>
	<p>Paragraph 87 of the written statement also refers to the 2.0 hectares of land but it is</p>	

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

understood from discussions with your officers that there is a strong possibility that the exact location of the Primary School is still fluid and could well be relocated further to the south to cater for the option outlined in Paragraph 88 whereby only one school will be provided to serve both Inshes and Milton of Leys neighbourhoods. Whilst it is appreciated the Highland Council wishes to maintain the zoning on the subject land for a Primary School until such time as the definite location is decided upon, the landowner wishes the assurance that in the event of the subject site no longer being identified for the school that it would be appropriate to rezone the land for residential use. Residential use is considered to be the most appropriate alternative use in view of the Planning Permissions which exist in respect of the adjoining sites lying to the northeast and southeast.

DISTRICT:
CULLODEN
Policy 97 (i and ii)
Balloch Community Council

On behalf of the Balloch Community Council I have the following comments and objections to the Inverness Local Plan - Deposit Draft dated September 2002.

1. The detail on housing has changed significantly from the Draft Plan of June 2001. Areas 10 and 11 in the Draft had a housing capacity of 10 and 6 units respectively. In the Deposit Draft, identified as 95i and 95ii, those units are removed. We would wish to see the housing capacity included.

2. The area of 0.4 ha for housing 16 units at Upper Cullernie identified as 9 on the Draft has disappeared on the Deposit Plan. This area is identified as 102 and now only refers to 'community/commercial' use. The second sentence in this paragraph on p 51 of the Deposit seems to define this as suitable for a bowling club and green, a park and play area. We welcome the recognition that Balloch needs more land for community use.

We would wish to see a more explicit statement, if the definition of 'community/commercial' could include some form of varying needs housing. Additionally if it could mean housing, then 16 units, identified in the 2001 Draft, would be the maximum in this area.

3. The Community Council are concerned about the possible uncontrolled housing sprawl beyond the boundaries of Balloch. In particular any development between Balloch and Feabuie which eventually removes both communities' distinct identity. The Local Plan Proposals Map gives little confidence that this distinction will be preserved. However paragraph 1.36 on p 16 of the Deposit Draft clearly shows that the Highland Council recognise this threat;

'Other threats include the continuing erosion of open countryside by development, principally unplanned aggregations of housing ...'

DELETE "95(i) 0.6 ha. of land...varying needs".

95 (i) This allocation is opposed by the landowner and therefore understood not to be available.

DELETE "95(ii) 0.6 ha. of land...varying needs".

DELETE from 2.25 "varying needs" and "and park".

ADD after "Other open space"..."/community facilities are".

DELETE "is".

ADD after "housing areas is required"... "These could be met south of Balloch and at Cullernie in the event that land becomes available."

95 (ii) In view of the strength of local views this site should not be promoted for development.

The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

We expect this to be an important consideration in any future planning decisions in this area.

Policy 97 (i & ii)
Alex Bennet

As a resident of the village of Balloch for the past 17 years, I wish to object to the Deposit Draft Plan as it affects part of the village.

See above.

I was disappointed to note that at page 51, clause 102 makes no reference to housing and that previous references to the local housing need have been omitted from this draft, with particular reference to the area known as Upper Cullernie. This reference has been omitted between drafts and I have no understanding as to why this should be the case as there has certainly been **NO CHANGE** in the housing needs of the village in the period between the drafts.

I also note that there has been a recent addition of two areas of ground in the village, reference to clauses 95 (i) & 95 (ii), both of which have been identified for variable needs housing. This is illogical in that it takes in “green” areas into development when the area at 102 is wholly within a developed zone already. I believe that the area 102 has always been zoned for development since Tulloch Homes received Planning Permission for the Wellside Estate in the early 90’s. Why then has this area not been zoned to include housing in this draft? There is a demonstrable local need for it.

I have recently been involved with the Community Council and I am aware of the need for smaller housing units (varying needs) to meet the needs of two sectors of the community; that of the elderly who wish to stay in the village in smaller accommodation and do not wish to leave to find it and; that of first time buyers who wish to stay in the community that they were brought up in or those who wish to settle in this community as a desirable location.

To this end I would wish to see the area referred to above, zoned for variable needs housing at a density commensurate with the site conditions, I would suggest a maximum of 16 units would be required, in conjunction with the wish by Balloch Social & Outdoor Bowling Club to establish long awaited and needed facilities on that site. I am fully aware that there is strong support in the village for these facilities as there is none at present. The youth of the village do need to have every opportunity to partake of activities in their own village, otherwise we will see an unwelcome rise in unacceptable activities i.e. vandalism, drug taking, etc.

Area 102 already has the necessary services available to service this site and I note that the Local Bowling Club have applied, jointly, with Tulloch Homes to develop the site for a Bowling Club Pavilion and Green, associated parking, 16 Housing units and associated open ground. I believe that this is wholly appropriate for this site.

I would be pleased if you will consider this representation and include area 102 for variable needs housing.

Balloch Housing
Hurd Rolland
Partnership

We met with yourselves recently to discuss our client's current application for outline planning consent to develop residential properties at the above site. We discussed with you the significant delay encountered in determining said application, due to the changed designation of the site and the fact that the application has fallen between the period of local consultation and deposit draft development of the new Local Plan.

More specifically you indicated that, as a result of representations received from adjoining owners to our clients application, the status of our clients site was proposed as amended in the deposit draft. Both our clients and ourselves and our client are of the view that our client has not been given an opportunity to comment on or rebut the representations received, and we are of the view that the proposed amendment to the deposit draft arising from said representations is inequitable and ill considered.

Specifically, the general nature of objection is not in our opinion sustainable nor a valid reason for refusal of consent; the site was designated under the new Local Plan as appropriate for housing, the community council in their observations do not depart from this view as regards our client's site, and indeed confirm the need for such development; and our client has previously indicated his willingness to address any section 75 or similar requirement for social housing development as part of the overall site development proposal, when submitted for detailed consent, should outline be granted.

From our discussion and the information made available to us and following our meeting, it appears to us that the Upper Cullernie site designation has been amended without full and proper consultation and as a 'knee-jerk' reaction to a number of (duplicated) adjoining owner objections, few if any of which would be sustainable and a valid reason for refusal should the application have come before the Planning Committee in the normal way.

You will appreciate that our client has now been waiting some 10 months for a decision on this matter and is extremely concerned that its handling in the deposit draft process has been unfair to his interest. We would request your advice and comment by return as to the current status of this matter we would also confirm that the observations and views noted above were expressed forcibly to you at our meeting on 4 April.

See above.

Balloch Housing
Mr J. Cockburn

I wish to comment on the proposal to modify the Inverness Local Plan. My interest relates particularly to that section of the Plan concerning Balloch village and surroundings.

At page 50, paragraph 2.25, of the Written Statement (April 2003) it states "Other open space/community facilities convenient to housing are required. These could be met South of Balloch. . . ." It is upon this issue that I wish to comment.

The Viewhill community at the southern edge of Balloch, while technically within the limits of the village is, in reality, quite separate from the main area of housing with the Culloden forest lying between it and the village proper. Thus, Viewhill is essentially a

The Plan safeguards land adjoining Balloch as part of the City's setting. It is not allocated for development. However, public access, community and recreational use of this land could, in principle, be legitimate activities on the fringe of the City. The Plan identifies particular deficiencies in open space provision in Balloch which are unable to be met within the existing structure of the neighbourhood. Land south of Balloch is referred to in the Plan following representations which promote such use in that locality, albeit that

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

rural setting which the local community is anxious to preserve. We are concerned, already, that recent planning approvals in the nearby Feabuie area are tending to encourage ribbon development at the South of Balloch and there is constant pressure on the part of the local farmer to seek approval of plans to allow speculative development at Viewhill farm. Thankfully, to date, these attempts have been resisted by the Council.

Against that background, the possibility of developing an open space/community facility in this locality, as implied by the local plan, is unhelpful. Not only would it be quite distant from the main village, but also, and, indeed, more importantly, it would reinforce the ribbon development tendency referred to earlier. It could not be developed within the existing boundary of the village and would be an inappropriate intrusion into the countryside.

I note that elsewhere in the documentation of the consultation exercise, the local Community Council argues strongly against any development in this area that dilutes the boundaries of Balloch as a distinct community. This proposal seems to fly in the face of that concern. There are other possible locations closer to the main village that would seem to be more appropriate for this type of facility.

the Council considers attached development proposals unacceptable. Notwithstanding, this opportunity for recreational use, other land adjoining Balloch is not prejudiced as an option.
NO CHANGE.

<p>Policy 97(ii) Mr and Mrs Allan MacRae</p>	<p>We refer to the above review document and hereby submit formal objection to the allocation of 0.6 hectares of land for housing at Upper Cullernie and referenced under paragraph 95(ii) of the Written Statement.</p> <p>The allocation is not in accordance with the current Local Plan, adopted in April 1994, which indicates the land remaining in its existing agricultural use. We and the local community had accepted the provisions of the current policy and we are not aware of any local demand for change thereto. There is nothing in the Written Statement to justify the assertion that varying needs dwellings should now be given priority at Upper Cullernie. What does exist however is a speculative planning application for 10 houses which we understand has been held over pending the outcome of the Council's deliberations on the Deposit Draft. This application should not be considered as a measure of the views held by the local community. If this application had been dealt with timeously as it should have been following submission in June 2002, it would have been liable to refusal under the provisions of the current Local Plan. We do not accept that the policy for this land parcel needs to change to accommodate the speculation of builders and developers.</p> <p>Our family has previously farmed this land,(including the application site), for a number of generations. The land allocated in the Deposit Draft is good productive land and although now severed from the farm unit, it was usefully productive until very recently, and would be still, had the successor farmer of Upper Cullernie been permitted to continue in occupancy. The recent grossly overgrown nature of the site gives an entirely false impression of the agricultural potential.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
---	---	-------------------

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

Development of houses will be grossly prejudicial to the rural amenity and panorama of agricultural land that we, and our neighbours enjoy and respect, at present. The existing Local Plan established a definitive development boundary and this should be adhered to. Development beyond this boundary is a breach of faith with the local public, and it introduces a suburban character, alien to the pleasant agricultural character of the area. Moreover it is incompatible with the neighbouring agricultural and transport activities, with prospect for conflict. In this particular regard, our agricultural business occasions transport vehicles using the farm track at "unsociable" hours (from 03.30 a.m). Potential conflict and complaint arising because of perceived nuisance claimed by incoming residents, will materially prejudice the provisions of our transport station licence and the continuation of our business.

There are alternative sites available for housing development within the Culloden and Balloch area, and these have been allocated in the existing Local Plan, the Consultative Draft, and the Deposit Draft. There is no pressing need therefore, for the allocation of this land for development.

Access for vehicles cannot be achieved without material prejudice and relative hazard, to the immediate neighbourhood. Access will not be permitted via the upper Cullernie Farm track, over which we have a shared interest. Any alternative via Cullernie Road will be hazardous to existing users and school children. This road is not built to adoptive standard at present, but upgrading to accommodate new houses will introduce use by service vehicles to the detriment of existing users' amenity and safety. Furthermore, the alignment of the access link to Barn Church Road is inadequate for the intensification of traffic.

Provisions for foul and surface water drainage will be difficult and expensive At present, sewage from the five houses on Cullernie Road is pumped westwards via a small bore sewerage system, which we understand has no spare capacity for the addition of any houses. The practicality of the policy proposal is therefore brought into serious question.

Overall we are deeply disturbed that the provisions of the existing Local Plan should be breached by the introduction of further housing land. This is a piecemeal and incremental incursion upon the countryside which is unnecessary, given alternative provisions for development within the locality, and undesirable given the conflicts that can arise between continuing agricultural businesses and suburban dwellers interests. Our amenity and enjoyment of the open environment will be prejudiced and our agricultural business will come under threat accordingly.

Policy 97(iv) The Garden History Society	The Council should seek to protect heritage assets worthy of conservation, whether or not they have some form of statutory designation in accordance with national planning policy guidance, particularly:	NO CHANGE. The Culloden House site is allocated in the Adopted Local Plan. There is no material change in circumstances. Adequate safeguards
--	--	--

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>NPPG 18: Planning and the Historic Environment</i> (para 6 and 37) National planning policy guidance expects local plans to seek to protect locally important buildings, townscapes and landscapes, whether or not they have some form of statutory designation, particularly: • <i>NPPG 18: Planning And The Historic Environment</i> in terms of the role of local plans in the protection of the historic environment (Para 6 and 37). The Council should seek to protect the setting of Culloden House and its key landscape components in accordance with the guidance set out in national planning policy documents, the Memorandum of guidance on listed buildings and conservation areas, the Scottish Executive's policy statements on designing places and architecture. The Council should acknowledge that the setting of Culloden House has little or no capacity to absorb development. 	are incorporated within the policy.
<p>Policy 98 Forest Enterprise</p>	<p>I am aware that we were given the opportunity to comment in August 2001 and whilst we commented at the time, the only area of land where we believe an amendment is required is for our Depot at Tower Road, Culloden. Paragraph 2. Number 98 (Page 51 of the Deposit Draft Written Statement). This site, extending to 2.2 ha is now much underused since the removal of the sawmill and the demolition of the timber house. It is too large for our current requirements and over the past year we have been giving serious consideration of various options, one of which involves moving our office/stores from this location.</p> <p>As this area is adjacent to a residential area and is bounded on the south by an amenity area and a proposed site for a church, we are now of the opinion that a residential designation would be more appropriate for this site in the event that we relocate. This would be more in keeping with the adjacent uses and would be welcomed by the home owners on the west of the site.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. This land is allocated for business/light industry in pursuit of sustainable urban communities able to provide choice in work as well as other social requirements, at “District” level. The site occupies a strategic location, central in Culloden and close to transport routes. Given the existing use and character and a shortage of immediately available sites for small businesses, such uses remain the preferred option.</p>
<p>Policy 103 Barratt Construction Ltd per G.H. Johnston</p>	<p>This area of land was reserved for school use under the current Local Plan adopted April 1994, and the housing allocation in this particular area has now been completed. There has been no attempt by The Highland Council to acquire or even demonstrate that this area of ground is required for educational or school uses. This 1.93 hectares of land is adjacent to approximately 1.7 hectares of land under the control of The Highland Council. This area of adjoining land is open space, which is used for recreational purposes. In addition the Culloden area is more than adequately provided with open space/park, and recreational facilities, and for this reason it is not felt necessary to add more community use/open space to this community.</p> <p>As previously stated, Barratt Construction Ltd, have now completed their house building programme, in this particular location, with the exception of any development on this area</p>	<p>DELETE “1.7 ha. of land at Moray Place is allocated for community use/open space.” ADD to 95 “(xi) “1.9 ha. Moray Place, including affordable accommodation. Layout will accommodate a centrally located open space and play facilities.”</p> <p>There is no requirement to reserve land at this location for a further primary school and development of the Culloden neighbourhood is nearing completion. Notwithstanding, there is a shortfall of some 8 ha. of public open space for recreation purposes across the District. There are no neighbourhood facilities (shop, hall church) in this part of Culloden and a previous reservation of land has been</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

of land. As the general house building in this area is complete under the current Local Plan, and there is no intention of providing additional land supply in the immediate area for house building, we would submit that there is now a shortage of housing land at this location. It is beyond doubt that there is a high demand for housing in this area, particularly starter homes and smaller houses. If this ground is released now for housing purposes, then Barratt Construction Ltd could complete their interest in this area, and instantly meet a demand, that cannot be met elsewhere in the Culloden area.

usurped by housing. The adjoining uses are predominantly residential and open space/park. In the circumstances, development of part of the site for housing and retention of part for community/open space purposes would be appropriate.

The location of this site is conducive with housing development, and is serviced by two adopted roads with adequate provision for additional housing. The site also has adequate capacity for the necessary utilities, and is of a size to address any SUDS issues relating to housing development. Therefore this site is capable of immediate development. With the exception of the large open space to the north of the site, the area is located within a predominately housing area, with varying densities and styles, this in itself would suggest that the land would best be developed contiguous with the surrounding housing. We would also submit that because of the design and layout of the surrounding housing, this particular area is now no longer suitable for a school, as the buildings and playgrounds would be extremely close to the surrounding housing. With the current change in climate regarding the security of primary schools, it would be unfortunate to see high-security fences erected around this site, so close to the adjoining housing.

Because there is a high demand for starter homes and smaller units, we would suggest that this site is suitable for 45 units, and depending on the design and layout, any surplus ground could be used for community or educational purposes. Notwithstanding the above, if The Highland Council Education Department after further investigation consider that this site is still required for educational or social uses, we feel that approximately 0.7 of a hectare would be the maximum required for this, and that the rest of the site could be used for housing, as described above.

On behalf of Barratt Construction Ltd, we hereby make formal representation and objection to the adoption of the Deposit Draft Local Plan, in that, paragraph 103 on page 51 should be removed, and replaced with a statement to the effect that “1.93 hectares of land allocated for housing development, conducive to the surrounding area, and that should an education provision be deemed necessary on this site, then the balance of the land not required for housing purposes should be allocated for education”. Any buildings on this site should give consideration to the amenity currently enjoyed by the surrounding houses and reasonable offset building distances and landscape buffers should be incorporated into the design of the site. We further make representations that on page 49, paragraph 2.26, that the statement “the park at Oakdene could be extended to land previously reserved for a primary school”, should be removed from the Deposit Draft.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

HINTERLAND

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
A96 CORRIDOR INVERNESS AIRPORT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE Policies 3-5 SEPA	<p>SEPA objects to these policies unless there is explicit recognition that there will be no development until foul drainage infrastructure is developed as part of the integrated foul drainage infrastructure for the development area as a whole. This is because of existing problems with watercourses, lack of capacity locally in waste water treatment works with concern over potential need to upgrade pumping systems and the waste water treatment works at Ardersier itself, and the fact that applications for development seeking interim or piecemeal drainage measures continue to emerge.</p> <p>SEPA supports the section that states that a Master Plan will be prepared to implement <i>inter alia</i> features such as water and sewerage networks but objects unless this refers to the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) for surface water management.’</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>The Plan recognises the requirement for a Masterplan to address the need for comprehensive servicing including foul and surface water drainage. It is not necessary to include a specific reference to SUDS given that the general policy GP12 is applied across the entirety of the Local Plan Area.</p>
A96 Corridor Policy 3 Railtrack plc	<p>The aspirations to develop the surface public transport links to and from Inverness Airport are understood and Railtrack will co-operate with the bodies involved. However a rail halt at the airport will give most benefit to travellers to and from towns to the east of Inverness on the Aberdeen line. It should be noted that the existing passenger terminal facilities at the airport are approx. 3/4 mile from the site of the proposed station and some form of shuttle bus would be required.</p> <p>The freight village with a rail served depot is feasible, however there needs to be a strategic view taken on the Inverness and Invergordon area as a whole, to determine which are the best freight sites to promote a sustainable local economy. The potential freight facility at Deephaven could alter the need for rail freight in the City Centre and the same perspective applies to the airport development.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The requirement for a “shuttle” link with the Airport terminal is understood.</p>
A96 Corridor Policy 6 SEPA	<p>SEPA supports redevelopment of brownfield sites, although it considers that the policy relating to the Fabrication Yard should also refer to the need for remediation where necessary.</p>	<p>ADD after “remediation works”...”where necessary.”</p> <p>The possible need for remediation measures is already stated in the policy.</p>
A96 Corridor Policy 6 RSPB	<p>We welcome the statement in Section 3.6 (P54) that the conservation interest of the Inner Moray Firth SPA will be protected regardless of the future use of the Fabrication Yard at Ardersier.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
CHAPTER 6 HINTERLAND Policy 1 Kilmorack Beaufort Estates per Cooper Design	<p>This site is within close proximity of the village of Kilmorack for which no figure for suggested maximum housing expansion has been given in the draft deposit of the local plan because of planning concerns with regard to road junctions and overhead high voltage electricity cables at available sites.</p> <p>We aver that there must be some demand for housing in the village and that this could be</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The proposal site lies outwith any identified settlement and does not represent the rounding-off of a smaller established group of houses. It should therefore be judged against the housing in the countryside policy. Seven houses at this location would be contrary to the principles of the policy and national planning guidance.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
Associates	accommodated on area B part of which could be made available for possibly seven houses together with a considerable amount of amenity space all as an adjunct to the village.	
Policy 3 SEPA	SEPA objects unless it is stated in this policy or in the policy specifically covering Does that drainage from the proposed visitor/heritage centre must go to public sewerage system due to the need to protect the designated Bathing Beach.	See proposed General Policy amendment above.
CHAPTER 7 BEAULY Policy 5 Railtrack plc	The station has opened with a short (I 5m) platform and has been a tremendous success, with passenger usage exceeding all expectations. This means that the short platform will require to be extend, Railtrack are working with ScotRail towards achieving this.	NO CHANGE. Noted. The Plan supports improved facilities at Beaulay Station and allocates the land required.
CHAPTER 8 DRUMNADROCHIT General SEPA	SEPA objects unless there is a policy statement that there will be no new development within the village envelope as defined on the draft Local Plan map unless it is connected to public sewer and that there may be sewerage constraints with parts of the village. Drumnadrochit is an "agglomeration" within an Urban Waste Water Treatment context and hence all properties should be connected to public sewer by, for this size of agglomeration, 2006.	NO CHANGE. Structure Plan Policy G2 makes clear that adequate drainage is a requirement of any development proposal. This principle carries forward to all development proposals. In most settlements drainage is recognised as an important development factor.
CHAPTER 9 ARDERSIER General SEPA	SEPA objects to any further expansion of this village until drainage problems with combined storm overflows are resolved.	NO CHANGE. Structure Plan Policy G2 makes clear that adequate drainage is a requirement of any development proposal. This principle carries forward to all development proposals. In most settlements drainage is recognised as an important development factor.
Policy 11 Crofters Commission	Land at Ardersier to the Northeast of Rowanglare and marked with the letter E, forms part of an owner-occupier croft and will require decrofting prior to any development.	NO CHANGE. Noted.
CHAPTER 10 CROY General SEPA	SEPA objects unless there is a policy statement that there will be no new development within the village envelope as defined on the draft Local Plan map unless it is connected to public sewer.	NO CHANGE. Structure Plan Policy G2 makes clear that adequate drainage is a requirement of any development proposal. This principle carries forward to all development proposals. In most settlements drainage is recognised as an important development factor.
CHAPTER 11 KIRKHILL Policy 6 Brian Smith	Following the community consultation in Kirkhill a piece of my land was allocated for housing development in the first draft of the Local Plan. In the current deposit draft Inverness Local Plan my area has been removed from that designated '6 E' with which it was previously included. I see that my land now has a designation of 'H' "The Council will safeguard the function and character of established residential areas and will encourage appropriate	ADD to 6 after "boundary planting"...", and layout to incorporate access through to the Hill House policies and to Wardlaw Road". The land adjoining Hill House could be suitable for limited "infill" housing in recognition of the prevailing access restrictions. It is possible however that development at Wester Kirkhill could

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

development." I assume by this that new housing could still be considered in a planning application. I therefore would like to thank you for this designation.

incorporate an alternative link and enable further development, in the future.

I would like to object to any proposals to remove the 'H' designation at any further stages in the process because it has already been reduced from the original proposals drawn up from the community consultation.

Policy 8
Mr & Mrs E. Robertson*

Our neighbour Mrs Georgeson of Corann Beag wrote to you recently stating that the owner of the verge in front of her house was indeed herself, thus confirming the point she made at the Public Meeting in Kirkhill Community Centre on 19th July 2001, after Tim Stott your Planning Officer told the audience that the farming family wishing to develop 'E8' actually owned all of the verges involved in any required road widening operations in this area. Having examined our deed plans, we too would appear to have purchased up to the edge of the tarred single-track roadway opposite her.

NO CHANGE.
The land at Groam Farm is identified for development subject to adequate access and calming in the vicinity of the school.

That said, at the time we purchased our house (some 8 years ago), we were aware of our farmer neighbours desire to eventually sell some sites, however the currently proposed scale of development is much larger than expected and larger than the area can safely cope with, hence we must object to the proposal, while obviously respecting our neighbours right to pursue their lucrative objectives.

Regarding the proposed eventual erection of a total of 40 dwellings on the good quality agricultural land lying to the east of our house, we now formally object to the proposal, but principally to the 20 houses proposed for the west-most 'E8' block, on the grounds that the road system generally is unsuitable/unsafe from the proposed site access point to the dangerous road junction at the centre of the village, the single track narrowing in the road close to the busy primary school cannot be developed safely (to describe such a lack of forethought as a 'traffic calming feature' beggars belief), the village would unquestionably be spoilt by further enlargement, some of the types of housing suggested (starter homes) could be potentially problematic, the Amenity Area proposed close to us could easily bring us nothing but trouble (and reduce our property value), the effects on the primary school role etc could be more damaging than presently indicated and finally the suggestion that the proposed development be carried out by only a larger contractor would be of no benefit to the many smaller contractors who live and work in the area, who successfully carry out 'piecemeal' development, and who should surely be supported where possible?

Other than for the very few individuals who will profit from the proposal, we have yet to meet any other villager who welcomes your apparent desire to spoil our beautiful village. The fact that even if we can stop the proposal becoming part of the Local Plan, we have been categorically told by your Planning Officer that the Weirs may simply apply for the development, it would be initially refused as not being part of the Local Plan, but would

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
	<p>most probably be approved as nine out of ten such cases are successfully appealed against! If that is the case, your so-called consultation procedure is rendered somewhat pointless and irrelevant.</p> <p>We do not agree with the Government's current blanket enlargement policy. This is a fine village with a strong community involvement in numerous indoor and outdoor activities. It should be left as it is, other than for the erection of the occasional one-off house. Incidentally, to also suggest possibly opening up the railway station at Groam Farm is also unacceptable to affected villagers for the obvious road, safety etc reasons. The continued housing growth in the area generally is noticeably adding to the peak period congestion on the old A9 and in Inverness itself, particularly in the Muirtown Locks Area. For these and other reasons, we would hope that larger scale development affecting the old A9 to the south of the Beaully Firth could now be halted.</p>	
<p>CHAPTER 13 DORES General SEPA</p>	<p>SEPA objects unless the Local Plan identifies the constraints that the designated bathing beach under the EC Bathing Waters Directive impose. It must be ensured that water meets the required quality. To this end it is essential that all sewerage systems in Dore both present and future must be connected to the public sewerage system. The sewerage system is being expanded to connect houses to the north east of the village and the public septic tank is about to be increased in capacity, but it is essential that the scale of the allocations proposed here be considered within the context of the proposed capacity of the system.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. Structure Plan Policy G2 makes clear that adequate drainage is a requirement of any development proposal. This principle carries forward to all development proposals. In most settlements drainage is recognised as an important development factor.</p>
<p>General Iain Cameron</p>	<p>The last local plan identified an area about 1km south of the village (near the fish farm) which would be suitable for a camp site. Although nobody seems to be keen on running a campsite, there is an increasing demand for the facility, following the closure of the sites at Scaniport and Dochgarroch. I think this should remain on the plan, in case there should be interest in this development sometime in the future.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. The Plan encourages the development of camp-sites and similar facilities at suitable rural locations. Given that the land identified lies within the policy area BP3, any proposal must demonstrate that the impacts of development will not cause significant damage to heritage, amenity or health factors and that site specific considerations are adequately accommodated.</p>
<p>Policy 8 British Waterways</p>	<p>BW may consider in the future additional facilities, but have no implementation proposals at present. Second sentence should be deleted.</p>	<p>DELETE after “Loch Ness for recreation”...“British Waterways propose to install” and REPLACE with “This could include”. The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 14 STRATHNAIRN General Derek & Barbara Chilton</p>	<p>We object to the Deposit Draft of the Local Plan's yoking together of Farr and Inverarnie as one settlement. There is no good reason for their being treated as a single unit; they have no more in common than any other two of the settlements in Strathnairn. Unfortunately, by treating them as one entity, Highland Council has made it possible for Inverarnie, already over its 25% growth limit, to be expected to support further housing</p>	<p>NO CHANGE. The Consultative Draft Local Plan identified sites with capacity for 29 houses. In view of local representations, the Deposit Draft reduces the capacity for building to 14 houses. This represents a 50% reduction in the land identified for housing in the course of</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

development.

We object to the building, above and behind existing dwellings, of any houses with septic tank drainage, as there is a very real danger of pathogens - particularly E. coli 0157-continually polluting the established gardens, making the soil a health hazard and rendering vegetables unfit for consumption. The combination of predicted climate changes, which will increase the rainfall in this area, and the presence in some places of sandy soil can only exacerbate the serious problems caused by the absence of an acceptable sewage system.

We object to the proposed access, alongside Tombreck House, to the proposed house/chalet development, since 1) this route is earmarked to be the start of a Nature Trail and we consider that such joint usage would be potentially dangerous and 2) red squirrels are known to cross this track regularly. There is another possible access to the proposed development, that is the one used by the farm and its neighbours, and we suggest that, should planning permission be granted, this route be preferred.

preparing the Plan. This is a modest scale of development which presents no overriding traffic safety impacts and is dependent upon adequate drainage. It is consistent with the strategy of the Plan insofar as these refer to “development in the right places” and the emphasis given to evolving settlements, accessibility to local services and housing choice and reflects the principles promoted in respect of the “Hinterland” settlements. Furthermore, the Plan is reflective of the Council’s consideration of the representations throughout the outlying communities closest to Inverness about the rate and scale of growth. The land identified for housing at Strathnairn is broadly in line with the guideline which seeks to restrain house-building within the 10-year period of the Plan to 25% of the size of the existing settlements. Subdivision of these communities would have no material significance in the application of the Council’s policy objectives. Opportunities are identified in the wider countryside for limited additional house-building.

**Inverarnie
Policy 1
Andrew Call**

I am writing to object to the proposed development for new houses at Inverarnie Farm. The development of urban style groups of houses is destroying the rural community in which we live and increasing pressure on an already failing roads structure.

See above.

On the day of writing 23/10/02 we have just had 24hrs of rain and the lower part of my drive, which is alongside the proposed access road, is under water. This area already has significant drainage problems with septic tanks requiring regular emptying and the impact of more concentrated housing cannot be underestimated.

The issue of safety is also raised by this proposed development, as the road access for Tombreck House, Treetops and Wilderwood will now have the added pressure of vehicles for 3 more houses and indeed how many more in the future? This access point is used by my two primary school children as pick up and drop of point for the local school.

I urge you to look very closely at this development both in terms of what is appropriate for a rural community and what the area can physically tolerate with regard to traffic and drainage without having an adverse effect on the existing community.

**Policy 1
Susan Harrower**

Proposed House/Chalet Development at Inverarnie Farm

See above.

I feel I must write to you today to say that I object to the above proposed development at Inverarnie Farm for the following reasons:

1) While I am not, in principle, against the building of "one-off" houses in the Strath, I am against suburban type developments springing up all over the place, particularly when I feel that it is purely to generate wealth for one or two people at the detriment to existing dwellers and the environment. One of the reasons that I came to live in the Strath is its relative remoteness and its rural ambience. I enjoy the peace and quiet, the complete darkness at night and living in a small, scattered community. If I had wanted to live in a suburban development on the periphery of Inverness I would have bought a house in Lochardil or Holm.

2) On page 14 of the June 2001 Draft and on page 18 of the Deposit Draft it specifically states that under Section (f) "the road network into Strathnairn has limited capacity ". This road, (the B851), as I am sure you are aware, is a single-track road which cannot cope with the volume of traffic that is using it at present. Some of the holes that appear on the verges of this road are so large that to drive into one would seriously damage your vehicle. I consider that by continually allowing small-scale developments at Farr and Inverarnie to go ahead is idiocy considering the state of this road.

3) It has also come to my attention that Farr and Inverarnie are "lumped" together by Highland Council when considering the 25% new housing growth benchmark, thereby allowing a much greater percentage of new growth than if Farr and Inverarnie were considered as individual settlement zones, like Balnafoich and Croachy. By what reasoning has this come about? I don't think you can state the criteria that they are linked by Farr Primary School and the new Farr Community Hall. After all, the hall has only been therefor a couple of years. What linked the villages before that?

4) Lastly, if the Council do decide to go against public opinion and the views of the local inhabitants, which would seem unlikely in view of "the Purpose of the Local Plan" which states that "everyone with a legitimate stake in the Area's future, and in particular to enable local people to influence the planning of their own communities ", then why not consider putting the access road to the development through Dalvourn Farm? This would seem a much more practicable alternative to the proposed farm shed access road as this road is already in place, access onto the crossroads is much more open in terms of visibility, it would keep traffic away from neighbouring properties and lastly, would not interfere with squirrels crossing the track to get to their feeding areas. Surely the developer could not object to this, as he is the only one who is actually going to benefit from this development. Why should the farm shed access be used when not only will it be of negligible value to the surrounding properties, but will actually be a nuisance?

I have lived in Inverarnie for just over 8 years now, and in that time I seem to have been continually signing petitions or writing letters against this or that proposed development,

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

from the pig farm to the quarry to the proposed city dump. The Strath is a beautiful, relatively unspoilt area of the highlands teeming with wildlife, greatly enjoyed by those of us who reside here. Why, though, do we continually have to defend it against unscrupulous developers who appear to think the Strath is an easy target for their moneymaking schemes at whatever cost?

Policy 1
WE & IM Campbell

The following points outline our objections to the above proposal:

See above.

Drainage

a) There is no public drainage system available in this part of Strathnairn. Objections previously lodged to the Draft Local Plan June 2001 stated that people living adjacent to the development have had trouble with their septic tanks and soakaway systems. This development will also be at a higher level than Tombreck House and we are therefore concerned about any seepage of sewerage effluent into our property. In addition, the Council by approving this development at Inverarnie will simply be adding to and exacerbating drainage, soakaway and possible pollution problems on the pretext that it will be satisfactory, simply because they are going to lobby Scottish Water for a future Drainage Scheme. We do not consider this to be satisfactory - a proper public drainage system should be in place first, before any further developments are considered.

Road Network

b) The current Deposit Draft Plan and the previous Draft both specifically stated under Sections (f) and (e) respectively that "the road network into Strathnairn has limited capacity ... ". This is true but yet the Council continues to propose and support housing developments in this rural area where such a condition exists. The attached photographs of car crashes and accidents show the ever present dangers faced by local people having to drive on these 'limited capacity' single track roads. The Planning Department's reaction to a previous development proposal in our area was to actually recommended refusal of the application on the grounds of 'traffic fears' and the impact that a Kennel's Business 'would have on the areas tortuous road system of single track roads'. The extra traffic which will be added to these single track roads with the creation of a further 16 properties between Dellmore and Dalvourn alone, without including the rest of Strathnairn, is at odds with the Section (f) and (e) statement. One has only to look at the extent of skid marks on the B851 to realise the ever present dangers existing residents face on such local roads of 'limited capacity'.

Access

c) The proposed access to this development, according to the Farmer/Developer, will be from the access track adjacent to Tombreck House. The 'Farm Sheds' access road (water bound) runs alongside the edge of Tombreck House and the front corner of Tombreck House is only about 12 feet from the fence line separating the access road from the House.

We are extremely concerned over this issue. Our privacy and peace and quiet will be utterly destroyed if this access is used, since the development proposal including the proposed access will almost completely surround us. We will be surrounded by roads on three sides with the development on the other.

The proposed access to the house/chalet development alongside Tombreck House will create yet another car user access on to the 'limited capacity' single track B851. Two young primary school children get picked up and let off daily by the school bus at this opening.

There is already an existing farm road which provides access to Inverarme Farm House and five other existing properties on the south side of Inverarmie crossroads. That road would provide less intrusive access/egress to the development proposal, whether it be obtained via the Farm House or by means of a cutting off that farm access/other properties road, than to use the smaller farm track adjacent to Tombreck House. Although these alternative accesses have been mentioned, we still fear that the siting of the development proposal itself, in the area of the sheds and its position above us, may impinge greatly on our peace, quiet and privacy and therefore we would still have to maintain our overall objection.

Red Squirrels

d) Pinewoods, Treetops and Tombreck House all have regular sightings of red squirrels who feed from the Scots Pine trees which are located at the front, sides and rear of these properties respectively. In particular the red squirrels cross the 'Farm Sheds' access track in order to get from the main forest to the wooded area at the rear of Tombreck House. This habitat/feeding route for the squirrels, should be preserved and protected and the proposed development access/egress route prevented.

Historic

e) The Farmer/Developer has reconstructed and enlarged a lochan adjacent to the proposed development site. Water from this large pond/lochan prior to its enlargement has in the past flooded down the 'Farm Sheds' access road for lengthy periods of time. Additional development and disturbance on the higher ground above Tombreck House, due to the nature of the ground conditions, during periods of heavy rainfall we fear, could also give rise to flash flood conditions, affecting the 12 feet high banking surrounding the south western and western periphery of Tombreck House. The Farm access track was previously used, at most, only two to three times a year. Two years ago the Farm Owner put a gate on at the access which stopped our neighbours at Treetops from using it to get occasional access to the rear of their own property.

We also find it concerning to read that the Deposit Draft of the Local Plan states that one of the requirements is tree retention, particularly when we have asked and the Farmer himself had proposed, removing some of the existing pine trees which stand at the edge of the 12 foot high bank, above our property on its south western side. Hopefully one or two

of the photographs enclosed will show you the difficulties we face from incessant falls of pine needles which continually block up our gutters and ruin our rear garden gravel surface. Some of the trees themselves, we fear, could also cause damage to our property if they were ever blown down. The pine needles simply cannot be lifted and the gutters require to be cleaned out 4 to 5 times a year over the winter months. In addition the tree screen on the southern western side of our property is scant and sparse in depth in places and we can see the farm sheds from two of our bedroom windows.

Deposit Draft of the Local Plan - Settlement Policies (Page 20)

f) 'The Council will safeguard the function and character of established residential areas and will encourage appropriate development'.

This current proposal and the presumed access will not, we feel, safeguard the function and character of established residential development. Such a new development coming into the rear of the existing properties at Inverarme will destroy the peace, quiet and privacy of those of us adjoining this development area. If the development is for chalets, then this Developer already has a holiday homes site at Dalvourn, which on appearance would seem to have plenty of scope for further development of additional chalets or holiday homes without creating two separate localities for the same functional purpose. If it is for houses then the Developer has ample land between Inverarme Lodge and Birch Cottage which is out of the way of anyone and this would have the advantage of seeing the existing track road which is used by five households daily, being upgraded and tarred. We do not think that the proposed development and its closeness to us, is appropriate.

Settlement Character item 17, Page 58 of the Deposit Draft Local Plan g) "There is widespread criticism of the `suburban scale and character of development which has taken place in the outlying communities, ' It must be emphasised in the strongest terms and in support of local views that the strategy gives priority to greater initiatives to ensure growth does not normally exceed 25% in any 10 year period. Developer contributions will be required to meet shortages in affordable accommodation in areas of defined housing stress i.e. bulk of the Hinterland"

Also Highland Council's Draft Deposit states that the "Plan does not envisage the coalescence of the Strathnairn Settlements. Their amalgamation in the Local Plan into one Section is explained by their common facilities such as the school and a hall and a desire to streamline the Plan format and content."

The points which arise here are –

1) The type of Development to be carried out at Inverarnie Farm does not in any way seem

to address low cost or affordable housing objectives. Even under Diversification issues in NPPG 15, it states that the existing Farm Buildings should be converted on a re-use basis where this development, according to the first Draft Plan, was identified as going to replace the agricultural sheds. Can one question why does this particular Fanner/Developer always seem to be so favoured for group Development purposes in Inverarnie and Farr

2) Rural communities may be prepared to accept a single house development in areas which are acceptable to the community. However there is not generally any support for urbanised developments consisting of groups of houses or chalets despite whether they are supported by Government Diversification Schemes or not. This is considered by ourselves to be an unacceptable project, so close to residential properties and something which we think would interfere with our privacy of our location. Adults or children from this Development area if they come into the wooded area will, very easily, be able to view down on our property from the height vantage of the fence line above us. You must appreciate that we really do not want this development beside us.

3) If both Inverarnie and Farr were treated as separate Settlement Zones like Balnafoich, Croachy and Daviot, then the 25% new housing growth factor for Inverarnie would be well exceeded. It is suggested that the common link in maintaining the one Settlement Zone is explained by the school and the hall but this has little logic. The school is used by many children from other Settlement areas. Parents have also sent their primary school children to Inverness and Secondary pupils in Inverarnie and Farr, as well as other parts of the Strath, go to the Academy in Inverness - Does this mean that these Strathnairn communities in the former situation should fall under the Farr/Inverarnie Settlement Zone, or in the latter, when Inverness schools are used should the respective areas be in an Inverness Settlement Zone? The hall in Inverarnie is also used by many people from many areas - Stratherrick, Dumglass, Dunlichity, Brin, Bunachton, Balnafoich, Croachy, Inverness and elsewhere - it is therefore completely wrong to maintain that there is this explained link of association between Inverarnie and Farr by the primary school at Farr and the hall at Inverarnie and as a consequence this should suggest that there must only be one Settlement Zone for both Farr and Inverarnie. On the contrary, consider Inverarnie within its own village signposts and having its own Settlement Area. The growth Factor in considering both Drafts of the Local Plan = 63.15%. Now consider Inverarnie extended to take in Wester Lairgs & Dellmoor, down to Dalvourn. The growth Factor = 61.53% (both being compared to a 10 year, 25% maximum figure) In order therefore to reduce and stabilise the proposed excessive growth of development, Inverarnie should be allowed its own Settlement Zone.

Over the last 4 weeks, since the issue of the Deposit Draft Plan, the shed or sheds appear as if they are being let out as one or other of them is being used 6 days a week by persons

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

we have never seen before and the access road which has only ever been previously used two to three times a year by the Farmer, is now also having cars, vans and lorries using it. Unfortunately at present we do not know exactly what is happening up at the sheds area but we feel that if this development proposal is granted approved, then we may have no choice other than having to consider moving away in order to achieve the priority of what we had moved here for in the first place - to obtain privacy and peace and quiet. Such a situation, particularly when one of us was retired on serious ill health grounds, is surely not an objective of the Local Plan?

Policy 1
Mrs Moira Chalmers

With reference to plans to build chalets/houses in Inverarnie, I write to object to this proposed development. There are several points that I consider to be very important and detrimental to Inverarnie residents. Firstly, the access road to the area becomes water bound. During times of heavy rainfall the road resembles a running stream which is made worse by an overflowing large pond at the top. An additional development on the higher ground above Tombreck House could give rise to flash flood conditions and further problems. Still on the subject of water, there is no public drainage system. All residents of Inverarnie have at times had trouble with their soakaways not naturally soaking and have had to track a new system in order for seepage to occur.

See above.

Certainly at Treetops we are on our third soakaway in eight years. Surely this speaks for itself. The planned access road to the proposed development is very seldom used. This is clearly evident by the overgrowth of weeds. Mr Forbes has prohibited my husband and I from using this road, unlike the previous owner who allowed this in order for us to park our vehicles at the top of our back garden. He has also disallowed lorries on his road when we have our domestic heating oil tank filled or our septic tank emptied, yet is now wanting to open it up as a thoroughfare to a housing development! Still on the subject of roads, the B851 is a very hazardous road to drive on. Extra housing = more people = more vehicles, adding to the danger.

Our neighbours at Wilderwood have two small children who wait at the bottom of the drive they share with us, which is parallel to the proposed access road, causing added danger for them.

I am also really concerned the noise nuisance this extra housing will cause. Peace, quiet and privacy is all we want and to live in harmony with our existing neighbours. Mr Forbes already has holiday homes at Dalvourn, an area which seems to have more space available for development than Inverarnie. Our area has already had nine dwelling houses added to it that I know of, in the past year. Surely this is enough development in a rural location.

Highland Council state a planned growth of 25% over a ten year period yet the council states the eight or nine new houses identified on the last draft of the local plan (June 2001)

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
	<p>are now existing and the 25% factor starts afresh again. If this is the case, Inverarnie could have approximately 35 further houses added to it in the next 5 years. Inverarnie and Farr should be classed as two separate settlement zones and the plan of 25% growth should be maintained for each.</p> <p>The continued demand for housing within Inverarnie threatens acute erosion of amenity and loss of heritage features. By far the worst part, is the proposed use of an access road between our house (Treetops) and Tombreck House. Our garden is home to several red squirrels, they make a nest in a doocot every spring. This is their natural habitat and development beside us would surely be detrimental to this endangered species. If planning were to be granted for this development, alternative access is undoubtedly available from the road to Inverarnie farm house using the start of this road and cutting a road off it. Please take our fears on board and take heed of the wishes of the local community.</p>	
<p>Inverarnie Housing Mrs Lesley Matheson</p>	<p>With regard to the recent Local Plan, I would like to query the proposed area for development at Inverarnie, Farr. I believe it's listed as area 14: Strathnairn.</p> <p>The site opposite the shop at Inverarnie is listed 'A'. I would be interested in a piece of land opposite the shop which I would, at some point in the future, wish to build as a continuation of the row of houses already there.</p> <p>I would therefore, wish the area to be included on the local plan before the plan is finalised.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>This land comprises a stand of mature trees which defines the edge of the settlement, provides an important local amenity and shelter. Any incursion could undermine this feature. Alternative sites are identified for housing.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 16 DOCHGARROCH Policy 1 British Waterways</p>	<p>Visitor facilities should be expanded to include “and associated leisure facilities”</p>	<p>ADD after “visitor”...“associated leisure facilities”</p> <p>The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 17 ABRIACHAN General Crofters Commission</p>	<p>Abriachan and the adjoining areas have a number of registered crofts and we welcome that the Local Plan recognises and encourages traditional crofting activities. It is also interpreted that crofter housing, associated with the occupation and working of croftland, and development/diversification opportunities will not be impeded. This should be emphasised and made explicit in the Plan.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The Plan includes reference to crofter diversification.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 20 CULLODEN MOOR Policy 2 Railtrack plc</p>	<p>It would be possible to reopen the station, however it is on the Highland Main Line and therefore there will be performance implications for an additional stop on this route, unless infrastructure enhancements are implemented. The adjacent former goods yard site has been partially sold off, therefore any further freight traffic is extremely unlikely.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>Noted. The Plan does not promote a rail freight facility at Culloden Moor, rather the relocation of the existing industrial use is encouraged. It is recognised that any rail halt proposal will depend upon infrastructure improvements.</p>

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREA

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

<p>CHAPTER 24 FORT AUGUSTUS Policy 1 Fort Augustus & Glenmoriston Community Council</p>	<p>One major area was raised at the meeting, covering the proposal to permit development beyond the proposed car park extension off and through the embankment and the area behind.</p> <p>This area of scrubland below the escarpment of Jenkins Park and adjoining the Rare Breeds Centre has a major visual impact from the newly-opened Great Glen Way route which parallels the Caledonian Canal from its south-bound entry to the village. It is recognised as the only remaining undeveloped green area alongside the River Oich, bordering the route to the Rare Breeds Centre and possibly, in due time, create a long-cherished wish to open up more local footpaths on top of the embankment and adjoining it to link up with the Forestry Commission’s Oich riverside and forest footpath trails.</p> <p>The long-awaited car park extension may hopefully now proceed with all haste and specifically to the option offered to the Community Council in December 2001 as an Options Appraisal for future car park extension in Fort Augustus.</p> <p>The community chose the option that retained the embankment and provided 156 car parking spaces and 10 coach bays.</p> <p>This was communicated to you in the last Draft Plan exercise, with the Community Council’s reasoning and we are surprised that you should consider developing it in any other way.</p> <p>The prospect of reconfiguring a new car park at some future stage by driving a road through the centre of it to open up land for executive housing is not acceptable to the Community Council nor is the removal of the embankment or developing the amenity space behind it. This view was passed on an almost unanimous vote by the Community Council and supported by those members of the public present at this meeting and the public meeting held last month.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
--	--	-------------------

<p>Policy 17 H.G. Biggs</p>	<p>I am writing to object to a serious misrepresentation being made under my own name in the Draft Development Plan for the Fort Augustus Area.</p> <p>On the final page of the section relating to the Fort Augustus area, numbered 7-8, my name is shown in the left hand margin under your reference number 000712. In the adjoining box the draft states: "Supports a mixed housing development within the triangular area of land bounded by the Caledonian Canal..."</p> <p>I quite categorically deny ever having expressed any view relating to this area of ground to which you ascribe my views.</p>	<p>ADD to 13 “Discussion will be held with landowners in this regard.”</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the representation to the Consultative Draft Plan had been unwittingly attributed. For the record, this will be corrected. The Plan indicates that the Council will carry out “any necessary remedial works”.</p>
--	--	--

If you will take the trouble to refer back to my letter of Feb 3rd 2000 (acknowledged by your Mr Greaves under your reference LP/IN/3.5/CM/TY on 14.2.-00) you will see that I carefully defined the area about which I was writing as being centred about the map reference "377082 in the current Landranger map no 34."

The topic of my letter was summarised in my paragraph immediately preceding the above map reference, as follows:

"I have recently been in touch with your Protective Services Department since we share a common concern about the road access to the Kill Cumein Cemetery. They are concerned at the almost annual flooding of the public approach to the Cemetery and were not aware that your Department has designated this as a 'flood risk area'."

The comment appended in your current, right hand "Decision" box does seem to relate to my letter but totally misrepresents the existing problem. It implies that the flooding that we regularly experience results from the river overflowing its banks. The true situation, as the Protective Services Department are well aware, is that the floodwater originates not from the river bank but from the Mill burn, further uphill. This water overflows the existing field drain, threatens the stability of the stone dyke and floods the access road *before* it spills over into the river Tarff.

For the purposes of your current Local Plan we do not need now to go into the further details of this situation. Having established that "protective works" are needed elsewhere, rather than "on the river margins", I do fully agree with the final sentence of your "decision", that "Any actions will be discussed with landowners."

I assume that you have quite deliberately determined to reject the secondary proposal in my original letter. This stated: "If your Department were able to formulate a satisfactory plan for defence from floodwater - which must involve fairly extensive excavation - the northern-most sector of the above field would seem ideal for public housing...." I now have strong reservations about upholding this offer - which related only, and specifically, to ground at the map reference given.

I trust that you will take considerable care in rewording both the "Summary" and "Decision" boxes appended to my name and reference number. I can forward a copy of my original letter or shall be pleased to consult with you by telephone about the complexities of this, if you so wish.

Alternatively, since we are agreed as to the necessity of resolving the problem of flooding at the Cemetery access, there is perhaps no need for you to make any reference to my letter of 3.2.00. I would fully accept this as your simplest solution.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
Policy 18 Mr E. M. Stewardson	18. This is the preferred area for all housing expansion (not business) and as such should not be fragmented by offering other areas further from the village centre and without the shorter lines of communication offered by here. The Market Hill Brief Draft is now to hand and I have responded to it directly. I reiterate here that this area should be of mixed housing and types of ownership, and not ghettoised into a predominantly Public Housing Estate. The need for privately built homes, Developer built estate development, self build sites and shared "buy and rent" dwellings will develop the wealth and range of people needed to regenerate a village that HC names as being "fragile". Over emphasis on Public Housing will create problems of division and do nothing for the local economy or cohesion of the community.	See above.
Policy 18 Crofters Commission	Land at Markethill is registered croftland in multiple ownership. Recent investigation carried out by the Commission, in relation to the transfer of a croft, identified unsatisfied demand for croftland in this area. Until this aspect is fully explored along with current activity, and access to the site is established, we ask that this area be excluded from the Local Plan. Where croftland is proposed for development, the Commission advise full consultation with the occupiers prior to final designation. The golf course is sited on part of the common grazing and any further expansion of the course will require full consultation with the crofters that share in the grazing.	See above.
CHAPTER 25 TOMATIN General Strathdearn Community Council	Following discussion, it was agreed that the Community Council did not wish to make any additional comments to those already made at the time of the first draft, apart from reiterating their keenness to see Tomatin Station open as a request stop.	See above. The rail halt proposal is promoted within the Plan
Policy 3 C.D. Glynne-Percy	Satisfactory access provision was to be provided by Highland Council under our agreement for the sale of the school site. As the access is now in place, it should therefore be deemed satisfactory without the requirement for any upgrading and this condition can be deleted.	DELETE from 3 "agreement and upgrading of road access". The Planning Authority agreed that this Modification was appropriate in response to the matters raised.
Policy 9 C.D. Glynne-Percy	Current Policy 3.4.4 (a) Site Opposite Little Chef: This site was previously designated for craft-related use under the current Local Plan. We object to the deletion of a site, which could potentially give employment opportunities, having previously been considered an appropriate site for such use, and wish to see it reinstated.	See above.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
<p>CHAPTER 26 BALNAIN Policy 2 Dr U. Urquhart</p>	<p>I am pleased to note that the boundary of the hinterland has been successfully altered to exclude Balnain. However, the undernoted concerns remain. Toilets, Balnain</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposal that the toilets within the hail should be made available to the general public. The hail was built largely by local subscription for the community. Any use by the general public would have safety implications for groups such as toddlers and young people. Problems with car parking and increased insurance costs for the hail users are further implications. There would be a threat of vandalism.</p> <p>It is unclear to me if there is a demand for public toilets in this location as there are no facilities at which tourists might wish to stop.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>CHAPTER 28 DALCHREICHART Policy 1 Mr J.F. and M. Donaldson</p>	<p>Following your Local Plan Newsletter and subsequent meeting of 22nd Oct at Fort Augustus, please register our objection to the said planning.</p> <p>To be as concise as is reasonably possible, and without touching on many other areas, e.g. traffic, drainage, filtration plant capacity, wild-life, environment etc.---the very nature of 'affordable housing' is a non-starter. That precludes so called professionals who are in an income bracket outwith this plan. By definition it is aimed at young families, by and large, having labouring and trades jobs, or seeking such work. No bad thing at all in principle, and one that we would generally applaud, given the 'retired' feel here in Dalchreichart.</p> <p>However!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-Where are the jobs locally? 2-Where are the shops and amenities? 3-How can enough wages be earned to afford the costs of transport and fuel? 4-How will it enhance/ benefit existing residents? 5-The school has been 'moth-balled' <p>I know these are simple questions, but that is all that needs asking, and to answer the above with justifiable reasons for low-cost/affordable housing will leave most reasonable people questioning their own good common sense! Unless there is another, unspoken yet, agenda, this 'plan' defies logic.</p> <p>Footnote: Back in the early sixties I was a victim of the 'big idea' of the dispersing of families to the wonderful 'new hoosies' (the 'schemes'), around Glasgow and our family ended up in Castlemilk, out in the country! No work-no shops-transport costs prohibitive-get-rich quick merchants preying on the families, resulting in thousands of good folk in dire circumstances, ours included. A similar -if on a much smaller scale- scenario is the future</p>	<p>See above.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
	for some young hopefuls here in Dalchreichart. Sadly it's an idyllic but expensive hamlet to live in. The removal vans-if they can afford them-will be shuttling in and out for years to come.	
CHAPTER 31 CROACHY Policy 3 Crofters Commission	<p>Inbye croftland has been identified for housing development to the north of the township, which forms part of a tenanted croft. Areas 1 & 2 are considered infill sites and we are content to see this designated for housing. Our preference would be that these areas are utilised for croft related housing, which may include provision of sites for family members. However the site marked 3 lies to the east of the public road and, in our view, should be excluded from the Local Plan.</p> <p>A further proposal to establish a community woodland on the area to the southeast and marked 5, which also forms the whole of a tenanted croft, can in our view be achieved without inclusion in the Local Plan. The Crofters (Scotland) Act 1993 defines the planting of trees as an acceptable activity for crofters to undertake on their crofts. Consequently the need to take the land out of crofting or to require the landlord's consent to plant trees is no longer a prerequisite for planting or creating a woodland on in-bye croftland. We therefore ask that the Local Plan be amended to remove both areas to the east of the public roadway.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The site is allocated in the adopted Local Plan. Development will be subject to a successful application to de-croft the land. Release from crofting is dependent ultimately on the Crofters Commission or the Land Court. Notwithstanding, and pending these considerations, the land remains suitable for development in principle. There has been no material change in circumstances to justify departing from the provisions of the Adopted Local Plan.</p>
FURTHER FORWARD: BEYOND 2011 Homes for Scotland	<p>Homes for Scotland welcome the commitment by the Highland Council to monitor the plan by way of an annual or biennial Forum involving partners and representative bodies. We would welcome the opportunity to participate in this Forum in order that the views of the private house building industry can help to contribute to an up to date, relevant and achievable Inverness Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Support welcomed.</p>
West District Map Scottish Natural Heritage	<p>Map 2: The City of Inverness - West shows the intertidal area adjacent to Longman. It is not clear why the intertidal area is shown on this map but not on any other maps within the document. In general SNH feel it would be helpful to show intertidal areas on all coastal maps as several Natura sites occur along the coast.</p> <p>SNH see the Longman as a prime site offering a unique opportunity for developments which compliment the adjacent Natura sites — for example a country park. It is very important therefore that any development here is in keeping with the prime location. SNH recommend that a design brief is drawn up to identify the best possible use of this site to guarantee a high quality environment.</p> <p>The inset maps do not make it clear which areas will be developed and which are to become a nature reserve country park. This should be clarified.</p>	<p>ADD after “Natura 2000 sites”...”and discussion with Scottish Natural Heritage in this regard”.</p> <p>The inter-tidal area is shown in relation to the designated statutory conservation sites on the Proposals Map. The enhanced colour mapping will clarify the extent of the “Green Wedge” and development area at Longman Bay.</p>
Culloden Moor Inset Map Scottish Natural	<p>SNH note that an area of 11.4 Ha is shown as Amenity on the inset map but described as “...safeguarded for the long term expansion of the community including possible community business and residential use.” SNH feel this may be misleading, people</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The land adjoining the community is identified as Amenity in order to safeguard the land from piecemeal development. The Plan</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
Heritage	referring to the Inset Map may presume this area is safeguarded as Amenity woodland whereas the long term proposal is to allow development on the site.	explains that the purpose is to enable future community development needs to be accommodated there.
Culloden District Inset Map The Garden History Society	<p>The Society object to the inset map - City of Inverness - Culloden District because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the school playing fields contribute to the setting of Culloden House and Policy BP3 should apply; and the setting of Culloden House should be covered by Policy BP3 (not BP2). <p>The Council should recognise that the school playing fields contribute to the setting of Culloden House and should be safeguarded from development in accordance with national planning policy guidance, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>NPPG 18: Planning and the Historic Environment</i> (para 6 and 37) <p>While Policy A favours the development of the sports fields for uses associated with its purpose and function, the Council should recognise that the intensification of this area for sport and related development could have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the setting of Culloden House. In this respect, it is more appropriate for the Council to apply Policy BP3.</p> <p>The Council should address the discrepancy between the designation of Culloden House as an area covered by Policy BP3 which presumes against development and the designation of its setting an area covered by Policy BP2 which generally favours development. The Society are of the opinion that the House and its setting are inextricably linked and each deserves the highest 'level' of policy protection.</p> <p>The Council should address the discrepancy between the Appendix which states that historic landscapes and listed buildings would be covered by Policy BP2 but the annotation on the inset map - City of Inverness - Culloden District - suggests that Culloden House is covered by Policy BP3.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE.</p> <p>The Culloden House housing site benefits from a previous planning consent and from an Adopted Local Plan allocation. There has been no material change in circumstances since the Plan was last adopted and adequate safeguards are incorporated within the policy. Playing fields and A listed buildings are BP3 features.</p>
Maps Inverness Civic Trust	<p>Maps</p> <p>The large Proposals Map is a useful, comprehensive summary for the whole Area, but it is difficult to identify the proposals in and around the City on this scale, without colour. The Inset maps, however, are quite clear. Of the small, coloured maps with the Written Statement, those on pp9 -13 and 14 have rather too much detail for this small scale.</p>	Noted. Colour CD-Rom copies of the mapping are now available.
Maps Graham Tuley	<p>Many major developments are only shown on the maps West and East (map p. 1&2) but there is confusion in the way that the Background Policies, Settlement Polices and Other which are shown on the orange sheet "Local Plan Legend" are shown on the maps. One must assume that the "Settlement Boundary" is the whole of Inverness and because there</p>	<p>AMEND PROPOSALS MAP to correct factual inaccuracies. See above recommendation on SNH representation.</p> <p>Policy coverage for a given piece of land is only shown once in</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
	<p>are no BP1, BP2, BP3 and BP4 on the map then you must assume that white areas ‘favour development’ diagonal hatching ‘favour development unless’ and shaded areas are “presume against” or “not approve. To have two shaded categories which cannot be separated on the map is unacceptable. Some “A” areas are shaded and some are white and there does not seem to be adequate explanation for this.</p> <p>On the maps:- The open space (104) at Inshes seems rather remote from Balloch Primary School. Chapleton - 41(vi) about LongmanA96 is not relevant. North of Culloden Academy - neither 41 (vi) nor 106 seem relevant. Milton of Culloden - why is there a S in eastern corner?</p>	<p>accordance with Government regulation. The Plan states that the background policy features are not always mapped and they are subject to the overriding site-specific policies and proposals contained elsewhere in the Plan.</p> <p>A colour version of the mapping is available on CD-Rom and a colour printed version of the adopted plan will be available. The use of colour makes the distinctions between policy notations very clear.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

PART 2: Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft with Modifications

STRATEGY

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
<p>FORWARD TO 2011 Highland Cycle Campaign per Mr G. Church</p>	<p>We object to the deletion of" Most are now connected to Inverness by safe and segregated cycle routes" from the section entitled" ".I am not certain why it happened that our comments were interpreted as an objection to this phrase and we wish it to be re-inserted.</p>	<p>The proposed Modification deletes duplicated text. For the avoidance of doubt, the Deposit Draft Local Plan with Modifications contains... “Most are now connected to Inverness by safe and segregated commuter cycle routes which combine “Paths for All” linking outlying communities with one another and Inverness.” Clarification will be offered to the Highland Cycle Campaign. NO CHANGE.</p>
<p>GP7 Mineral Workings Mr & Mrs Smith</p>	<p>It has recently come to our attention that a policy statement on Mineral Workings has been removed from the proposed new Local Plan. We would like to raise an objection to the removal of this statement. The statement that has been removed stated -'... to make good any shortfall in the availability of materials, extensions of existing sites (operating with minimal environmental impact) will be given preference over new sites. ...' The deletion of this statement removes an important safeguard to residents in this area if further quarrying applications were to be submitted. As you are aware many parties have fought hard to try to ensure that Munro's application at Wester Lairgs is refused. Strathnaim already has two major quarries and we would support their right to expand in preference to the creation of new quarries. However any proposed expansion would also have to be carefully controlled. We would therefore request that: 1. The above statement be reinstated. 2. The following statement be added: 'The Council will not support any quarrying operations which may cause detriment to the amenity and enjoyment of residential properties in proximity to such developments.'</p>	<p>This objection was withdrawn.</p>
<p>GP20 Bio-diversity Initiative Scottish Natural Heritage</p>	<p>Regarding the concern over policy protection for habitats and species in the wider countryside, SNH welcomes the inclusion of Policy 22 Habitats and Species. However, the statement that development proposals will be considered in the context of Policies N1 and G2 of the Structure Plan is confusing. Policy N1 relates to designated sites and the hierarchy of protection afforded to these sites and Policy G2 is concerned with general sustainability criteria. SNH wish to maintain this objection as we consider that the current wording in the local plan does not adequately protect special natural heritage features in the wider countryside.</p>	<p>Structure Plan Policy N1 covers habitats and species of international importance. Policy G2 covers the impact on other habitats and species. These policies either protect conservation interests or seek appropriate integration of developments. NO CHANGE.</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

THE CITY OF INVERNESS

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
<p>Policy 18 Police HQ Mr & Mrs Grant per Graham & Sibbald</p>	<p>Mr & Mrs Grant lodge an objection to the modifications proposed on the deposit draft.</p>	<p>This objection was withdrawn.</p>
<p>Policy 37 Developer Contributions Inverness Civic Trust per Mr G.Tuley</p>	<p>The Trust supports the production of detailed Development Briefs/Master Plans and suggests that this should be strengthened as a firm commitment. The comment "No Change" we believe is misleading because there has been significant change to this paragraph and the Trust believes that it has been weakened rather than strengthened.</p>	<p>Noted. NO CHANGE.</p>
<p>Policy 89 Inshes Primary School Culcabock and Drakies Community Council</p>	<p>We remain concerned that development at Inshes and Milton of Leys will be allowed to continue unabated until a new primary school is provided on the east side of the Southern Distributor Road. It is understood that there is a lack of sufficient capacity in the nearby schools of Hilton and Cradlehall and therefore limited potential to accommodate pupils arising from new development at Inshes and Milton of Leys. The redrawing of the school catchment areas will only increase traffic in these areas, particularly at Cradlehall, where there are also acute school traffic problems. Asking pupils to travel from Inshes and Milton of Leys across the A9 will not encourage parents to allow their children to walk to and from Cradlehall Primary School. Cramming more pupils into Drakies in temporary classrooms is not a satisfactory solution either and one which we would raise strong opposition to. There is also pressure to accommodate nursery school aged children at Drakies on a site that is in danger of being over developed and under even more pressure from traffic.</p> <p>In light of our concerns we maintain our original objection and demand that an embargo be placed on further house building within the current Drakies Primary School catchment area until such time as a new school at Inshes is completed and ready for occupation. This approach is consistent with the restriction on further development in the Charleston area due to the lack of capacity in the road network and the limitations of the Caledonian Canal crossing at Tomnahurich.</p> <p>The other course of action open to the Council is to seek developer contributions to the new school (as required of developers at Woodside) and to interim traffic reduction measures at the other schools.</p>	<p>The Council as Education Authority has a statutory responsibility to provide school places. This requirement is being met at the neighbouring Primary Schools. The Council intends to build a new primary school at Inshes as part of its PPP programme during 2004 and proposes that this will be open for the commencement of the school year 2005. Present arrangements are therefore expected to continue for a short time only, thus relieving the existing schools of pupils residing at Inshes and Milton of Leys and freeing up capacity at Drakies Primary School for local educational needs. Measures are in-hand to address longstanding traffic and safety issues at Cradlehall Primary School. In these circumstances the Council does not consider it appropriate to restrain house-building at Inshes and Milton of Leys for which a draft Development Brief – itemising developer contributions including to local education facilities – has been prepared.</p> <p>NO CHANGE.</p>
<p>Balloch Housing Mr J. Cockburn</p>	<p>I wish to comment on the proposal to modify the Inverness Local Plan. My interest relates particularly to that section of the Plan concerning Balloch village and surroundings. At page 50, paragraph 2.25, of the Written Statement (April 2003) it states "Other open space/community facilities convenient to housing are required. These could be met South of Balloch. . . ." It is upon this issue that I wish to comment.</p>	<p>The Plan safeguards land adjoining Balloch as part of the City's setting. It is not allocated for development. However, public access, community and recreational use of this land could, in principle, be legitimate activities on the fringe of the City. The Plan identifies particular deficiencies in open space provision in Balloch which are</p>

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

The Viewhill community at the southern edge of Balloch, while technically within the limits of the village is, in reality, quite separate from the main area of housing with the Culloden forest lying between it and the village proper. Thus, Viewhill is essentially a rural setting which the local community is anxious to preserve. We are concerned, already, that recent planning approvals in the nearby Feabuie area are tending to encourage ribbon development at the South of Balloch and there is constant pressure on the part of the local farmer to seek approval of plans to allow speculative development at Viewhill farm. Thankfully, to date, these attempts have been resisted by the Council.

Against that background, the possibility of developing an open space/community facility in this locality, as implied by the local plan, is unhelpful. Not only would it be quite distant from the main village, but also, and, indeed, more importantly, it would reinforce the ribbon development tendency referred to earlier. It could not be developed within the existing boundary of the village and would be an inappropriate intrusion into the countryside.

I note that elsewhere in the documentation of the consultation exercise, the local Community Council argues strongly against any development in this area that dilutes the boundaries of Balloch as a distinct community. This proposal seems to fly in the face of that concern. There are other possible locations closer to the main village that would seem to be more appropriate for this type of facility.

unable to be met within the existing structure of the neighbourhood. Land south of Balloch is referred to in the Plan following representations which promote such use in that locality, albeit that the Council considers attached development proposals unacceptable. Notwithstanding, this opportunity for recreational use, other land adjoining Balloch is not prejudiced as an option.

NO CHANGE.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREA

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

CHAPTER 24
FORT AUGUSTUS
Policies 14 & 15
 Crofters Commission

Land at Markethill is registered croftland in multiple ownership. Recent investigation carried out for the Commission, in relation to the transfer of a croft, identified unsatisfied demand for croftland in this area. Until this aspect is fully explored, along with current activity and access to the site is established, we ask that this area be excluded from the Local Plan. Since the above response was made the Commission have considered the Development Brief prepared by your Council and conclude that the wider community of Fort Augustus will be better served by our objection being retracted. This recognises the need for affordable housing in the community provided through the "grant" system consistent with the Communities Scotland guidance publications; Housing for Varying Needs, and Suitable Housing Design Guide For Scotland.

Noted. This confirms withdrawal of the Commission's objection to the allocation of land for expansion at Markethill. The matters relating to crofting use of adjoining land are consistent with the Local Plan. Committee may wish to consider elaborating the Markethill Development Brief in this regard in due course.
NO CHANGE.

I now confirm that the Crofters Commission withdraws its objection to the land owned by Mr Turnbull at Market Hill being included in the local plan for development. In so doing we would look to the draft Development Brief being completed and that the Crofters Commission are consulted in the process to ensure crofting can continue on the adjoining land, that remains subject to the Crofting Acts.

CHAPTER 25
TOMATIN
General
 Strathdearn Community Council

18. 20 houses east of the Distillery
 Strathdearn Community Council would support a development of 20 houses and a sports pitch here.

23. (pedestrian Measures and Safety and Amenity Concerns) ,
 Strathdearn Community Council would also support The Highland Council's investigation of the scope for pedestrian measures through the village, together with other safety and amenity concerns.

24. (Lobbying to improve the safety of the A9 Junction)
 Strathdearn Community Council would strongly support The Highland Council in lobbying the Trunk Roads Authority to improve safety of the A9 Junction at Tomatin. The Community Council has been in correspondence with the Scottish Executive regarding our concerns about the safety of this junction since December 2002. In May 2003 we sent copies of our correspondence with the Scottish Executive to the Director of Transport, Environmental and Community Services at The Highland Council. She is currently looking into the issues we have raised, including the breakdown of accident statistics on the A9 between Aultnaslanach and Slochd *between 1999 and 2002* (which we obtained from Northern Constabulary) which show that during this period there were.

- 1 Serious Accident on the A9 near the Tomatin Road (Au t 2002)
- 1 Slight Accident at the Tomatin Junction
- 1 Slight Accident on the A9 Northbound Two Way Undivided Carriageway North of Tomatin

Support welcomed.
NO CHANGE.

Para	Summary of Objection/ Representation	Decision / Reason
------	--------------------------------------	-------------------

1 Damage Only (no injury to people) Accident 100 yards north of the Tomatin Junction
 1 Damage Only Accident 400 yards north of the Tomatin Junction.

CHAPTER 31
CROACHY
General
 Crofters Commission

Inbye croftland has been identified for housing development to the north of the township, which forms part of an tenanted croft. Areas 1 & 2; are considered infill sites and we are content to see this designated for housing. Our preference would be that these areas are utilised for croft related housing, which may include provision of sites for family members. However the site marked 3 lies to the east of the public road and in our view should be excluded from the plan.

A further proposal to establish community woodland on the area to the southeast and marked 5, which also forms the whole of a tenanted croft can in our view be achieved without inclusion in the Local Plan. The Crofter (Scotland) Act 1993 defines the planting of trees as an acceptable activity for crofters to undertake on their crofts. Consequently the need to take the land out of crofting or to require the landlords consent to plant trees is no longer a prerequisite for planting or creating woodland on in-bye croftland. We therefore ask that the plan be amended to remove both areas to the east of the public roadway.

We are disappointed that you have not accepted our recommendation to amend the Local Pan to take account of our comments relating to Croachy. We remain of the view that the proposals may be damaging to the long-term future of crofting in this township. It appears, however, that there may be demand from locals to develop these sites and we would not wish to rule out local people finding sites within their local village to build on. Therefore, we do not propose to maintain our objection to the sites east of the public roadway being included in the Local Plan for the purposes stated, but wish the Council to note our comments for future consideration should proposals to develop theses sites be forthcoming.

This withdrawal of objection and comments therein are noted.
NO CHANGE.

STATEMENT UNDER REGULATION 37 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (STRUCTURE AND LOCAL PLANS) SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 1983

Inverness Local Plan

Part 1	Deposit Draft with Modifications (2)	
	Strategy	p2
	The City of Inverness	p8
	Hinterland	p16
	Rural Development Area	p22
Part 2	Factual Changes	p28
Part 3	Deposit Draft with Modifications	
	Strategy	p34
	The City of Inverness	p40
	Hinterland	p48
	Rural Development Area	p56

PART ONE:

The Highland Council proposes to make the following Modifications to the Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft with Modifications further to its consideration of the Report of Public Local Inquiry (March 2005) and decisions of the Planning, Development, Europe and Tourism Committee on 25th May 2005 and 1st October 2003*.

STRATEGY

Paragraph	Modification
FORWARD TO 2011	ADD to A Competitive Place after “A 24-hour operating regime”...”due consideration of safeguarding requirements,”.
FORWARD TO 2011	DELETE “Craig Dunain has been restored as the centrepiece of a new ‘media’ campus involving major links with the UHI”
CHAPTER 1 STRATEGY Supporting Communities Para 1.5	DELETE “Ideally about 300 affordable houses, including for varying needs, require to be provided initially each year to address the current backlog as care facilities are increasingly delivered to people in their own homes” and REPLACE with “Further to a needs assessment carried out in 2003, the Council has identified a requirement for 330-415 affordable homes per annum in the period to 2008.” DELETE para. 1.5 “by a standard planning obligation” and REPLACE with “in partnership with the private sector”.
Creating Prosperity Para 1.21	ADD after “There are parts of the landward area which offer potential for more productive uses along these lines.” ... “Potential areas for wind farms arise on high or exposed ground with no significant constraints”.
Para 1.47(e)	DELETE “permissive” and REPLACE with “more flexible”.
General Policies Para 1.49	ADD after “The following policies and proposals, which relate to the Local Plan area as a whole, will be applied.”... “Where a development proposal raises an issue that is not covered by a general policy, Structure Plan Policy G2, and any other relevant Structure Plan policies, will apply.”
BACKGROUND POLICIES BP2	DELETE “The Council will favour development unless this would significantly affect important features” and REPLACE with “The Council will permit development unless this would be likely to have a significantly adverse effect on, or be significantly adversely affected by, the features for which the area has been designated. Where it is concluded that any such adverse effects are likely to arise, development will only be permitted where it is considered that these would be outweighed by social or economic benefits”.
BP2	DELETE policy “The Council will favour development unless this would significantly affect important features” and REPLACE with “The Council will permit development unless this would be likely to have a significantly adverse effect on, or be significantly adversely affected by, the features for which the area has been designated. Where it is concluded that any such adverse effects are likely to arise, development will only be permitted where it is considered that these would be outweighed by social or economic benefits”.
Policy GP 2 Urban Structure	DELETE from Density/Capacity – City/District/Neighbourhood ...”<40; 20-25; and >10” and REPLACE respectively with “20/25-40; 10-20/25; up to 10”.
Policy GP2 Urban Structure	ADD after “Section 75 Agreement where necessary.”... “Developer contributions will be sought in accordance with the policy GP4”.
Policy GP2 Urban Structure	ADD under “Facilities” in “District” before “superstore” ... “supermarket or”.

Paragraph	Modification
Policy GP 3 Designed Sustainable Construction	<p>DELETE “The Council will prepare...Development Plan Policy Guidelines” and REPLACE with “The Council has prepared draft supplementary guidance on the aspects of design and sustainable construction listed in the policy in the form of a Development Plan Policy Guideline: Design for Sustainability in the Highlands.”</p>
Policy GP 4 Affordable Housing	<p>DELETE policy “Where housing land is being allocated...home ownership and discounted serviced plots” and REPLACE with “AFFORDABLE HOUSING In the City of Inverness, Beauly, Drumnadrochit, Ardersier, Croy, Kirkhill, Kiltarlity, Dores, and Fort Augustus, where housing land is being allocated for the first time or allocation is reaffirmed from an earlier local plan and a planning permission does not already exist, the Council will expect to secure, through a section 75 agreement with the landowner/s and other interested parties, or by other appropriate mechanisms, an affordable housing contribution. This will apply to proposals for 10 or more houses. Negotiations will be based on the sequential mechanisms set out in a Development Plan Policy Guideline (DPPG): Affordable Housing, and subject to market and site conditions, on an affordable housing target comprising a 25% proportion of the housing capacity of the proposal concerned.</p> <p>Outwith the settlements listed above, the Council will seek to secure affordable housing in suitable locations, through the mechanisms identified in Recommendation H6 of the Structure Plan”.</p>
Policy GP 5 Waste Management	<p>DELETE “The Development Plan will therefore...within the Highland Area Waste Plan” and REPLACE with: “To assist the delivery of the Area Waste Plan, this local plan identifies existing sites and those with planning permission for the sorting, processing (except Energy from Waste) and transfer of Municipal Solid Waste that are required to implement that Plan, and these will be safeguarded for this purpose. Proposals for other waste management facilities, including for commercial and industrial waste, will be assessed against policies in the Structure Plan, and in this local plan, guided by the Area Waste Plan.</p> <p>Unless facilities already exist or are to be made available by other means, and where consistent with Policy GP5 (Developer Contributions), proposals for new housing developments, will be expected to include household waste recycling facilities designed to achieve a level of provision equivalent to one recycling point/per 500 houses. Further guidance will be contained in the Development Plan Policy Guideline or protocol to be prepared in the context of Policy GP5”.</p> <p>ADJUST Proposals Map (to indicate existing waste management sites and those with planning permission).</p>
Policy GP 8 Transport	<p>DELETE policy and REPLACE with “In accordance with the objectives of its Local Transport Strategy to improve road safety and promote sustainable transport, the Council will pursue a major package of integrated transport measures for which it will seek to assemble funding from appropriate sources, including in partnership with the relevant agencies and private sector. Specifically, the Council will continue to encourage the Scottish Executive to give priority to the allocation of resources for trunk road improvements. Where developer contributions are sought, these will accord with Policy GP5. Development proposals will require to demonstrate as necessary, through Green Transport Plans and in accordance with NPPG 17 “Transport and Planning”, commitment to increased accessibility to public and community transport, reductions in private car commuting, increased integration of transport facilities, and modal shift in freight haulage.”</p>
Policy GP8 Transport	<p>ADD after “Trunk Road Improvements”... “where developer contributions are sought, they will accord with Policy GP5.”</p> <p>DELETE “NPPG” and REPLACE with “NPPG 17: Transport and Planning”.</p>

Paragraph	Modification
-----------	--------------

Policy GP 11 Water and Waste Water	<p>DELETE Policy GP11 Water and Waste Water and REPLACE with “The Council will encourage Scottish Water to improve infrastructure where necessary to implement the local plan strategy. Connection to the public sewer as defined in the Sewerage (Scotland) Act 1968 will be a pre-requisite of planning permission for all development proposals in the City of Inverness and in all the Local Centres and Key Villages identified in the plan. Elsewhere, connection to the public sewer will be required, unless the applicant can demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) connection is not feasible, for technical or economic reasons, or;(ii) the receiving WWTP is at capacity and Scottish Water has no programmed investment to increase that capacity, and;(iii) the proposal is not likely to result in significant environmental or health problems.
---	--

Planning permission for developments with private waste water systems will only be allowed where proposals satisfy (i) or (ii) above, and satisfy (iii). Any such systems within the River Nairn catchment, including all allocations within Strathnairn (see Chapter 14), Culloden Moor (20), and Clephanton (21) should discharge directly to land rather than water.”

Policy GP 12 Flood Risk	<p>DELETE policy and REPLACE with: “Development proposals in areas susceptible to flooding (defined using SPP 7’s Risk Framework) will require a developer funded Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
------------------------------------	--

In all circumstances where flood risk occurs, developers will be required to demonstrate:

- that the development can be adequately protected from flooding in terms of the Risk Framework and, where appropriate, that remedial measures to alleviate the flood risk will be taken;
- that no adverse impact on the characteristics of the watercourse will arise;
- use of best practice in the management and disposal of surface water; and
- that suitable evacuation provisions are embodied in site/building layout and design.

The costs of flood protection works associated with development proposals will be met by developers whether on or off-site”.

The Council will recognise that different types of housing having differing vulnerability to flooding. Mainstream housing development will normally be assessed against a 200 year flood return period whereas sheltered and/or accommodation without upper storey access will be assessed against a longer period. A shorter return period may be appropriate for those parts of a housing site reserved for car parking and amenity space.

The SEPA commissioned flood risk maps will not be available until September 2005 at the earliest. Therefore it will be impractical for the Council to comply with the Reporter’s final recommendation in terms of the content of the next draft of the Plan.

Policy GP 22 Habitats and Species	<p>DELETE Policy and REPLACE with “The Council will encourage the management and maintenance of areas supporting the following habitats and species, where these contribute to the coherence of the Natura network or are of major importance:</p>
--	--

- habitats and species listed in Annex I of the EC Habitats Directive;
- habitats and species of community interest listed in Annexes II, IV, and V; and
- habitats of naturally occurring wild birds, particularly those in Annex 1 of the EC Birds Directive and migratory species.

Paragraph	Modification
-----------	--------------

This policy will also apply to species listed in Schedules 1, 5 and 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended.

All these resources will be given full consideration in the assessment of development proposals that may affect them, and developments that are judged likely to have significantly detrimental effects shall not accord with the plan. In respect of the animals and plants identified in Annex IV, planning permission will not be granted unless it is demonstrated that the proposal will either not impact adversely on any European Protected Species in the area, or that all 3 tests in Regulation 44 of the Habitats Regulations are satisfied”.

THE CITY OF INVERNESS

Paragraph	Modification
CHAPTER 2 THE CITY OF INVERNESS Prospects Para 2.2	DELETE and REPLACE with “A strategy based on the Structure Plan and NPPG 8 is required to maintain an efficient, competitive and innovative retail sector and consumer choice. The aim is to consolidate the structure of shopping facilities which support the functions of Inverness as the regional centre and its development as a sustainable City, and enhance the role of outlying centres in the sub-region. Within Inverness, this affords primacy to the City Centre for all comparison shopping and a role for Retail Parks and locations at the Railyard/Longman in this regard, together with provision for convenience facilities at a scale suitable for local needs in existing and proposed district and neighbourhood centres. A sequential approach will apply in locating new retail development, with preference for sites within the City Centre, followed by suitable edge-of-centre locations and only then by out of centre sites that are or can be made easily accessible by a choice of means of transport. These provisions support a City Centre strategy which is intended to secure pedestrian priority of the traditional shopping “streets”, reaffirm retailing at ground floor level in the core of the Centre, maximize occupation of upper floor property for mixed uses, restore the built heritage and enhance the public realm; and further phases of commercial redevelopment, after 2006. In this context and further to the outcome of the Public Local Inquiry (2005), it is appropriate to make provision for an additional 5,000+ sq. m. of convenience floorspace and in the order of a further 19,000 sq. m. of bulky goods floorspace in the period to 2011.”
Prospects Para 2.3	ADD “2.3 Renaissance of the City Centre is vital to first impressions and an enduring image of Inverness. A major new shopping mall at Eastgate, opened in 2003, will be followed by an intensive programme of infrastructure and enhancement works as part of the City Vision approved by the Scottish Executive in 2004. These should be designed to extend the pedestrian priority area, enhance transport “gateways” and expose an outstanding urban fabric, represented by designation of the City’s core as an Outstanding Conservation Area and place of archaeological interest. Such designation provides a statutory basis for special attention to preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the City Centre where new developments are concerned, and further to completion of a Conservation Area Appraisal, such principles will also apply to additional areas so designated. This heritage is being enhanced under the auspices of a City Heritage Trust and the commitment of £250,000 per annum for three years from Historic Scotland for partner schemes. Measures are needed to stimulate trade in the traditional shopping streets, bring vacant upper floor accommodation into use and repopulate the Centre. Prestigious redevelopment, exceptional architecture and a cultural quarter would regenerate the riverfront, drawing on the Ness as the City’s greatest natural asset.
CITY CENTRE Policy 1 Uses	ADD after “purposes” ...“The City Centre will be regarded as the town centre in Inverness in terms of NPPG 8 and sequential approach, and the Council will seek to direct all new general comparison retail floorspace there in the first instance” and after “and vitality.”... insert “Land and sites at Academy Street and Strothers Lane offer opportunities for redevelopment, including retailing, post-2006.
Policy 6 Revitalisation	ADD to policy 6 after “major”...”high profile”. DELETE “could be” and REPLACE with “will be”.
REGENERATION Policy 7(ii) Torvean	DELETE from policy “and retailing”.
Policy 7(iv) Longman Bay	ADJUST Proposals Map (to delete BP3 from car parks).
Policy 7(v) Rail Yard/College	DELETE from policy “Subject to maintaining rail-related freight uses, land should become available for prestigious office, leisure and service uses together with a stronger focus for the UHI/Inverness College, which could extend...” and REPLACE with “Subject to maintaining rail-related freight uses, land should become available post 2006 for office, leisure and service uses, and bulky goods retailing, together with a strong focus for the UHI/Inverness

Paragraph	Modification
	College, which could extend ...”.
Policy 7(v) Rail Yard/College	ADD to policy 7(v): “The College is currently preparing an options appraisal which will guide its Development and Estates Strategy. The potential or redevelopment/re-use of any surplus property arising in this context may also be addressed in a Development Brief”.
Policy 7(vii) Ashton	ADD after “parkland location.”...“These include amongst a range of possible uses, business, research and development, educational and related leisure activities. Development”. DELETE “These developments”.
BUSINESS Policy 10	ADD “7.0 ha. of land at West Seafield is allocated for business use, subject to development being laid out to facilitate access to the adjoining major campus site at Ashton (see 7(vii)).”
BUSINESS/INDUSTRY Policy 11 Longman	DELETE from policy (second bullet) and REPLACE with “redevelopment of land adjoining the A82/Harbour Road axes for office/educational/service activities consistent with the adjoining college campus and future regeneration of the Rail Yard; and, within the A82/core area defined on the Proposals Map, retail use, restricted to bulky goods. Consideration will be given to the scope for land assembly where this is required to co-ordinate development in pursuit of the above objectives (see 7(v) above)”. DELETE “Further to (39) below, there will be a presumption against retailing other than activities ancillary to business/industrial uses and distributive trades” and REPLACE with “Outwith the defined A82/core area, retailing proposals other than those ancillary to business/industrial uses will require to be rigorously assessed against considerations (a)-(k) in paragraph 45 of NPPG 8”. ADJUST Proposals Map (as above).
SPECIAL USES Policy 20 District/Neighbourhood Centres	DELETE from policy 2:20 “In accordance with NPPG 8 and their functions these are defined as District Centres”.
Policy 23 Harbour	DELETE policy and REPLACE with “12.5 ha. of land comprising the harbour and adjoining service areas is allocated for expansion of the port and ancillary uses. The Harbour Authority is providing additional facilities and intends to pursue a further phase of reclamation for operational purposes to the north together with possible expansion of the yachting marina between 2002/5. Development in these areas will be subject to assessment of the effect on the Moray Firth cSAC and SPA and water quality, and safeguards for the integrity of these interests where required. Where it is concluded that this integrity would be likely to be adversely affected, planning permission will only be granted if there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest.”
Policy 27 Southern Distributor Road	DELETE policy 27 and REPLACE with: “A9-A82 TRUNK ROAD LINK The Council will safeguard land at Ness-side, Canal Parks and Torvean for the construction of Phase V of the A9-A82 Trunk Road Link Road to link Dores Road with the A82(T) at General Booth Road. This will enable the road to be constructed on the general alignment identified on the Proposals Map as one scheme, including a new canal crossing; and linkage to Glenurquhart Road/the Bught dependent on the means of construction, related traffic and technical considerations. The road will be designed to minimise the environmental impact on landscape features, and on open space and recreational activities towards the Bught. The highest standards of design and fit into the landscape will be required. The Council proposes to allocate funds after 2005/6 and will seek to secure contributions towards the cost of the route from developers of land at Ness-side, Charleston and Torvean in accordance with the provisions of this Local Plan. Provision will be made as part of the accommodation works for the road to relocate any displaced uses within Council land at Torvean, or on land the Council will seek to secure for such purposes, including for reconfiguration of an

Paragraph	Modification
	<p>18-hole golf course, the rugby pitches, clubhouse and ancillary facilities associated with these activities and the rowing club, see (2:43) below. The Council will also investigate the requirement for traffic management measures on General Booth Road.</p> <p>Given that Phase V will provide a continuous link between the A9 and A82 for trunk road traffic, the Council recommend that the Scottish Executive adopt and maintain the entirety of the route as part of the trunk road network.</p> <p>In respect of Phases III and IV, the Council will apply its Supplementary Policy: Southern Distributor Road in order to secure developer contributions in respect of proposals located within the Agreement Area”.</p> <p>ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly (to make clear that the route is a general alignment and includes a safeguarded <i>corridor</i> in the vicinity of the canal).</p>
<p>Policy 28 Cross Rail Link</p>	<p>DELETE policy and REPLACE with “CROSS RAIL LINK The Council propose to extend the inner relief road network with the construction of the Cross Rail Link between Millburn Road and Longman Road/A82(T) during the Plan period, without prejudice to development of land for railway operations. This will include a traffic management scheme for Midmills Road/Kingsmills Road and adjoining routes, which will be put in place before the link road opens to traffic. Any impact on the wooded escarpment at Millburn Road will be minimised as far as possible and retained woodland will be the subject of a management scheme.”</p>
<p>Policy 32 Urban Cycle Routes</p>	<p>ADJUST PROPOSALS MAP (to distinguish cycle routes, including those intended to comprise the Inverness Strategic Cycle Route Network).</p>
<p>Policy 33 Surface Water Drainage</p>	<p>DELETE “The Council will proceed with a Flood Prevention Order and will carry out site investigations and detailed design work.” and REPLACE with “The Council is progressing a South West Inverness Flood Relief Channel Flood Prevention Order and parallel planning procedures.”</p>
<p>EXPANSION Policy 36</p>	<p>DELETE after “see (37) below” and REPLACE with “Such developer contributions will be sought in accordance with the policy GP5”.</p>
<p>Policy 36(iii) Westhill</p>	<p>ADD after “in accordance with the agreed Development Brief”... “which sets out requirements for affordable housing, community facilities, footpath and cycle links; together with developer contributions towards the provision of education facilities, playing fields, and distributor and other road improvements.”</p>
<p>Policy 36(iv) Ness Castle/ Ness-side</p>	<p>ADJUST Proposals Map (to include the croft at 2 Ness-side in the Expansion Area and with a Policy 2:36(iv) annotation).</p>
<p>Policy 36(v) Charleston</p>	<p>ADD to 36(v) after “will be expected.”...”In this regard, development of brownfield land at Westercraigs with capacity for up to 140 houses could proceed prior to Phase V of the SDR.”</p>
<p>Policy 37 Developer Contributions</p>	<p>DELETE policy and REPLACE with “GP5 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS The Council will seek developer contributions towards resolving deficiencies in infrastructure and services, including affordable housing, transport and roads, education, community facilities, recreation and other public infrastructure, where these are necessary for a development to proceed. Such contributions will be secured by a section 75 agreement compliant with the principles in SODD Circular 12/196, or by other appropriate means. These contributions will be distinguished from other planning obligations, such as works required by planning conditions, for which developers will be wholly responsible. Where more than one landowner/developer is involved, obligations</p>

Paragraph	Modification
	<p>will be expected to be met on a fair and equitable basis, and in proportion to the share of the overall development potential. This plan identifies locations where developer contributions will be expected, and the matters these are expected to cover. Where a Development Brief or Master Plan is identified as a requirement, this will provide greater detail on the level of contributions expected, and will be formulated in discussions with the prospective developer, where known.</p> <p>The Council will prepare, in discussion with representatives of the development industry, and other relevant interests, a Development Plan Policy Guideline (DPPG), or a general protocol, setting out the principles that will be applied in assessing and calculating contributions.”</p>
<p>Policy 38 Districts/Neighbourhoods</p>	<p>ADD to policy 2:38 “The above provisions relate to community facilities other than retailing”.</p>
<p>Policy 39 Retailing</p>	<p>DELETE and REPLACE with “7 RETAILING OUTWITH THE CITY CENTRE Provision for convenience shopping will be made within District and Neighbourhood Centres, as defined in the Proposals Map, in accordance with their functions and at a scale commensurate with local needs, and with the retail hierarchy described at paragraph 2.2. District Centres are intended to serve a district function, and will not be regarded as town centres in applying the sequential approach and the provisions of NPPG 8.</p> <p>The Council also recognises that provision should be made for further growth in bulky goods/warehouse retail floorspace. This will be encouraged where opportunities arise within the established retail parks at Telford-Carse, Inshes and West Seafield. In the absence of suitable edge-of-centre sites at these locations, the Council has identified additional sites for this purpose at the Rail Yard and within a defined area of the Longman/A82 core (see policies 2:7(v) and 2:11). Any planning permissions granted in these locations will be restricted to bulky goods only. Proposals for retail development outwith the framework described above will be rigorously assessed against considerations (a)-(k) in paragraph 45 of NPPG 8.</p> <p>All proposals for retail development over 2,500 sq m gross will require to be the subject of a RIA”.</p> <p>ADJUST Proposals Map (to identify A82/Longman core).</p>
<p>AMENITY AREAS Policy 41 Green Wedges</p>	<p>DELETE from policy “No development will be permitted within defined areas.” and REPLACE with “There will be a presumption against development likely to prejudice the intended purpose and function of these defined areas”.</p>
<p>DISTRICTS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS DISTRICT: WEST Para 2.7</p>	<p>ADD after “Protection of the Torvean SSSI, the”...“the most significant”.</p>
<p>HOUSING Policy 47(iii) Leachkin Brae</p>	<p>DELETE Policy and REPLACE with “(iii) 5.5 ha Leachkin Brae subject to traffic monitoring to establish the timing of development relative to Phase V of the A9-A82 Trunk Road Link, and the provision of a footpath link through the site from Leachkin Road to Leachkin Brae”.</p>

Paragraph	Modification
DISTRICT: NESS FACTFILE	ADD under Service Deficiencies after “supermarket”... “or superstore”.
DISTRICT: SOUTH FACTFILE	ADD under Service Deficiencies after “supermarket”... “or superstore”.
DISTRICT: SOUTH HOUSING Policy 71(v) Slacknamarnock Quarry	DELETE “0.8” and REPLACE with “2.0”. ADD after “Development” ... “of 15-18 houses”. ADD “Consideration should be given to alternative access from the east.” ADJUST Proposals Map (to identify site).
Policy 88 Culcabock	DELETE second sentence of para 2.21 and REPLACE with “Local facilities have evolved at Perth Road/Culcabock Road. There is scope for limited redevelopment on land adjoining Drakies House, provided that local housing and traffic considerations are taken into account, and the part of the policies that remains undeveloped is safeguarded”. DELETE from policy 88, “Notwithstanding (79(iv)) above...improved access.” ADD to policy 79(iv) after “subject to access”... “improvements.” ADJUST Proposals Map (to reflect the extent of the Action Area).
DISTRICT: CULLODEN FACTFILE	ADD “supermarket or superstore”.
DISTRICT: CULLODEN HOUSING Policy 95 (i) and (ii) Balloch	ADD to policy 97 “(x) 0.6 ha Upper Cullernie, Balloch Suitable for varying needs.” AMEND Proposals Map (to apply <i>Amenity</i> policy on adjoining land within the District).
SPECIAL USES Policy 104 Housing/Open Space	DELETE “1.0 ha. of landtogether with play facilities” and REPLACE with “1.0 ha of land at Upper Cullernie is allocated for a mix of housing and community/open space: 0.5 ha for low density dwellings; and 0.5 ha for community open space, which could comprise a bowling green and play facilities.”

HINTERLAND

Paragraph	Modification
CHAPTER 3 A96 CORRIDOR Inverness Airport Economic Development Initiative Policy 3 Special Uses	<p>DELETE (i) “50 ha.” and REPLACE with “36 ha.”. Planning permission for these uses and activities will be subject to a Masterplan (see 5 below) and supporting Transport Assessment which will require satisfy the Council that proposals are compatible with sustainable transport objectives (and include as necessary, Green Transport Plans) Consideration may be given in future to expansion of business uses in this locality to the south west”.</p> <p>DELETE (iii) “together with a further 8.5 ha. for industry south west of the Airport terminal”.</p> <p>DELETE (v) “8.0 ha. for warehousing west of the Airport terminal” and REPLACE with “16.5 ha for industry and warehousing south-west of the Airport terminal subject, in respect of proposals for warehousing, to the suitability and availability of land within Dalcross Industrial Estate [see (iii) above].”</p>
INDUSTRY Policy 6 Fabrication Yard	<p>DELETE “whilst at the same time...Whiteness Head SSSI” and REPLACE with “Development will be subject to assessment of the effect on the Moray Firth cSAC and SPA and safeguards for the integrity of these interests where required. Where it is concluded that this integrity would be likely to be adversely affected, planning permission will only be granted if there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest”.</p>
Policy 7 Morayhill	<p>ADD after “subject to adequate drainage” ...”Any large scale industrial user will require public drainage”.</p>
CHAPTER 5 LOCHSIDE HOUSING Policy 1	<p>DELETE “drainage” and ADD after “site clearance.”... “Prior investigation of drainage arrangements will be required in consultation with SEPA, subject to which there will be a preference for individual septic tank/soakaway arrangements.”</p>
Policy 2	<p>ADJUST Proposals Map (to include land at Lochside House and its grounds in the settlement boundary).</p>
CHAPTER 6 HINTERLAND HOUSING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE Policy 1	<p>DELETE “Limited development of additional dwellings...in particular G2 Design for Sustainability” and REPLACE with “In addition to the settlements that are the subject of Chapters 7-22, some residential development that would consolidate or round-off the following housing groups may be acceptable, always provided this is in keeping with the existing settlement pattern. An indicative maximum additional capacity, equivalent to a 25% proportion of the number of existing houses, or houses with planning permission at September 2002 when the Deposit Draft Local Plan was placed on deposit, is given in brackets:</p> <p>Ardendrain (4), Balblair (5), Balnafoich (4), Beauly Braes (26), Cabrich (6), Cantray (north) (2), Cantraywood (6), Culburnie (7), Daviot East (7), Foxhole (5), Inchberry (3), Leanach (3), Lentrans House* (4), Lentrans Station (3), Moy (3), Moy Hall (3), Nairnside* (5), Newtonhill (4), Ruilick (3), Scaniport (3), Torness (2), Upper Myrtlefield (3).</p> <p>(* denotes groups where extant planning permissions will be regarded as fulfilling the indicative maximum additional capacity, and where further permissions will only be granted in substitution for any of these extant permissions that lapse).</p> <p>Outwith these locations (ie. in the open countryside or in the locations not listed above) there will be a presumption against the development of new dwellings and conversion of non-traditional buildings for housing purposes unless the proposal either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relates to the management of land; • is required for family purposes related to the management of land;

Paragraph	Modification
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprises conversion of a building of traditional design; or is to be developed by a social housing agency to meet demonstrated local affordable housing need. <p>All proposals within the Hinterland must also comply with the terms of the Structure Plan General Strategic Policies, in particular Policy G2: Design for Sustainability”.</p> <p>Further to GP11 above ADD “Foul drainage arrangements for development associated with the groups listed above, which fall within the River Nairn catchment, should discharge directly to land rather than water.”</p> <p>ADJUST Proposals Map (to delete defined settlements).</p>
Daviot East	DELETE after “Daviot East”....” (8)” and REPLACE with “(7)”.
Lentran House	ADD after “Lentran Station”...”Lentran House (4*).
Easter Clunes	DELETE “Easter Clunes (3)”
Policy 2 Settlement Expansion	DELETE “Accordingly, for development ... exceeding 5 years.” and REPLACE with “Accordingly, for development proposals involving land identified under the Settlement Policy E: Expansion, the Council will seek to limit, pro rata with the total capacity of such land in any settlement, the number of houses granted planning permission in any 5 year period to 50% of the 10 year figure”. ADD “The base date from which the 10 year period in the policy will apply is the date of publication of the Deposit Draft Local Plan (13 th September 2002).”
CHAPTER 7 BEAULY Expansion Policy 12 Croyard Road	<p>DELETE “Capacity 30 houses subject to...development commencing” and REPLACE with “30 houses, subject to assembly with (11) above, a developer funded Flood Risk Assessment, and phasing of development from the east. Completion of a distributor road between Croyard Road and the High Street (A862) and traffic calming on the lower section of Croyard Road will be a prerequisite to development commencing on this site”.</p> <p>DELETE from policy “Section 75 Agreement will be sought...incorporate affordable housing.” and REPLACE with “Section 75 agreement will be sought to ensure a rate and scale of building compatible with the terms of policy 6:2 Settlement Expansion. Development Briefs including comprehensive layout and servicing, footpath links, open space and landscaping will be expected. Development will also be expected to incorporate a range of house types and tenures, including affordable housing”.</p>
CHAPTER 8 DRUMNADROCHIT Village Centre Policy 1	DELETE policy and REPLACE with “The Council wishes to investigate the scope to strengthen the Village Centre as a focus for commercial/social activity and the potential for further mixed uses where these are compatible with local business prospects. Further investigation of additional retailing, business premises, visitor accommodation and facilities, residential uses (possibly in upper floor properties) and extension of the car park will be the subject of a Development Brief for the area identified on the Proposals Map. Within this area, any development will be expected to reflect the form and character of established buildings and their setting around the "Green" and to take account of residential amenity. Development will be subject to a flood risk assessment and any necessary and suitable flood protection measures which may require to be carried out on or off-site either at developer(s) expense or subject to their contribution.”

Paragraph	Modification
HOUSING Policy 8	DELETE “flats” and “planning permission, conversion” and REPLACE with “8 plots or conversion to flats”.
HOUSING Policy 11	DELETE policy and REPLACE with “Further infill housing at Lewiston and Milton, where compatible with the flood protection and other site requirements, should be of plot size, orientation, height, form and finishes, building line and curtilage treatment compatible with its surroundings.”
SPECIAL USES Policy 22	DELETE policy and REPLACE with “Subject to details, including adequate servicing and flood safeguards, the Council will support development of visitor and recreational facilities at Borlum, including on land south of the River Coiltie, and conversion of farm steadings. The 1.5 ha of land allocated for camping and caravan facilities may offer scope for expansion subject also to adequate servicing and compatibility with conservation interests.”
AMENITY AREAS Policy 28	ADJUST Proposals Map (to indicate Blairbeg Wood).
CHAPTER 11 KIRKHILL HOUSING Policy 1	ADD “The following land is allocated for housing: 1.3 ha. Achnagairn; up to 5 houses; Subject to consideration of the TPO. Section 75 Agreement requiring some of the proceeds from development to be devoted to the repair of Achnagairn House.”.
CHAPTER 12 KILTARLITY EXPANSION Policy 6 Glebe Farm	DELETE “including 0.4 ha. of open space” and REPLACE with “very high standard of design, layout and landscaping; housing being set back from Allarburn Drive beyond open space and oriented to retain a view across the site to the south; the widening of the access road at least as far as the site entrance; the provision of a footpath link to the school.”
CHAPTER 13 DORES HOUSING/SPECIAL USES Policies 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8	<p>DELETE policies 1, 3 and 6 and REPLACE with “EXPANSION 3.0ha. of land between Dores Parish Church and Ness View Cottage is safeguarded for possible relocation of the primary school, a cemetery extension, subject to further investigation of ground conditions, and housing. Access will be taken from the B862 and/or Torr Gardens. A Development Brief will be prepared to guide such uses and safeguards for the listed church, burial ground and woodland. The mix of uses will take account of the effectiveness of other allocated land within Dores.”</p> <p>DELETE policy “8 EXPANSION Subject to discussion with the community and landowner, 0.7 ha. of land west of the B862 is allocated for a mix of community/visitor uses in the longer term. This is centrally located and close to facilities, and development would be dependent on the release of land from agriculture. Uses could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relocation of the Primary School. Whilst not within the current capital programme, the Council recognises the desirability of relocating the school within the village in future. This site offers an alternative to land previously reserved at the Glebe, which could help meet local housing needs if released earlier (see 3); • extension of amenities to form a community focal point. This could include a recreational ground attaching to the existing small park together with a small visitor/tourist information centre and car parking at the “gateway” to the village; • a shop together with a caravan and camping site.

Paragraph	Modification
	The Council will prepare a Development Brief. This will address the siting of low profile buildings held tightly to the eastern side of this area to preserve the open outlook to Loch Ness and any ground works necessary to achieve connections to utility services. Access improvements/traffic calming on the B862; retention of trees and footpaths associated with the loch margins and remnants of the military road will be essential.”
*Policy 2	ADD after “access”... “, planting”
SPECIAL USES Policy 5	DELETE “0.2 ha. of land south of the village is allocated for a new Waste Water Treatment Plant. Scottish Water intends to provide this facility in 2003.”
*Policy 8	ADD after “services”... “and a landscape structure.”
CHAPTER 17 ABRIACHAN HOUSING Policy 1 Infill	ADJUST Proposals Map (to indicate extent of land subject to Policy 1 extended east).
CHAPTER 19 INCHMORE HOUSING Policy 1 Former Primary School	DELETE from policy 1 “0.1 ha.” and REPLACE with “0.3ha., 3 houses”.

THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREA

Paragraph	Modification
RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREA CHAPTER 24 FORT AUGUSTUS FACTFILE	DELETE “300” and REPLACE with “325”.
Prospects Para 24.1	DELETE “600” and REPLACE with “500”.
Village Centre Policy 3	ADD policy “3 1.2 ha. of land adjoining the village centre could have potential for housing, business and community uses subject to removal of part of the embankment, site levelling/upfilling, extension of services and any necessary river defence works. The bridge abutments and adjoining ground will be retained to enable public access, and vegetation around the edges of the site reinforced. A full feasibility study should be pursued to explore the cost/engineering implications of development and the options for access, after which the Council will prepare a Development Brief.”
*Policy 4	ADD “and edge planting to the A82.”
BUSINESS Policy 7	DELETE “on 0.1 ha. of land” and REPLACE with “0.1 ha. of land is allocated for these activities which are supported as part of an economic development strategy for the village (see 24 below).”
Policy 8	ADD policy “8 0.2 ha. of land adjoining the car park at the Village Centre is allocated for business use, subject to a feasibility study (see 3 above). This will involve reconfiguration of access through the car park and removal of part of the disused embankment.”
Policy 12 Blaes Pitch	ADD “0.2 ha. of land comprising the blaes pitch south of the Abbey is suitable for development for business purposes”.
EXPANSION Policies 14/15	<p>DELETE policy 14 and REPLACE with “The following land is allocated for housing and community uses in the medium-longer term. The Council will prepare Development Briefs to guide the comprehensive layout and servicing of these areas together with footpath links, related amenities and Landscaping: 2.0 ha. rear of the Old Convent access will be taken from the A82 and will involve upgrading/reconfiguration of the junction and road serving the Cemetery/sub-station, including consideration of a roundabout as part of a wider traffic management initiative. Development will be limited to the southern most fields. The Council will expect to enter Section 75 Agreement with the land/owner developer to secure the higher ground and mature woodland together with local cultural features in the community’s interest. Development will be set well back from the river margins to enable public access to be promoted and a new pedestrian link will be sought through to the trunk road/Abertarff Place north west of the site.”</p> <p>DELETE from policy “8.5 ha. between ... servicing and established village footpaths” and REPLACE with “8.5 ha. between the Academy and the Golf Course development could comprise a mix of housing types and tenure reflecting the range of local needs; business, community and recreation uses together with tree planting and safeguards for amenities, phased from the east. Particular attention should be paid to maintaining views. Access should be taken from the A82(T) opposite Abertarff Place with links through to the school, adjoining land identified for recreation, canal related servicing and established village footpaths.”</p>

Paragraph	Modification
CHAPTER 25 TOMATIN FACTFILE	DELETE “SETTLEMENT” and REPLACE with “KEY VILLAGE”.
DEVELOPMENT FACTORS	ADD “should be prioritised to improve infrastructure and assist development of the village.” DELETE “in 2002 and”.
HOUSING Tomatin Distillery	ADJUST Proposals Map (to DELETE annotation “A” on housing at Tomatin Distillery and REPLACE with “H”).
Policy 7 Allt Dubhag	DELETE “0.8 ha...access and drainage”. ADJUST Proposals Map (to delete Policy 7)
SPECIAL USES Policy 13	DELETE “0.2 ha of land...2002” and REPLACE with “The Waste Water Treatment Plant off Balvraid Road has recently been upgraded.”
SPECIAL USES Policy 15	DELETE from policy 15 “1.0 ha. of land...playing field” and REPLACE with “The Council will seek to secure and safeguard 1.0 ha. of land east of the Distillery or nearby for a community playing field (see policy 17)”.
EXPANSION Policy 18	DELETE from policy 18 “dependent on 13 above...ultimately” and REPLACE with “dependent on 13 above. Development will be subject to a Development Brief specifying design and layout, the identification and safeguarding of 1.0 ha of land at this location or nearby for a community playing field (see 15 above), drainage connections to a new sewage treatment works, and management/retention of existing woodlands, together with provision for a pedestrian link to Station Road before any houses on the site are occupied, and vehicular access through to Station Road ultimately”.
*Policy 18	ADJUST Proposals Map (to identify the approximate line of the link road from the C34 to Station Road).
*Policy 18	ADD after “existing woodlands”... “and new planting.”
ACTION Policy 20 Enhancement	ADD after “context of the Distillery.” ... “This could take place in association with a suitable business/tourism development on the site.”
Policy 23 Traffic/Pedestrian	DELETE policy 23 and REPLACE with “The Council will investigate the scope for measures to improve pedestrian safety through the village, and to address other safety and amenity concerns.”
CHAPTER 26 BALNAIN	DELETE “The Council will consider development proposals in accordance with the General Policies contained in the Local Plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area; consistent with the settlement pattern at Balnain, existing land uses and amenity.” and REPLACE with “SETTLEMENT POLICY Within the settlement boundary at Balnain, the Council will consider development proposals sympathetically where these accord with the General

Paragraph	Modification
SPECIAL USES Policy 1	Policies contained in the local plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area, and are consistent with the settlement pattern, existing land uses and amenity”.
CHAPTER 27 INVERMORISTON Prospects Para 27.1	DELETE “likely to be recognised as part of the Natura 2000 network of conservation assets”. ADD after “and falls”...”comprise a candidate SAC and”
SPECIAL USES Policy 2	ADJUST Proposals Map (to extend land within which the policy applies). ADD to policy after “at Invermoriston.”...“Private drainage arrangements will require to discharge directly to land rather than water.” DELETE “NOSWA” and REPLACE with “Scottish Water”
CHAPTER 28 DALCHREICHART SPECIAL USES Policy 1	DELETE “The Council will consider development proposals in accordance with the General Policies contained in the Local Plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area; consistent with the settlement pattern at Dalchreichart, existing land uses and amenity.” and REPLACE with “SETTLEMENT POLICY Within the settlement boundary at Dalchreichart, the Council will consider development proposals sympathetically where these accord with the General Policies contained in the local plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area, and are consistent with the settlement pattern, existing land uses and amenity. Private drainage arrangements will require to discharge directly to land rather than water”.
APPENDIX: POLICY DEFINITION	ADD Analysis Map. LEGEND footnote as follows: “SEDD Circular 2/2003 confirms the transfer of responsibility for safeguarding of civil aerodromes and technical sites from the CAA to site operators. The Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas)(Scotland) Direction 2003 obliges a planning authority, before granting planning permission for the development of land forming the site or in the neighbourhood of an aerodrome, to consult the airport operator.
APPENDIX: POLICY DEFINITION	Analysis Map
*APPENDIX: POLICY DEFINITION BP2	ADD after “wetlands”... “riparian woodlands”
PROPOSALS MAP	ADJUST in accordance with the above Modifications
APPENDIX	ADD: HOUSING LAND ALLOCATIONS.

PART TWO:

The Highland Council proposes to make the following factual changes to the Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft with Modifications.

Paragraph	Factual Changes
-----------	-----------------

INTRODUCTION	ADD “NATIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK FOR SCOTLAND The National Planning Framework for Scotland (2004) is a non-statutory, planning policy document prepared by the Scottish Executive which looks at Scotland from a spatial perspective and sets out an achievable long-term vision. This refers “Inverness and the Inner Moray Firth is an economic development zone with considerable potential. To the east of the City, the A96 corridor and the Airport offer opportunities for future expansion”.
STRATEGY Policy GP 2 Urban Structure	ADD to DISTRICTS FACTFILE: NESS, SOUTH and MILLBURN under Service Deficiencies “Playing Fields”.
Policy GP 7 Mineral Workings	DELETE “5.1” and REPLACE with “10.7” DELETE “7-8” and REPLACE with “15” DELETE “3.3” and REPLACE with “8.9” DELETE “There are two outstanding planning applications at Mid Lairgs and Wester Lairgs which, if approved, may secure a supply of materials in excess of 10 years’ requirements.”
CITY OF INVERNESS Policy 9 Beechwood Park	ADJUST Proposals Map (to indicate the extent of land with planning permission).
Policy 41 Green Wedges	DELETE “B8971” and REPLACE with “B971”.
SPECIAL USES Policy 61	DELETE “Road”and REPLACE with “Street”.
DISTRICT: CULLODEN Policy 95(iv) Culloden House	FACTUAL CORRECTION: Such that “requirements” reads “development should be contained within the walled garden and should respect the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed building”
CHAPTER 12 KILTARLITY HOUSING Policy 2	DELETE from policy “Any relocation.” and REPLACE with “and relocation”.
FORT AUGUSTUS Policy 21 Economic Development Strategy	DELETE policy “Further to ...to be accommodated.” and REPLACE with “Further to the allocation of alternative sites, the Council will investigate with Inverness and Nairn Enterprise and community interests the implementation of an economic development strategy for Fort Augustus. This should take account of demand for premises, land availability and the types of activity to be accommodated.”

Paragraph	Factual Changes
-----------	-----------------

SPECIAL USES Policy 13	ADJUST Proposals Map accordingly (to indicate where Waste Water Treatment has been built)
Glossary	APPEND Glossary.

The Highland Council proposes to make the following factual changes to the Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft with Modifications (2).

Programme and Procedures	DELETE from Programme and Procedure “Deposit Draft with Modifications (2)...August 2005” and “A period of 6 weeks is allowed for objections to the <u>Modifications</u> only. These should be lodged with: John D. Rennilson, Director of Planning and Development, The Highland Council, Glenurquhart Road, INVERNESS, IV3 5NX by <u>Friday 26 August 2005</u> .” and REPLACE with “A period of 28 days is allowed for Scottish Ministers to consider the Plan. During this period, they can direct the Council not to adopt the Plan or alternatively, after the 28 days, advise the Council that they may adopt the Plan.”
City of Inverness Policy 3	DELETE “The following facilities are to be refurbished during 2002/3:” and REPLACE with “The following facilities are being refurbished:
City of Inverness Policy 26	DELETE “The Council propose to build a Gaelic Medium Primary School in Inverness. Investigations are continuing to identify a suitable site. Options include development of an existing school campus and/or a new location within or adjoining one of the Expansion Areas.” and REPLACE with “The Council are building a Gaelic Medium Primary School in Inverness. A site has been identified at Slackbuie.”
City of Inverness Policy 52	DELETE “Clachnaharry Conservation Area “...“during 2002”.
City of Inverness Policy 56	DELETE “The Council and partners propose to carry out a housing renovation and redevelopment scheme involving land and property at McLennan Crescent during 2002. This will provide up to 68 new or refurbished dwellings and incorporate environmental improvements.” and REPLACE with “The Council and partners carried out a housing renovation and redevelopment scheme involving land and property at McLennan Crescent during 2002. This has provided up to 68 new or refurbished dwellings and incorporated environmental improvements.”
City of Inverness Policy 66	DELETE “The Council proposes to carry out environmental improvements to the fabric and setting of Cromwell’s Tower at the Citadel during 2002.” and REPLACE with “The Council has identified a need to carry out environmental improvements to the fabric and setting of Cromwell’s Tower at the Citadel”
City of Inverness Policy 73	DELETE after “Burnside Centre at Burn Road”... “during 2002-3”
City of Inverness Policy 89	DELETE “2003/4” and REPLACE with “2006/7”

Paragraph	Factual Changes
City of Inverness Policy 94	DELETE “Southern Distributor” and REPLACE with “A9-A82 Trunk Road Link”
City of Inverness Policy 98	DELETE “The Council propose to redevelop property at Cameron Court, Smithton to provide 20 houses and upgrade adjoining open space during 2002/3.” and REPLACE with “The Council have redeveloped property at Cameron Court, Smithton to provide 20 houses and upgraded adjoining open space.”
City of Inverness Policy 102	DELETE “The Council propose to extend Culloden Academy during 2002/3.” and REPLACE with “The Council propose to extend Culloden Academy.”
Chapter 4 Tornagrain Policy 2	DELETE after “Waste Water Treatment”...“during 2001”.
Chapter 8 Drumnadrochit Policy 13	DELETE “A new 250-pupil community Secondary School is under construction and due for completion in 2002. This will include a multi-purpose hall and library. Land extending to 3.5 ha. adjacent to the existing Primary School is allocated. Access - involving improvements to the A82(T) junction - will be taken from Pitkerrald Road with provision for bus drop-off/pick-up and turning together with shared parking facilities for use by staff/patrons of both schools. The existing access via St Drostan’s should continue for use by service traffic and a drop-off/ pick up point will also operate at the existing car park on Balmacaan Road.” and REPLACE with “A new 250-pupil community Secondary School has been completed. This includes a multi-purpose hall and library. Access - involving improvements to the A82(T) junction - has been taken from Pitkerrald Road with provision for bus drop-off/pick-up and turning together with shared parking facilities for use by staff/patrons of both schools. The existing access via St Drostan’s should continue for use by service traffic and a drop-off/ pick up point will also operate at the existing car park on Balmacaan Road.”
Chapter 8 Drumnadrochit Policy 14	DELETE “The Council proposes to extend Glenurquhart Primary School during 2002. Temporary accommodation will be provided for occupation during the construction period.” and REPLACE with “The Council has extended Glenurquhart Primary School.”
Chapter 9 Ardersier Policy 4	DELETE “Cairn Housing Association and Albyn Housing Society have acquired 31 houses at Station Road with assistance from the Council. These are to be refurbished as part of a joint initiative during 2001/02.” and REPLACE with “Cairn Housing Association and Albyn Housing Society have acquired 31 houses at Station Road with assistance from the Council. These have been refurbished as part of a joint initiative.”
Chapter 13 Dores Policy 1	DELETE after “2.2 ha”... “north”.
Chapter 25 Tomatin Policy 11	DELETE “A new primary school is currently under construction on 1.3 ha. of land adjoining Old Mill Road. The School will include a hall, nursery and kick-about pitch for community use and is scheduled for completion in 2002.” and REPLACE with “A new primary school has been constructed on 1.3 ha. of land adjoining Old Mill Road. The School includes a hall, nursery and kick-about pitch for community use.”
Chapter 27 Invermoriston	DELETE “The Scottish Executive proposes to improve visibility at the A82/Dalcattaig junction and to construct a footpath alongside the trunk road to the caravan and camping site at Rhu during 2002/3.” and REPLACE with “The Scottish Executive have improved visibility at the A82/Dalcattaig junction and

Paragraph	Factual Changes
Policy 3	constructed a footpath alongside the Trunk Road to the caravan and camping site at Rhu.”
Chapter 30 Foyers Policy 7	DELETE after “proposed to be built”...“in 2003/04”.
APPENDIX	DELETE from BP2 under Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings (B&C) “BC4” and REPLACE with “BC5”.

Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft with Modifications

PART THREE:

The Highland Council proposed the following Modifications to the Inverness Local Plan Deposit Draft.
These were advertised and placed on deposit from 30th May – 11th July 2003.

Matters recorded **bold** are the subject of further proposed Modifications, following the Council's consideration of the Report of Public Local Inquiry (March 2005) (see Part One).

STRATEGY

Paragraph	Modification
-----------	--------------

INTRODUCTION Context	ADD after “Development Plan”...”Both contain policies intended to guide development and land use change.”
Monitoring	ADD “The monitoring process will ensure that, when and where the Plan is no longer effective, a review will be considered.”
FORWARD TO 2011	DELETE A European City and Capital of the Highlands “Cultural Capital...a distinction won and proudly” and REPLACE with ...” the Highlands resurgent culture and heritage,” DELETE “Most are now connected to Inverness by safe and segregated commuter cycle routes.” ADD after “bedded in well, but”...”whilst the Inverness City Partnership has been instrumental in early progress,”
CHAPTER 1 STRATEGY Creating Prosperity Para. 1.21	ADD after “such as agriculture, where”...“- as well as supporting mainstream production -”. REPLACE annotation "Potential area for Wind Farms" with "symbol". ADD after "need to be balanced."..."There are parts of the landward area which offer potential for more productive uses along these lines. Harnessing and developing renewable resources could make a significant contribution to national energy objectives and through technological advancement, restore traditional economic links with communities founded on the major post-war hydro-schemes." AMEND Creating Prosperity accordingly.
Caring for our Heritage	AMEND Caring for Our Heritage accordingly.
Caring for our Heritage	ADD after “cultural attraction”...“Highland Archive and Genealogy Centre”.
Developing the Right Places The City	ADD after “committed to upgrading”...“water, drainage and roads”.
General Policies Para. 1.49	DELETE “overriding”.
Policy GP 2 Urban Structure	ADD to URBAN STRUCTURE Districts after “park”...”, local nature reserves”. ADD to Neighbourhoods after “playing fields”...”habitats”. ADD to Local Centre after “playing field”...”, local nature reserve”. ADD to Key Village after “playing field”...”habitat”.
Policy GP 3 Designed Sustainable Construction	DELETE “normally”. ADD after “re-use/recycling”...”(including the separation/collection of household, commercial or industrial waste)”.

Paragraph	Modification
Policy GP 4 Affordable Housing	DELETE “The proportion of affordable....Local Housing Strategy.” and DELETE “Stress Areas will be....Housing Development Fora.” ADD after “Categories of affordable housing may comprise social” ...“and approved private rented”. ADD after “25% proportion”...“, subject to market and site conditions,”.
Policy GP 5 Waste Management	DELETE “As part of the...within the Highland Structure Plan.” and REPLACE with “The Highland Area Waste Plan has been developed to establish a framework for improved waste management practices across the Highland Council area. The Plan is the output of a process that identified, consulted and appraised options for future waste management and represents the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) for the management of Municipal Solid Waste (which is that waste produced by households and some commercial premises collected and managed by the Council). A framework for the future development of BPEO for all other wastes is set out in the Area Waste Plan, and this will continue to develop through the work of the Highland Area Waste Group. Over the 20-year period of the Plan, recycling of Municipal Solid Waste will increase from 2% to 27%, while composting will rise to 13%; Energy from Waste will be introduced from 2010 at a rate of 27% and landfill will decrease from 98% to 29%. The infrastructure required to implement the BPEO has been identified, indicatively, within the Area Waste Plan. These facilities will include bring sites, civic amenity sites, transfer stations and composting facilities across the whole Council area. The Inner Moray Firth area will also require a Clean Materials Recycling Facility (MRF), an Energy from Waste Plant (from 2010 onwards) and a new landfill site for those wastes from which no further value can be obtained. The Highland Council will prepare an Implementation Plan which will inform the delivery of the majority of the infrastructure through a Public Private Partnership (PPP), for the provision of waste management services for the next 25 years. The PPP contract covers the areas of Inverness, Nairn, Ross and Cromarty (excluding Ullapool) and Lochaber, and it will be for the Partner to implement. Other facilities may be provided by the Council, the Not for Profit sector, community groups or through partnering arrangements between them. The Development Plan will therefore assist the delivery of the Area Waste Plan. Proposals for waste management facilities will be assessed in the context of the policies set out within the Highland Structure Plan and the Local Plan, guided by the Highland Area Waste Plan. Provision will also require to be made for commercial and industrial waste following the closure of the Longman landfill site in Inverness, and these are likely to be provided by the private sector. Any proposals for the transfer or disposal of these wastes will also be the subject of assessment under the criteria set out within the Development Plan, as well as the general principles and any emerging guidance within the Highland Area Waste Plan.”
Policy GP 6 Farm Diversification	ADD after “business/visitor and”...”leisure/”.
Policy GP8 Transport	ADD “GP8 TRANSPORT In accordance with its Local Transport Strategy, the Council will pursue a major package of integrated transport measures for which it will seek to assemble funding from appropriate sources including in partnership with the relevant agencies and private sector. Specifically, the Council will continue to encourage the Scottish Executive to give priority to the allocation of resources for trunk road improvements. Developer contributions will be expected in respect of relevant transport objectives (see 37) and proposals will demonstrate as necessary, through Green Transport Plans and in accordance with NPPG, commitment to increased accessibility to public and community transport, reductions in private car commuting, increased integration of transport facilities, and modal shift in freight haulage.”
Policy GP 10 Water and Waste Water	ADD “Mains drainage will be a prerequisite of development within the City and in defined Local Centres and Key Villages, where land is identified for expansion or promoted for other significant purposes.” DELETE “press” and REPLACE with “encourage”.

Paragraph	Modification
Policy GP 11 Flood Risk	DELETE “Further to NPPG7...levels of risk” ...and REPLACE with “Further to NPPG7, development proposals in areas susceptible to flooding (defined in relation to the best available flood probability data), will require a developer-funded Flood Risk Assessment. Proposals will be assessed for their sensitivity according to the following levels of risk:” ADD after “are embodied in”...”site/building”.
Policy GP 12 Surface Water Drainage	ADD after “C521”...“and PAN 61 Planning and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems”.
Policy GP 13 Contaminated Land	DELETE “water courses” and REPLACE with “controlled waters”. DELETE “detailed site survey and analysis” and REPLACE with “risk assessment”. DELETE “leaching” and REPLACE with “contaminant migration”.
Policy GP 14 Flood Appraisal	ADD after “River Ness”... “and River Nairn”.
Policy GP 16 Long Distance Routes	DELETE “propose to complete” and REPLACE with “completed”.
Policy GP 22 Habitats and Species	ADD “GP22 HABITATS AND SPECIES Development proposals which affect habitats or species to which Schedules 1, 5 and 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Annex 2 or 4 of the EC Habitats and Species Directive and Article 4.1 and 4.2 of the EC Wild Birds Directive refer, will be considered in the context of policies N1 and G2 of the Structure Plan.”

THE CITY OF INVERNESS

Paragraph	Modification
-----------	--------------

<p>CHAPTER 2 THE CITY OF INVERNESS Prospects Para. 2.1</p>	<p>DELETE “Highland bid for European Capital of Culture 2008.” and REPLACE with “the Highlands resurgent culture and heritage.”</p>
<p>Para. 2.2</p>	<p>ADD after “archaeological interest”...“ In purely quantitative terms there is limited capacity in Inverness for additional convenience shopping. Any additional superstore may lead to restructuring of the existing pattern of retailing. This may achieve improvements in the distribution and accessibility of facilities, consumer choice and sustainable City districts but equally might result in the closure of one or more of the existing food superstores at the Carse, Inshes, Rose Street and/or Tomnahurich Street with the loss of convenience for those people living close to these shops. As regards comparison shopping, additional floor-space at Eastgate II will provide for “town centre” requirements for the foreseeable future. Additional growth is expected in the market for “bulky/white products” in the period through to 2011.”</p>
<p>Para. 2.3</p>	<p>ADD after “visitor destination”...“, possibly including a focus for archive and genealogy interest in the Highlands.” ADD after “and utility networks”...”namely, post-2001 water, drainage and distributor road systems,” ADD after “accommodation and”...”leisure”.</p>
<p>Para. 2.4</p>	<p>DELETE “desirable” and REPLACE with “essential”.</p>
<p>Para. 2.5</p>	<p>DELETE “must be maintained”. ADD before “Attractive, accessible”...“There should be”.</p>
<p>Para. 2.6</p>	<p>ADD after “to public access”...”and providing better links across the urban area as a whole.”</p>
<p>CITY CENTRE Policy 1 Uses</p>	<p>DELETE “Proposals which seek a significant...the terms of (39) below.”</p>
<p>Policy 2 Design</p>	<p>ADD “Integrated directional signing and information will be essential.”</p>
<p>Policy 5 Circulation</p>	<p>ADD after “Bridge Street/”...”Bank Street”.</p>
<p>Policy 6 Revitalisation</p>	<p>ADD after “Harbour/”...“South Kessock”. ADD (fourth bullet); access to existing uses and consideration of alternatives to on-street parking;” ADD after “cyclist improvements”...”possibly with public conveniences”.</p>

Paragraph	Modification
REGENERATION Policy 7(ii) Torvean	ADD “Relocation of the 18-hole golf course will be a prerequisite of development at Torvean <u>and</u> construction of Phase V of the SDR (see 27 below). Discussions will be held with the Golf Club in respect of an agreed timescale for such works.” ADD after “park-n-ride”...“retailing, in accordance with 39 below”.
Policy 7(iii) Muirtown Basin	ADD after “A feasibility study”...” to be pursued in partnership with British Waterways,” ADD after “Traffic Assessment”...”and may require to address adjacent foot and cycle routes”.
Policy 7(iv) Longman Bay	ADD “and Environmental Assessment of the effect of development and other uses on the Moray Firth cSAC and SPA and safeguards for the integrity of these interests will be necessary.” ADD after “trunk road junction”...” (possibly a grade separated interchange).
Policy 7(v) Rail Yard/College	ADD after “residential halls”...”and retailing, in accordance with 39 below”.
Policy 7(vi) Craig Dunain	ADD after “other services”...“including integrated water supply improvements”.
BUSINESS/ INDUSTRY Policy 11 Longman	ADD after “regeneration of the Rail Yard (see 7(v) above)”...”Consideration will be given to the scope for land assembly where this is required to co-ordinate development in pursuit of the above objectives”.
SPECIAL USES Policy 18 Police HQ	DELETE “1.8 ha.” and REPLACE with “0.8 ha.” ADD after “from the existing HQ site”...”and a contribution towards upgrading of Inshes roundabout may be required. The layout and design of any buildings and ancillary use of land should have regard to the appearance of the site from the west, minimise disturbance to existing trees, and where appropriate include SUDS to control the release of surface water.”
Policy 20 District Centres	ADD after “mixed use district/neighbourhood centres”...” (retail, leisure and community activity)”.
Policy 23 Harbour	ADD after “ancillary uses”... ”subject to Environmental Assessment of the effect of development on the Moray Firth cSAC and SPA and safeguards for the integrity of these interests where appropriate”. DELETE “Safeguards will be required for the Firths nature conservation interests.”
Policy 27 Southern Distributor Road	DELETE “This will enable either Route C or D to be built in one or two phases and further detailed investigation of a suitable canal crossing.” and REPLACE with “This will enable the route to be constructed on the alignment identified on the Proposals Map with a canal clearance of 4.5 - 6.0m; and linkage to Glenurquhart Road/the Bught dependent on the means of construction, related traffic and technical considerations whilst minimising the environmental impact on open space and recreational activities towards the Bught”. AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly. ADD after “ancillary facilities”...”associated with these activities and the rowing club, where appropriate”. ADD after “trunk road network”...”The Council will investigate the requirement for traffic management measures on General Booth Road”.

Paragraph	Modification
Policy 28 Cross Rail Link	AMEND PROPOSALS MAP (to define route).
Policy 32 Urban Cycle Routes	AMEND PROPOSALS MAP (to define proposed routes).
Policy 33 Surface Water Drainage	DELETE “extended ultimately to” and REPLACE with “including”.
EXPANSION Policy 36(i) Inshes	ADD “Redevelopment/conversion of the existing farm steadings for commercial/community or housing use will be promoted.”
Policy 36(ii) Culduthel-Slackbuie	DELETE “interim”.
Policy 36(iii) Westhill	ADD “Development will be expected to proceed in accordance with the agreed Development Brief.”
Policy 36(iv) Ness Castle/ Ness-side	ADD after “which could be suitable for”...”social/leisure”. ADD to (b) after “with the A82”...“including developer contribution”. ADD to (b) after “trunk water”...”and drainage”.
Policy 36(v) Charleston	ADD after “dependent on”...”completion of”. ADD after “Phase V”...” (including a canal crossing”. DELETE “water storage facilities.” and REPLACE with “integrated water supply improvements including additional storage”. ADD after “mains utility”...”and other”
Policy 37 Developer Contributions	DELETE “DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS 37 Individual Expansion Areas... confirmed in the Local Plan.” and REPLACE with ”DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS 37 The Council will seek developer contributions towards resolving deficiencies in infrastructure and services, including affordable housing, transport and roads, education, community facilities, recreation and other public infrastructure, in order to facilitate development. Where necessary, these will be secured by Section 75 Agreement compliant with Circular 12/96, relate in scale and kind to the development proposed and be proportionate to the deficit or additional burden arising from the impact of the development proposed on the respective City district and neighbourhood. The timing of related works may be dependent upon the aggregation of resources, including where applicable, the allocation of funding by the Council or relevant agency. Insofar as these principles relate to the City’s Expansion areas and Regeneration sites, such requirements, where possible, will be set in the context of a Development Brief/Master Plan as identified. They will be accompanied by a Protocol identifying expected financial contributions and developer requirements. These provisions will apply to all land within the City of Inverness allocated for housing, business/industry, special and community uses in this Local Plan, and in other circumstances where the Council is minded to grant planning permission.

38 Such Developer Contributions will be distinguished from other planning obligations for which developers will be wholly and entirely responsible and which the Council will expect to be fulfilled as an integral part of development proposals, whether on or off-site. Where a development proposal involves more than one landowner/developer, these obligations will be expected to be met by individual interests on a fair and equitable basis and in proportion to their share of the overall development potential. In these circumstances all parties will be expected to enter into an appropriate agreement transferring land and quantifying the extent of works or financial commitments. This will be accompanied by definitive plans relating to ground for roads and other public purposes which it is anticipated will be transferred at zero consideration to the Council or other agency as appropriate.”

<p>Policy 39 Out-of Centre Retailing</p>	<p>DELETE “39 OUT-OF-CENTRE RETAILING In accordance with...with local needs see (20) above.” and REPLACE with “39 RETAILING Further to its intention to strengthen and enhance the City Centre as the focus for retail activity, the Council’s objective is to improve the distribution and accessibility of shopping facilities, consumer choice and encourage sustainable City districts. Accordingly, proposals for retail development will be considered against the sequential test set out in NPPG8 and, for those involving more than 2,500 sq. m., a Retail Impact Assessment which will be expected to demonstrate compatibility with these principles. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for convenience shopping, proposals should be consistent with the viability of food stores at District/Neighbourhood level in accordance with policies R4 of the Structure Plan; and • for comparison shopping: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) (personal goods), the City centre will continue to be promoted; (b) (“bulky/white goods”), proposals should recognise further potential for growth over the Plan period up to an additional 12,500sq.m.(net), and possible opportunities at the regeneration sites (ii) Torvean and (iv) Rail Yard and within the A82/core of the Longman Estate consistent with the promotion of mixed uses as set out in (11) above.” <p>For the purposes of the Council’s objectives, the existing Retail Parks at West Seafield, Inshes and Telford-Carse will be regarded as District Centres in the context of NPPG8.</p> <p>AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly.</p>
<p>AMENITY AREAS Policy 41 Green Wedges</p>	<p>AMEND PROPOSALS MAP (to define Amenity Areas).</p>
<p>Policy 41(ii) Torvean/Muirtown</p>	<p>ADD after “worked out quarry”...”community woodland”.</p>
<p>Policy 44 Public Access</p>	<p>ADD after “on the Proposals Map”...“for discussion with landowners”.</p> <p>AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly.</p>
<p>Policy 46 Badger Survey</p>	<p>ADD after “urban fringe”...“and into the A96 corridor”.</p>

Paragraph	Modification
DISTRICTS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS DISTRICT WEST Para. 2.7	ADD after “Southern Distributor Road”...“Phase V (canal crossing)”.
ACTION Policy 54	ADD “The Council will keep under review the scope to carry out improvements at the railway bridge/B862 junction at Clachnaharry.”
DISTRICT CENTRAL Para. 2.12	ADD after “community focus.”...”The South Kessock Community Woodland, “.
SPECIAL USES Policy 61	DELETE “0.8 ha. of land at Telford Street...hall or public house.” and REPLACE with “Subject to availability, 0.8 ha. of land at Telford Street/Balnacraig Lane would be suitable for redevelopment for a mix of uses including residential, community and commercial. Any retail use should be consistent with the scale of existing retail activity and the form and layout of development compatible with access, traffic management and residential amenity. A Development Brief will be prepared in consultation with the landowner.”
DISTRICT NESS Policy 76 Amenity Areas	ADD “10.0 ha. of land enclosed by the SDR, Culduthel Road and Slackbuie Avenue is allocated for open space purposes and the formation of a District Park. Developer contributions will be sought in association with 36(ii) above.” AMEND PROPOSALS MAP.
DISTRICT MILLBURN Para. 2.21	DELETE “Access to this land needs to be resolved.”
SPECIAL USES Policy 84	ADD after “community”...“and leisure”.
Policy 85	ADD after “office/business”...“and community”. ADD “0.2 ha. of land at Miller Road/adjoining the westernmost junction with the SDR is allocated for commercial/community use.”
Policy 86	DELETE “the scope for ...part of the policies.” and REPLACE with “the scope for development of no more than 50% of the frontage policies of Drakies House and retention of the remainder of its grounds”.
AMENITY AREAS Policy 89	DELETE after “statutory procedures”...”and consultation.” and REPLACE with “A Conservation Area appraisal will be prepared as a basis for consultation and the Council will take account of any further views prior to proceeding.”
Policy 91	DELETE “7.0 ha.” and REPLACE with “8.0 ha.”.

Paragraph	Modification
DISTRICT CULLODEN Para. 2.25	DELETE “varying needs” and “and park”. ADD after “Other open space”.../community facilities are”. DELETE “is”. ADD after “housing areas is required”...”These could be met south of Balloch and at Cullernie in the event that land becomes available.”
HOUSING Policy 95	DELETE “95(i) 0.6 ha. of land...varying needs”. DELETE “95(ii) 0.6 ha. of land...varying needs”. ADD “95(xi) 1.9 ha. Moray Place, including affordable accommodation. Layout will accommodate a centrally located open space and play facilities.”
Policy 97	DELETE “has been given planning permission.” ADD before “A mixed use development”...”Land is allocated for”. DELETE “will” and REPLACE with “could”.
Policy 97(v)	AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly.
Policy 101	AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly.
SPECIAL USES Policy 102	DELETE “1.0 ha. at Upper Cullernie...a park and play area”. and REPLACE with “1.0 ha. of land at Upper Cullernie is allocated for a mix of development and community/open space purposes: 0.5 ha. for housing with smaller, lower density dwellings preferred; and 0.5 ha. for community/open space could comprise a bowling green together with play facilities.”
Policy 103	DELETE “1.7 ha. of land at Moray Place is allocated for community use/open space.”

HINTERLAND

Paragraph	Modification
CHAPTER 3 A96 CORRIDOR Inverness Airport Economic Development Initiative Policy 3 Special Uses	ADD “8.0 ha. for warehousing west of the Airport terminal”. AMEND Proposals Map accordingly. DELETE “first phase”. AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly. ADD “Development and related infrastructure will be consistent with the protection of nature conservation interests in the Moray Firth cSAC”
Policy 4	DELETE “ultimately” and REPLACE with “It is proposed to construct the distributor road during 2004/5 in one phase.
Policy 5	ADD “for elaborating the land allocations at 3(i-v above) and”. ADD after “arrangements”...”for”. ADD after ”setting of farm and woodland.”...“which will incorporate safeguards for the ancient and semi-natural woodland between the development area and the B9093.” ADD “Any phased installation of water and drainage services will be consistent with an overall framework for utilities, and the technical requirements of SEPA and Scottish Water.”
Policy 6 Fabrication Yard	DELETE “the nature conservation interest in the adjoining Moray Firth SPA.” and REPLACE with “statutory nature conservation interests represented by the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar site, the Moray Firth cSAC and Whiteness Head SSSI”. AMEND PROPOSAL MAP accordingly. ADD after “remediation works”...”where necessary.”
Policy 7 Morayhill	ADD after “energy production.”... “subject to adequate drainage”.
CHAPTER 4 TORNAGRAIN Development Factors Para. 4.2	DELETE “are programmed.” and REPLACE with “have been carried out with effluent pumped to Ardersier via Dalcross.”
CHAPTER 5 LOCHSIDE Para. 5.1	ADD after “open space below”...”Safeguards will be required for conservation interest in Loch Flemington SPA”.
Hinterland Prospects	DELETE “Stuart Bay...Whiteness Head” and REPLACE with “Longman and Castle Stuart Bay, the Beaully Firth, and Whiteness Head SSSI; the Inner Moray Firth SPA and Ramsar Site and the Moray Firth SAC.”
Cabrich	AMEND PROPOSALS MAP (Cabrich) accordingly.

Paragraph	Modification
Daviot East	AMEND PROPOSALS MAP (Daviot East) accordingly.
Nairnside	DELETE “Nairnside”. AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly
Lentran House	DELETE “Lentran House”. AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly.
BEAULY Expansion Policies 10 & 11	DELETE “5.7 ha. north west of the lorry park, 60 houses” and REPLACE with “12. 2.7 ha. north-east of Croyard Road, 30 houses, subject to assembly of this land with (11) above and phasing of development from the west. Completion of a distributor road between Croyard Road and High Street (A862) will be a prerequisite to development commencing. ” ADD before “Development Briefs”...”Section 75 Agreement will be sought to ensure a rate and scale of building compatible with the terms of policy : (2) Settlement Expansion”.
DRUMNADROCHIT VILLAGE CENTRE Policy 1	ADD after “the Green.” ...“and residential amenity”.
Policy 2	DELETE after “The Council”...”propose to build” and REPLACE with “built. ADD after “2001/02”...”on” and DELETE “is allocated”.
HOUSING Policy 6	ADD “Tree planting and stone walling to Balmacaan Road”.
Policy 8	ADD “Design details at (11) below will be sought where appropriate.”
Policy 10	ADD “1.5ha. Pitkerrald Road (south), 5 houses access; preferred from Pitkerrald Road; mains drainage and adequate provision for surface water, retaining vegetation cover and access/safeguards for the monument”.
Policy 11	ADD “Further infill housing at Lewiston and Milton, where compatible with the flood protection and other site requirements, should be of compatible plot size, orientation, height, form and finishes, building line and curtilage treatment.” AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly
SPECIAL USES Policy 13	DELETE “in consultation with” and REPLACE with “involving”.
Policy 20	DELETE “1.5 ha of land at Borlum Farm is allocated for camping and caravan facilities.” and REPLACE with “Subject to details, the Council will support development of visitor and recreational facilities at Borlum including on land located south of the River Coiltie, subject to adequate servicing and flood safeguards; and conversion of the farm steadings.1.5 ha of land allocated for camping and caravan facilities may offer scope for expansion subject to adequate servicing and compatibility with conservation interests.”

Paragraph	Modification
Policy 21	ADD after “Village Centre”...“together with other safety improvements”.
EXPANSION Policy 23	ADD after “The Council”...“will continue to discuss the principles of development in this locality with community interests and”.
Policy 23	ADD after “north of Druimlon”...“although consideration will continue to be given to the scope to serve this land from Pitkerrald Road;”. ADD after “It is essential that any <u>limited</u> infill does not prejudice these objectives.”
AMENITY AREAS Policy 24	DELETE “propose to carry out” and REPLACE with “has carried out”. ADD after “2002 and”...“will deal”. ADD “consistent with an integrated catchment Management Plan, in partnership with various agencies, landowner and community interests.”
Policy 27	ADD after “in partnership with”...“the Glen Urquhart Land Use Partnership”
Policy 28	ADD to 28 “The Council will keep under review the need to upgrade the local road network.”
Policy 29	ADD to 29 after “in partnership with”...“the Glen Urquhart Land Use Partnership”
CHAPTER 9 ARDERSIER ACTION Policy 16	ADD after “public toilets”...“Safeguards are essential for the Moray Firth cSAC.”
CHAPTER 11 KIRKHILL HOUSING Policy 6	ADD after “boundary planting”...”, and layout to incorporate access through to the Hill House policies and to Wardlaw Road”.
CHAPTER 12 KILTARLITY Development Factors	ADD after “growth of the community.”...“Limited capacity in the WWTP is sufficient to cater for building in the short-medium term”.
HOUSING Policy 8	ADD after “residential uses”...“It is expected that development of this land will require upgrading of the WWTP.”

Paragraph	Modification
-----------	--------------

CHAPTER 13 DORES AMENITY AREAS Policy 8	DELETE after “Loch Ness for recreation”...“British Waterways propose to install” and REPLACE with “This could include”.
--	---

CHAPTER 14 STRATHNAIRN Prospects-Action	DELETE “STRATHNAIRN” and REPLACE with: “Prospects
--	--

14.1 Inverarnie, Farr and Broomhill-Croftcroy are small settlements strung out over some 2 km. alongside the B851 through Strathnairn. This part of the strath has experienced considerable growth in population and house-building with some 45 dwellings completed in the past decade. Many are located in the countryside where controls on sporadic development are tightening. Local housing, employment and facilities therefore require to be met substantially within the recognised settlements in future in order to retain population and enhance the level of services. A new community hall has been built recently and two sports pitches established.

Development Factors

14.2 Land for development in Inverarnie, Farr and Broomhill-Croftcroy needs to be augmented, utilities upgraded and amenities safeguarded or provided. The priority is to preserve the separate identities of the Strathnairn communities by preventing their coalescence. Emphasis is placed on building opportunities which safeguard this existing settlement pattern, make improved infrastructure provision more likely, give choice and take account of:

- physical factors/land use: the flood plain is a significant constraint. Land currently in farming or forestry use east of Inverarnie and between Farr and Croftcroy appears suitable for development, subject to availability;
- infrastructure/services: the lack of public drainage facilities needs to be rectified. A combined system may be appropriate;
- facilities: the primary school, shop/filling station and a new community hall are spread between the communities. There is a need for a system of linking footpaths;
- safety: the B851 is narrow and poorly aligned in places. Consideration needs to be given to segregated pedestrian/cycle routes and measures for restricting traffic speeds;
- amenity: reducing the impact of overhead electricity lines by reinforcing the landscape framework; and protecting the “boulder field” and setting of the Church. Opportunities arise to create local trails involving woodlands, the River Nairn edges and archaeological sites.

Policies and Proposals

INVERARNIE

HOUSING

The following land is allocated for housing:

	Area (ha.)	Location	Capacity	Requirements
1	1.3 ha.	east of Inverarnie	3 houses	tree retention, redevelopment of sheds, access only from south/west and drainage, siting, design and orientation of houses together with retention of existing vegetation should respect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers
2	0.7 ha.	Dalvourn	3 houses	realign paddocks, shared access

SPECIAL USES

3 The community intend to progress a pavilion/changing room facilities on land adjacent to the recently completed sports pitches.

ACTION

4 Scope exists for a small wildlife reserve comprising the lower wetter ground east of Inverarnie Hall. This could be managed by the community with assistance from Scottish Natural Heritage.

FARR

HOUSING

The following land is allocated for housing:

	Area (ha.)	Location	Capacity	Requirements
5	0.6 ha.	School Wood	6 houses	Community Woodland, footpath system, reserve access

BROOMHILL / CROFTCROY**HOUSING**

The following land is allocated for housing:

	Area (ha.)	Location	Capacity	Requirements
6	0.7 ha.	Croftcroy	2 houses	further phase

**STRATHNAIRN
ACTION**

- 7 The Council will encourage an initiative to secure community management of part of School Wood and Milton Wood. Scope exists to create small car parks and improve the footpath system which connects the communities.
- 8 Consideration should be given to introducing further traffic calming measures between Inverarnie and Broomhill.
- 9 The Council will lobby Scottish Water to provide treatment facilities within the Strathnairn area.”

**CHAPTER 16
DOCHGARROCH
Policy 1**

ADD after “visitor”...“associated leisure facilities”

**CHAPTER 17
ABRIACHAN
HOUSING
Policy 1**

ADD after “upgraded”...”to adoptable standards, where necessary”.

AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly.

DELETE “Leault”.

ADD “Additional dwellings will require to demonstrate acceptable fit with the building pattern and landscape setting, focus on the established “nodes” and retain intervening open land and vegetation.”

**CHAPTER 21
CLEPHANTON
Policy 1**

ADD before “drainage”...”adequate”.

**CHAPTER 22
DAVIOT
Policy 1**

ADD after “housing at Daviot”...“with the exception of limited “infill” outwith the operational “buffer” associated with the quarry, suitably set back and screened from the A9 by significant planting.”

AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREA

Paragraph	Modification
RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREA CHAPTER 24 FORT AUGUSTUS Prospects Para. 25.1	ADD after “fire station.”...”Future provision of new community sports and leisure facilities could embrace the school and the hall.” DELETE “Authority” and REPLACE with “Enterprise”.
VILLAGE CENTRE Policy 1	DELETE “It is intended to establish a Community Company” and REPLACE with “Fort Augustus Abbey Preservation Trust has been established”.
Policy 2	DELETE “160” and REPLACE with “156”.
Policy 3	DELETE from Fort Augustus “3. 1.2 ha. of land adjoining the village centre...Development Brief”.
HOUSING Policy 5	DELETE after “Market Hill (south)”...“6” and REPLACE with “7-8”.
BUSINESS Policy 8	DELETE “8. 0.2 ha. of land adjoining the car park ...of the disused embankment (see 3 above).” ADD to 8 “British Waterways is investigating the scope for craft workshops/residential use on 0.1 ha. of land adjacent to the Canal”.
SPECIAL USES Policy 14	DELETE “0.1 ha. of land adjoining the Royal British Legion is allocated for a bowling green.”
Policy 16	DELETE “0.2 ha. of land comprising the blaes pitch...for business purposes”.
Policy 17	ADD “Discussion will be held with landowners in this regard.”
EXPANSION Policy 18	ADD after “mix of housing”...” - reflecting the range of local needs and detailed survey to be carried out by the Highland Small Communities Housing Trust - “.
ACTION Policy 24	ADD “24. Further to the allocation of alternative sites, the Council will investigate with INE and community interests an economic development strategy for Fort Augustus. This should take account of demand, land availability and the types of activity to be accommodated.”
TOMATIN HOUSING Policy 7	ADD “0.8 ha. Allt Dubhag; 6-7 houses; development will require satisfactory access and drainage”.

Paragraph	Modification
Policy 3	DELETE from 3 “agreement and upgrading of road access”.
BUSINESS Policy 7	DELETE from 7 “see 11” and REPLACE with “upgrading of Station Road to the south east, which could also serve the westernmost part of 18 below”.
Policy 9	DELETE “0.7 ha. of land...picnic facilities” and REPLACE with “Tourist uses are encouraged close to the northern “gateway” to the village. Land comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.7 ha. south of the Little Chef; or • 0.7 ha. west of the Little Chef offers suitable locations for services which might include a Visitor Centre, craft enterprises and parking/picnicking facilities.”
SPECIAL USES Policy 11	DELETE “11 The following land...see7.”
EXPANSION Policy 18	DELETE “longer term” and “links through to station yard and upgrading of Station Road to the south-east”. ADD “; together with provision for access through to Station Road ultimately.”
ACTION Policy 20	ADD after “boundary walling”...”These features could be extended through the village”.
Policy 23	ADD “The Council will investigate the scope for pedestrian measures through the village together with other safety and amenity concerns.”
Policy 24	ADD “The Council will lobby the Trunk Roads Authority to improve the safety of the A9 junction at Tomatin.”
CHAPTER 26 BALNAIN Policy 1	DELETE “HOUSING The following...affordable housing.” and REPLACE with “SPECIAL USES The Council will consider development proposals in accordance with the General Policies contained in the Local Plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area; consistent with the settlement pattern at Balnain, existing land uses and amenity.”
Policy 2	DELETE “There are no...at the hall”.
CHAPTER 27 INVERMORISTON General	AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly.
CHAPTER 28 DALCHREICHART Policy 1	DELETE “The Council will...affordable housing development.” and REPLACE with “SPECIAL USES The Council will consider development proposals in accordance with the General Policies contained in the Local Plan and the provisions for the Rural Development Area; consistent with the settlement pattern at Dalchreichart, existing land uses and amenity.”

Paragraph	Modification
APPENDIX: POLICY DEFINITION	ADD under BP2 Heritage “Continuity of Feature/Habitats ie. drystone dykes, hedges, wetlands”. ADD to BP4 “Other major hazards”. ADD after “Designed Landscapes”... “/SNH”.
APPENDIX: POLICY DEFINITION	ADD to APPENDIX: POLICY DEFINITION BP2 “designated Airport Safeguarding Areas” . AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly . ADD to APPENDIX: POLICY DEFINITION BP3 “Public Safety Zone (1: 100,000 risk)” . AMEND PROPOSALS MAP accordingly . ADD to APPENDIX: POLICY DEFINITION BP4 “Public Safety Zone (1: 10,000 risk)” .
Maps	AMEND PROPOSALS MAP to correct factual inaccuracies.
APPENDIX	ADD to APPENDIX: ABBREVIATIONS